

# Fact Sheet



## For Final Renewal Permitting Action Under 45CSR30 and Title V of the Clean Air Act

Permit Number: **R30-06100016-2018**  
Application Received: **December 27, 2017**  
Plant Identification Number: **03-54-06100016**  
Permittee: **The Monongalia County Coal Company**  
Facility Name: **Monongalia County Preparation Plant**  
Mailing Address: **P.O. Box 24, Wana, WV 26590**

*Revised: N/A*

---

Physical Location: Wana, Monongalia County, West Virginia  
UTM Coordinates: 560.47 km Easting • 4395.78 km Northing • Zone 17  
Directions: Approximately 1/2 mile NE of Wana and State Route 7 on County Road 12/2

---

### **Facility Description**

The facility is a coal preparation plant that includes a 115 mmBTU/hr coal-fired thermal dryer and coal handling facility consisting of a wet wash plant with associated coal handling equipment. Facility SIC code is 1222.

**Emissions Summary**

<b>Plantwide Emissions Summary [Tons per Year]</b>		
<b>Regulated Pollutants</b>	<b>Potential Emissions</b>	<b>2017 Actual Emissions<sup>1</sup></b>
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	103.0	69.09
Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )	136.31	75.3
Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	505.16	13.74
Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	505.16	36.25
Total Particulate Matter (TSP)	1,644.04	67.89
Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	249.4	120
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	129.25	73.87
<b>Hazardous Air Pollutants</b>	<b>Potential Emissions</b>	<b>2017 Actual Emissions<sup>1</sup></b>
Hydrogen Fluoride (HF)	2.0	0.86
Hydrochloric Acid (HCl)	2.6	1.10
Total HAPs <sup>2</sup>	4.7	1.97

<sup>1</sup> Actual emissions are from the State and Local Emissions Inventory System (SLEIS) 2017 Emissions Report Total Emissions by Source and represent emissions from January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017.

<sup>2</sup> In addition to HF and HCl, the total HAPs emissions include comparatively small amounts of other speciated HAPs reported in SLEIS.

**Title V Program Applicability Basis**

This facility has the potential to emit 103.0 tpy of CO; 136.31 tpy of NO<sub>x</sub>; 505.16 tpy of PM<sub>10</sub>; 249.4 tpy of SO<sub>2</sub>; and 129.25 tpy of VOC. Due to this facility's potential to emit over 100 tons per year of criteria pollutant, The Monongalia County Coal Company's Monongalia County Preparation Plant is required to have an operating permit pursuant to Title V of the Federal Clean Air Act as amended and 45CSR30.

**Legal and Factual Basis for Permit Conditions**

The State and Federally-enforceable conditions of the Title V Operating Permits are based upon the requirements of the State of West Virginia Operating Permit Rule 45CSR30 for the purposes of Title V of the Federal Clean Air Act and the underlying applicable requirements in other state and federal rules.

This facility has been found to be subject to the following applicable rules:

Federal and State:	45CSR5	Control of Air Pollution from Coal Preparation Plants, Coal Handling Operations and Coal Refuse Disposal Areas
	45CSR6	Open burning prohibited.
	45CSR10	Control of Sulfur Oxides
	45CSR11	Standby plans for emergency episodes.
	45CSR13	Permits to modify/construct
	45CSR16	New Source Performance Standards
	WV Code § 22-5-4 (a) (14)	The Secretary can request any pertinent information such as annual emission inventory reporting.
	45CSR30	Operating permit requirement.

	40 C.F.R. Part 60, Subpart Y	Coal Preparation Plant
	40 C.F.R. Part 61	Asbestos inspection and removal
	40 C.F.R. Part 64	Compliance Assurance Monitoring
	40 C.F.R. Part 82, Subpart F	Ozone depleting substances
State Only:	45CSR4	No objectionable odors.

Each State and Federally-enforceable condition of the Title V Operating Permit references the specific relevant requirements of 45CSR30 or the applicable requirement upon which it is based. Any condition of the Title V permit that is enforceable by the State but is not Federally-enforceable is identified in the Title V permit as such.

The Secretary's authority to require standards under 40 C.F.R. Part 60 (NSPS), 40 C.F.R. Part 61 (NESHAPs), and 40 C.F.R. Part 63 (NESHAPs MACT) is provided in West Virginia Code §§ 22-5-1 *et seq.*, 45CSR16, 45CSR34 and 45CSR30.

**Active Permits/Consent Orders**

Permit or Consent Order Number	Date of Issuance	Permit Determinations or Amendments That Affect the Permit (if any)
R13-0718F	November 4, 2016	

Conditions from this facility's Rule 13 permit(s) governing construction-related specifications and timing requirements will not be included in the Title V Operating Permit but will remain independently enforceable under the applicable Rule 13 permit(s). All other conditions from this facility's Rule 13 permit(s) governing the source's operation and compliance have been incorporated into this Title V permit in accordance with the "General Requirement Comparison Table," which may be downloaded from DAQ's website.

**Determinations and Justifications**

- I. **40 C.F.R. 60 Subpart Y – Standards of Performance for Coal Preparation and Processing Plants.**  
 The provisions of this subpart apply to affected facilities in coal preparation and processing plants that process more than 181 megagrams (Mg) (200 tons) of coal per day. The applicable requirements of this regulation are in the current operating permit. However, two requirements have been updated in the renewal permit to reflect the current regulation language, which are discussed below in Table Y.

**Table Y**

Subpart Y (superseded)	Subpart Y (current)	Title V	Discussion
§60.254(b)(1)	§§60.257(b)(5), (b)(5)(i), and (b)(5)(ii)	3.3.3.	The current Title V permit stated §60.254 as the citation of authority. The specific requirement was in §60.254(b)(1), which is the content of the current permit condition. However, the requirement has been modified and the renewal permit condition updated. The requirement to utilize Method 5 in §60.257(b)(5)(ii) is applicable since the facility does not utilize a wet flue gas desulfurization (FGD) system. The statement in §60.257(b)(5)(i) about three valid test runs has been added to the condition.
§60.255(c)	§60.255(c)	4.3.5.	The language of the permit condition has been updated to reflect the current regulation.

- II. **40 C.F.R. Part 64 – Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM).** This regulation requires owners or operators of affected sources to conduct monitoring that satisfies particular criteria established in the rule to provide a reasonable assurance of compliance with applicable requirements under the Clean Air Act. Monitoring focuses on emissions units that rely on pollution control device equipment to achieve compliance with applicable standards. According to §64.2(a), CAM is applicable to a pollutant-specific emissions unit (PSEU), which means that the applicability of the regulation must be evaluated for each pollutant emitted from an emission unit.

The CAM requirements applicable to the particulate matter emission limitations on the Thermal Dryer 037C are in renewal operating permit condition 4.2.1. This condition has been restructured to clarify which requirements are derived from NSPS Subpart Y and which are only for CAM purposes.

The citation of 45CSR§30-5.1.c. has been added to the citation of authority in renewal permit conditions 4.2.8. and 4.2.9.

- III. **Changes Suggested in the Application Cover Letter.** In the cover letter for the renewal application, the permittee suggested the following changes be incorporated into the renewal operating permit. Each suggested change has been written below with a response stating the rationale for either making the change, modifying the change, or not making the suggested change.

- a. Condition 4.1.5 contains hourly and annual throughput limitations for Conveyors CB3 and CB16. The hourly throughput limit requested by the previous owner of the facility does not reflect the true operating capacity of the conveyors. Accordingly, the hourly capacity for CB3 and CB16 in Table 1 and Condition 4.1.5 has been changed from 1,500 to 1,800 tons per hour (tph).

**Response:** The suggested change constitutes a modification of requirement 4.1.8. in underlying NSR permit R13-0718F, which cannot be made using Title V permitting procedures. Furthermore, the hourly and annual throughput rates and other criteria in the Section 1.0 Emission Units table are established as limitations per requirement 4.1.1. of R13-0718F (Title V condition 4.1.19.). For these reasons the suggested change has not been made in the Emission Units table.

- b. Condition 4.1.8 contains a 20% opacity requirement for units subject to NSPS Y that were constructed on or before April 28, 2008. Units 056 (Conveyor belt 17) and 058 (Refuse Loadout Bin) handle/store coal refuse and were installed in 2004. 40 CFR 60.251(d)(1) specifies that for units constructed, reconstructed, or modified on or before May 27, 2009, the definition of coal *does not* include coal refuse. Accordingly, refuse processing and conveying equipment and refuse storage systems installed prior to May 27, 2009 are not subject to the rule. Therefore, units 056 and 058 have been removed from the applicability section of this condition.

**Response:** The suggested change has been made in the renewal permit.

- c. Condition 4.1.11 contains a 20% opacity requirement under 45CSR§5-3.4. Emission units 046 (Conveyor Belt 9) and 058 (Refuse Loadout Bin 2) are subject to this requirement but were missing from the list of subject units; they have been added in the redline version.

**Response:** The suggested change has been made in the renewal permit.

- d. Condition 4.1.15 requires MCCC to maintain and operate equipment in accordance with good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions. This is a requirement from the general provisions of 40 CFR Part 60. The existing permit includes 45CSR13 in the regulatory basis for this requirement. However, the requirement does not appear anywhere in Rule 13. Accordingly, this reference has been removed in the redline version. The existing permit also contains an apparent erroneous reference to condition 4.1.14 of R13-0718F which has been deleted in the redline version. Finally, as noted previously, emission units 056 and 058 are not subject to NSPS Y and have therefore been removed from the applicability section of the condition.

**Response:** The citation of authority in current permit condition 4.1.15. includes “45CSR13” because this is the rule under which the underlying permit has been written and issued. The requirements themselves do not necessarily have to be in the rule 45CSR13 (such as requirement 4.1.18.), but may be (such as requirement 4.1.14.). Underlying permit R13-0718F requirements 4.1.14. and 4.1.18. are applicable to the facility and will remain in the renewal operating permit. The emission units 056 and 058 have been removed for the renewal permit.

- e. Condition 4.1.18 specifies that compliance with all annual throughput limitations shall be determined using a 12 month rolling total. MCCC proposes to update this condition to specify that compliance with all hourly throughput limitations also be determined using a 12 month rolling total. Specifically, compliance will be demonstrated by dividing the rolling 12 month throughput by the rolling 12 month hours of operation each month.

**Response:** The suggested change would allow for potentially exceeding the hourly limit of 1,500 ton/hr in condition 4.1.5. for comparatively short time periods but still “average out” over the long term and be less than 1,500 ton/hr. Further, the suggested change constitutes a modification of requirement 4.1.2. in underlying NSR permit R13-0718F, which cannot be made using Title V permitting procedures. The suggested change has not been made.

- f. Condition 4.2.1 of the existing permit requires MCCC to monitor the following:

- Exit temperature of the thermal dryer
- Pressure loss through the venturi scrubber
- Water supply pressure to the control equipment
- Water supply flow rate to the control equipment

Additionally, MCCC is required to maintain each of the above parameters within a specified range.

The regulatory citation for this requirement in the existing permit is 40 CFR Part 60 and 40 CFR Part 64. The redline version of the permit provided with this renewal application seeks to clarify the regulatory justification for this condition. Specifically, NSPS Y requires thermal dryers constructed on or before April 28, 2008 to monitor exit temperature, pressure loss, and water supply pressure. However, the rules *does not* require operators of such thermal dryers to monitor water supply flow rate and *does not* require operators to establish and operate the thermal dryer within any specified range for any of the parameters. Accordingly, the redline version of the permit seeks to clarify that 40 CFR Part 64 is the basis for the requirement to monitor water supply flow rate and the requirement to establish and operate within specified ranges for each parameter.

Additionally, MCCC has provided updated proposed operating ranges for each parameter to reflect normal operating conditions for the scrubber. These revised operating ranges are reflected in the CAM plan included with this application.

Finally, MCCC has proposed language to specify that the monitoring shall be performed in accordance with 40 CFR 60, Subpart A. Specifically, 40 CFR 60.13(e)(2) provides the following:

*“All continuous monitoring systems referenced by [paragraph \(c\)](#) of this section for measuring emissions, except opacity, shall complete a minimum of one cycle of operation (sampling, analyzing, and data recording) for each successive 15-minute period.”*

Further, 40 CFR 60.13(h) specifies:

*“Owners or operators of all continuous monitoring systems for measurement of opacity shall reduce all data to 6-minute averages and for continuous monitoring systems other than opacity to 1-hour averages for time periods as defined in §60.2...”*

Finally, 40 CFR 60.13(h)(2)(i) states:

*“Except as provided under paragraph (h)(2)(iii) of this section, for a full operating hour (any clock hour with 60 minutes of unit operation), at least four valid data points are required to calculate the hourly average, i.e., one data point in each of the 15-minute quadrants of the hour.”*

Therefore, for each parameter, MCCC will obtain at least one (1) data point every 15 minutes. The data will be reduced to hourly averages in accordance with 40 CFR 60.13(h). Finally, MCCC will calculate three-hour average parameters to compare to the required operating range and to ultimately define an excursion.

**Response:** The response below has been structured to address the three concerns expressed in the comment, which are the data averaging period, restructuring of the condition, and expanding the parameter ranges.

#### Averaging Period

The permittee requested that a three-hour average be specified for each of the monitoring parameters in condition 4.2.1. CAM contains provisions for data collection and averaging based upon the potential emissions, in tons per year, calculated including the effect of control devices. In this case, the controlled PM emissions are limited to 70.8 tons/year (permit condition 4.1.4.), which is less than the major source threshold of 100 tons/year. Consequently, the criteria in §64.3(b)(4)(iii) must be met, and the data monitoring and averaging period proposed by the permittee in this comment meets these criteria. Therefore, each Roman numeral sub-condition in 4.2.1. now specifies the three-hour average.

#### Permit Condition Restructuring

Concerning the restructuring of the permit condition and data averaging, the following changes have been made:

- Current condition 4.2.1.a.1. has been divided into 4.2.1.a.1. and 4.2.1.a.1.i. to clarify that the parameter range, excursion definition and excursion response requirements are for CAM purposes only and not required under 40 C.F.R. §60.256(a).
- Current condition 4.2.1.a.2. has been divided into 4.2.1.a.2. and 4.2.1.a.2.i. to clarify that the parameter range, excursion definition and excursion response requirements are for CAM purposes only and not required under 40 C.F.R. §60.256(a).
- Current condition 4.2.1.a.3. has been divided into 4.2.1.a.3. and 4.2.1.a.3.i. to clarify that the parameter range, excursion definition and excursion response requirements are for CAM purposes only and not required under 40 C.F.R. §60.256(a).
- Current condition 4.2.1.a.4. has been divided into 4.2.1.a.4. and 4.2.1.a.4.i. to reflect the preceding parameter conditions. The entire condition is based upon CAM since water supply flow rate is not required under 40 C.F.R. §60.256(a) since the source was constructed before April 28, 2008.

The content of 4.2.1.b. has been revised to clarify that the content in the current condition applies to monitoring in §60.256(a). Since the monitoring in 4.2.1.a.4. is not affected by §60.256(a), an additional similar requirement has been written to ensure that the water supply flow rate device is also calibrated annually. The appropriate CAM citation of authority for quality assurance has been added to 4.2.1.b. along with the 45CSR30 monitoring citation that accompanies all CAM requirements.

Proposed Expansion of Parameter Ranges

In the renewal application, MCCC has provided revised operating ranges for each parameter to reflect what the permittee believes are normal operating conditions for the thermal dryer and scrubber. This writer reviewed the annual compliance certifications to determine the amount of deviations from each of the parameter ranges, which are summarized in the table below.

**Annual Compliance Certifications – Deviations Reported**

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Temperature of Gas Stream Exiting Thermal Dryer</b>	<b>Pressure Loss Through Venturi Constriction</b>	<b>Water Supply Pressure to Scrubber</b>	<b>Water Supply Flow Rate to Scrubber</b>
Year/Range	120 to 220 °F	26 to 40 inches of H <sub>2</sub> O	14 to 30 psi	640 to 1,053 gpm
2012	0	0	0	Not Reported
2013	0	0	0	Not Reported
2014	129	74	263	Not Reported
2015	0	4	0	Not Reported
2016	0	4	2	0
2017*	0	3	0	0

\*This data is from the 2<sup>nd</sup> half semi-annual monitoring report, which is the only certification reporting any deviations for the parameters.

Clearly, there were monitoring issues in 2014 when there were many deviations. But it appears that the issues were corrected before 2015.

In technical correspondence dated September 7, 2018, the permittee stated it believes that operating within the wider range of parameters produces similar, compliant results. Yet in response to technical questions, the permittee stated in the correspondence that it does not have performance test data that substantiate the proposed expanded parameter ranges. To substantiate a parameter monitoring range, 40 C.F.R. §64.4(c)(1) requires the permittee to submit control device (and process and capture system, if applicable) operating parameter data obtained during the conduct of the applicable compliance or performance test conducted under conditions specified by the applicable rule. Further, if this data is not available, a test plan or indicator ranges that rely on engineering assessments and other data, must be submitted per §64.4(d)(1) and (2). Neither has testing been proposed to justify the expansion of the parameters, nor have any engineering assessments or other data been provided. Further, the deviations data in the table above do not support any expansion of parameter ranges.

The permittee stated in the same technical correspondence that the purpose of the request is to provide the plant with more operating flexibility without sacrificing performance or environmental impacts. However, based upon the deviations data in the table above reported by the permittee, there is no need to expand the ranges of the parameters. To expand the parameter ranges without performance test data at the time of this permit renewal would be arbitrary at best and at worst would be unsupported by the data in the table above.

For these reasons the parameter ranges will not be revised for this operating permit renewal.

- g. Condition 4.2.2 of the existing permit requires MCCC to perform prescribed visible emissions checks/evaluations to confirm compliance with the various opacity requirements in the permit.

The condition is ambiguous as currently written. For example, 4.2.2.b requires that MCCC perform a Method 9 evaluation within 72 hours for any emission unit where the required weekly visible emissions checks indicate opacity in exceedance of 50% of the allowable limit. However, no Method 9 is required if the issue is corrected as expeditiously as possible, but no later than 24 hours from required the weekly observation where the potential exceedance was observed. However, Condition 4.2.2.c specifies that if any visible emissions evaluation indicates visible emissions in excess of 50 percent of the allowable limit, a Method 9 shall be performed at least once every two (2) weeks until three (3) consecutive evaluations indicate visible emissions less than or equal to 50% of the allowable limit. As currently written, it is unclear whether the trigger for the bi-weekly Method 9 evaluations is the weekly visible emissions checks or the first Method 9 evaluation triggered by a weekly observation indicating visible emissions in excess of 50% of the allowable limit.

Further, 4.2.2.d requires that a visible emissions evaluation be conducted on all 'process and control equipment' at least once per calendar month. Given that MCCC is required to perform weekly checks on every emission unit subject to an opacity requirement, it is unclear what equipment would potentially be subject to this less stringent requirement. Further, this condition seemingly conflicts with Condition 4.2.3 which requires that the permittee inspect all fugitive dust control systems on a weekly basis.

The redline permit provided with this application seeks to provide clarification by streamlining and simplifying the language of this condition.

**Response:** The suggested changes for Title V condition 4.2.2. constitute modifications of the content of underlying NSR permit R13-0718F, requirement 4.2.4., which cannot be made using Title V permitting procedures. The suggested change has not been made for renewal permit condition 4.2.2. Since condition 4.2.2.d. cannot be removed from the permit (as in the suggested permit language) and does not specifically address fugitive dust control systems, no change has been made to permit condition 4.2.3. that requires inspection of the fugitive dust control systems utilizing the authority of 45CSR§30-5.1.c.

- h. Condition 4.2.4 contains testing requirements for PM. It also required that the permittee establish and operate within indicator ranges for exit temperature, water supply pressure, and pressure loss. However, this conflicts with Condition 4.2.1 which requires that MCCC operate within fixed parameter ranges. Accordingly, MCCC proposes to remove the conflicting language from Condition 4.2.4.

**Response:**

Current condition 4.2.4. has as its underlying authority 45CSR§30-5.1.c., which means it is testing that was added by the permit writer utilizing the authority of 45CSR30 to ensure sufficient monitoring to comply with an applicable emission limitation and/or standard. This testing requirement originated in 2003 when the initial Title V permit was issued. According to the 2003 Fact Sheet, the testing required by current condition 4.2.4. is to demonstrate compliance with the PM concentration limit of 0.031 gr/dscf in 2003 permit condition 4.1.18. (see current condition 4.1.10.(1), based upon 45CSR§5-4.1.a. for thermal dryers, that incorporates by reference §60.252(a)(1)). Revision01 (MM01) of the 2003 permit did not affect current condition 4.2.4. (then condition 4.2.5.).



In the 2008 renewal, the permit writer included the PM mass rate limit with the existing original PM grain loading concentration standard mentioned in permit condition 4.2.4. Additionally, for the 2008 renewal, the permit writer specified the parameter ranges in condition 4.2.1. and stated that these are for informational purposes only and not a permit condition. However, these parameter ranges would later in the 2013 renewal become the indicator ranges for 40 C.F.R. Part 64 *Compliance Assurance Monitoring*.

As part of this review of the monitoring in conditions 4.2.1. and 4.2.4. of this permit renewal, it has been determined that the requirements in condition 4.2.4. are not derived from misapplied language from 40 C.F.R. 60 Subpart Y. In 2003 when the initial permit was written, there were no pre- and post-April 28, 2008 affected sources as in the current NSPS Subpart Y. In 2003, all affected sources were subject to the 0.031 gr/dscf limit in §60.252(a)(1). At that time, Subpart Y only stated in §60.254(b)(1) that Method 5 shall be used to determine the PM concentration. Based upon the language of Subpart Y when the 2003 permit was issued, the requirement in current condition 4.2.4. could not have been written based upon Subpart Y language for a post-April 28, 2008 affected source. Further, in the 2003 Fact Sheet the permit writer discussed the rationale for selecting the parameters to be monitored and recorded during a performance test, and Subpart Y was not referenced. Based upon these findings there is no reason to jettison any part of condition 4.2.4.

This permitting action also reviewed prior Title V permit documents to understand the intent of condition 4.2.4. It is noted that the 2003 Fact Sheet reads, “**Initial** stack testing will establish instrument operating range parameters in which the thermal dryer will be operated to provide a reasonable assurance that the thermal dryer unit is in compliance with opacity and particulate loading limits” (bold font added by this writer for emphasis). The 2003 permit writer’s intent was for the parameter ranges to be established during the initial stack testing. Moreover, there is no language in the 2003 Fact Sheet or permit condition to indicate that the parameter indicator ranges must be reestablished during each subsequent performance test under the authority currently cited for condition 4.2.4. Based upon this finding, this writer has clarified the content of condition 4.2.4.

As briefly mentioned above, it was not until the 2013 renewal that CAM requirements were incorporated into the permit, and thereby changing the informational parameter ranges into required CAM indicator ranges as specified in the CAM Plan submitted by the permittee. However, there is no requirement in 40 C.F.R. Part 64 that requires the permittee to periodically reestablish the indicator ranges. Further, no Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §64.8 has been required by the Director to reestablish parameter indicator ranges. Based upon these facts, CAM does not (at this time since no QIP has been required) require reestablishment of the indicator ranges.

For the reasons detailed above, the first paragraph in condition 4.2.4. has been revised for this renewal to clarify that the parameter indicator ranges in 4.2.1. are not generally required to be reestablished each time that performance testing is conducted per condition 4.2.4.

The permittee shall use Method 5 or an alternative method approved by the Director for testing particulate matter emissions in condition 4.1.4. Parameter indicator ranges ~~shall be~~ **have been** established for the exit temperature of the thermal dryer, water pressure to the control equipment, water supply flow rate to the control equipment, and the pressure loss of the inlet airflow to the scrubber ([see condition 4.2.1](#)). The permittee shall ~~establish~~ **monitor** these indicator ranges and operate within these ranges to provide a reasonable assurance that the thermal dryer unit is in compliance with opacity and particulate loading limits. The permittee shall take immediate corrective action when a parameter falls outside the indicator range established for that parameter and shall record the cause and corrective measures taken. The permittee shall also record the following parameters during such testing:

Neither the preceding discussion nor changes made to the permit shall be construed as to preclude the Director from requiring the permittee to reestablish indicator ranges, conduct performance testing, require the permittee to develop a QIP under CAM, or other action the Director deems necessary. Furthermore, this discussion does not preclude the permittee from proposing to

reestablish indicator ranges to modify its CAM Plan under the permitted and approved procedures for testing and submitting of such information to the Director.

The dates of the last testing and next testing, as well as the percentage of the emission rate, have been updated in permit condition 4.2.4. based upon information provided in the suggested permit language in the renewal application.

Finally, water supply flow rate has been added to the list of parameters to be recorded in 4.2.4. as provided in the suggested permit language in the renewal application.

- i. Condition 4.2.5 contains visible emission evaluation requirements for the thermal dryer. MCCC is required to operate a PM control device and to continuously monitor multiple parameters to confirm proper operation of the control device. These monitoring and recordkeeping requirements are far more stringent means of ensuring continuous compliance with the applicable PM and opacity limitations than performing a daily visible emissions evaluation. Requiring daily visible emissions evaluations in addition to continuously monitoring multiple control device operating parameters represents an unnecessary burden for the plant. Accordingly, MCCC proposes to remove the requirement to perform a daily visible emissions evaluation on the thermal dryer.

**Response:** Current permit condition 4.2.2. provides visible emissions and opacity monitoring for the opacity limit in condition 4.1.10. for the thermal dryer (Em. Unit ID: 037C). Except for the daily VE monitoring in current condition 4.2.5.b., the last half of current condition 4.2.5.d., and all of current condition 4.2.5.e., the requirements of 4.2.5. are covered by current condition 4.2.2. Therefore, these requirements in 4.2.5.d. and e. have been added to renewal permit condition 4.2.2.g. and as new condition 4.2.2.h. and current condition 4.2.5. has been deleted. The daily monitoring of current condition 4.2.5.b. can be relaxed to the weekly monitoring in 4.2.2.b. for the thermal dryer since the parametric monitoring in condition 4.2.1. is conducted continuously. The corresponding recordkeeping frequency is revised in condition 4.2.2.g. as well. The citation of 45CSR§30-5.1.c. has been added to 4.2.2. to require these changes to the monitoring. This citation is also used to specify that the sufficient time interval is to be at least one minute in 4.2.2.b. The language in condition 4.2.2.g. applied only to the thermal dryer (037C) when it was in current permit condition 4.2.5.d. To avoid making condition 4.2.2.g. applicable to all of the sources listed at the end of condition 4.2.2., a reference to 037C has been added following condition 4.2.2.g.

- j. Condition 4.2.9 contains continuous monitoring requirements that are duplicative of Condition 4.2.1. Accordingly, MCCC proposes to remove condition 4.2.9.

**Response:** The requirements in current condition 4.2.9. have been reviewed to compare content with 4.2.1. to ensure that no requirement will be lost by eliminating the condition. All of the underlying requirements in 4.2.5. of permit R13-0718F can be combined with those in Title V condition 4.2.1. by citing the appropriate requirement in 4.2.1. Therefore, the following changes have been made:

- Current condition 4.2.9.a.1. has been combined with 4.2.1.a.1. by citing R13-0718F, 4.2.5.(1)(i), with the requirement in 4.2.1.a.1.
- Current condition 4.2.9.a.2.i. can be combined with 4.2.1.a.2. by citing R13-0718F, 4.2.5.(1)(ii)(A), with the requirement in 4.2.1.a.2.
- Current condition 4.2.9.a.2.ii. can be combined with 4.2.1.a.3. by citing R13-0718F, 4.2.5.(1)(ii)(B), with the requirement in 4.2.1.a.3.
- Current condition 4.2.9.b. can be combined with 4.2.1.b. by citing R13-0718F, 4.2.5.(2), with the requirement in 4.2.1.b.
- The citation of 45CSR§5-9.1. in current condition 4.2.9. has been carried over to condition 4.2.1.

- k. Conditions 4.4.8 through 4.4.11 contain requirements to continuously record temperature, pressure loss, water supply pressure, and water flow rate to the venturi scrubber. As noted above, Condition 4.2.1 was updated to specify that all continuous monitoring be performed in accordance with 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart A, which also defines recordkeeping requirements. Accordingly, MCCC proposes to remove Conditions 4.4.8 through 4.4.11.

**Response:** The 40 C.F.R. 60 Subpart A recordkeeping requirements are in §§60.7(b) and (f).

The requirements in §60.7(b) are to maintain records of the occurrence and duration of any startup, shutdown, or malfunction in the operation of an affected facility; any malfunction of the air pollution control equipment; or any periods during which a continuous monitoring system or monitoring device is inoperative. None of these specific events to be recorded include continuously recording a parameter; therefore, the Subpart A requirement in §60.7(b) does not justify removing the recordkeeping in current permit conditions 4.4.8. through 4.4.11.

The requirements in §60.7(f) are to “maintain a file of all measurements, including continuous monitoring system, monitoring device, and performance testing measurements...” This requirement is applicable to continuously recording the value of a parameter. However, all the current permit conditions 4.4.8. through 4.4.11. contain a requirement not specified in Subpart A, which is to document and maintain records of all periods when a parameter is outside the respective range specified in 4.2.1.a. and any corrective action taken during these periods. The recordkeeping in current conditions 4.4.8. through 4.4.11. has been deleted for the renewal permit. However, the requirement to maintain records when an excursion of any parameter occurs, has been incorporated into the permit as condition 4.2.1.c. since Subpart A does not include this. Finally, the CAM citation §64.9(b) has been added to 4.2.1. for the requirement in condition 4.2.1.c.

**IV. Changes Suggested in the Application Attachment I.** The renewal application included an Attachment I, which is a red-lined version of the current operating permit indicating changes suggested by the permittee. Below, each suggested change has been summarized with a rationale for either making the change, modifying the change, or not making the suggested change. Changes suggested in the Application Cover Letter are not addressed again though they are included in Attachment I.

- a. Following the Emission Units table section 1.1., it was suggested to delete footnote 1.

**Response:** This requirement is based upon the same requirement following the emission units table in Section 1.0 of the underlying permit R13-0718F. However, since the identical requirements are in permit conditions 4.1.8. and 4.1.9. this redundant statement of the requirement following the emission units table has been deleted for this renewal.

- b. In the heading of Section 4.0, it was suggested to add source IDs 029, 039, 042, and 058.

**Response:** The Clean/Raw Coal Stockpile 1 (029), Raw Coal Stockpile 1 (039), Raw Coal Stockpile 2 (042), and Refuse Loadout Bin 2 (058) have been added to the heading since these emission units are subject to requirements in Section 4.0 of the renewal permit. Additionally, these emission units have been added to the Table of Contents of the renewal permit.

- c. In condition 4.1.5., it was suggested to change the hourly throughput from 1,500 tons per hour to 1,800 tons per hour. It was also suggested that the designated applicability to the “Preparation Plant” in brackets be changed to “008, 055”.

**Response:** The request to change the hourly throughput from 1,500 tons per hour to 1,800 tons per hour has been addressed above in the discussion “**Changes Suggested in the Application Cover Letter.**” Additionally, since the requirement in condition 4.1.5. specifies its applicability to conveyor belts CB3 and CB16, the reference to “Preparation Plant” in brackets after the citation of authority has been changed to the emission unit IDs “008, 055” for CB3 and CB16, respectively.

- d. In condition 4.1.10., it was suggested to delete 45CSR§5-3.1. from the citation of authority.

**Response:** This section of the rule sets the 20% opacity requirement, which is applicable. In technical correspondence the permittee agreed that the citation of authority should remain in the permit.

- e. For current condition 4.2.2., it was suggested to make the following changes:

- i. In the first paragraph, delete the bracketed language “Except for the following... in Section 4.3.5 of this permit”.

- ii. In 4.2.2.a., change the first sentence as follows: “An initial visible emissions evaluation in accordance with 40 CFR 60 Appendix A-4, Method 9 shall be performed within ninety (90) days of permit issuance for each emission unit with a ~~visible emissions~~ an opacity requirement in this permit unless such evaluation was performed within the consecutive 12-month period preceding permit issuance.”

- iii. In 4.2.2.b., change the first sentence as follows: “The permittee shall perform a visible emissions check on each ~~Each emissions unit with a visible emissions limit contained~~ an opacity requirement in this permit ~~shall be observed visually~~ at least once each calendar week during periods of facility operation for a sufficient time interval to determine the presence or absence of visible emissions.”

If visible emissions from any of the emissions units are observed during these weekly ~~observations~~ checks, or at any other time, that appear to exceed 50 percent of the allowable ~~visible emission~~ opacity requirement for the emission unit, a ~~a~~ visible emissions evaluations in accordance with 40 CFR 60 Appendix A-4, Method 9 shall be conducted as soon as practicable, but no later than seventy-two (72) hours from the time of the observation. A Method 9 evaluation shall not be required if the visible emissions condition is corrected as expeditiously as possible; ~~[but no later than twenty-four (24) hours from the time of the observation~~ visible emissions check]; ~~the emissions unit is operating at normal operating conditions;~~ and, the dates and times, causes and corrective measures taken are recorded.

- iv. In 4.2.2.c., delete the outline letter “c.” and make this paragraph the third paragraph in 4.2.2.b., and edit the language as follows:

If ~~any visible emissions~~ a Method 9 evaluation is required and it indicates ~~visible emissions~~ opacity in excess of 50 percent of the allowable visible emissions requirement for a given emission unit, ~~a visible emissions~~ subsequent evaluations in accordance with 40 CFR 60 Appendix A-4, Method 9 shall be performed for that unit at least once every consecutive 14-day period. If the subsequent visible emissions evaluations indicate visible emissions less than or equal to 50 percent of the allowable visible emissions requirement for the emission unit for 3 consecutive evaluation periods, the ~~emission unit~~ permittee may ~~comply with the visible emissions testing requirements in Section 4.2.2.b. of this permit in lieu of those established in this condition~~ revert to weekly checks for that emission unit.

- v. In 4.2.2.d., delete the entire requirement.
- vi. In 4.2.2.e., change the outline letter from “c.” to “c.” due to suggested revision to 4.2.2.c. and deleting 4.2.2.d.
- vii. In the citation of authority, delete the source 037C and add the source 048.

viii. After the citation of authority, add the following note: “[Note: The following emission units are exempt from this requirement as they are subject to the certification requirements under 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart Y, as specified in Section 4.3.5: CB18, CB18A, CB19A, TLB, 022, 024, BWL]”.

**Response:** The suggested changes constitute a modification of requirement 4.2.4. in underlying NSR permit R13-0718F, which cannot be made using Title V permitting procedures. The suggested changes have not been made. Only 048 has been added to the citation of authority.

f. For current condition 4.2.7. revised dates and compliance margins for recent stack testing have been provided.

**Response:** The suggested changes have been made in renumbered renewal condition 4.2.6.

g. For current condition 4.3.5. it was suggested to delete “[Belt Conveyors CB18, Belt Conveyor CB18A, Truck Loadout Bin TLB, Belt Conveyor CB10 (022), Refuse Loadout Bin 1 (024), Belt Conveyor CB19A and Batch Weigh Loadout Bin BWL]” and replace it with “[CB18, CB18A, CB19A, TLB, 022, 024, BWL]”.

**Response:** The suggested changes have been made in renumbered renewal condition 4.3.4.

### Non-Applicability Determinations

The following requirements have been determined not to be applicable to the subject facility due to the following:

None.

### Request for Variances or Alternatives

None.

### Insignificant Activities

Insignificant emission unit(s) and activities are identified in the Title V application.

### Comment Period

Beginning Date: 11/02/2018  
Ending Date: 12/03/2018

### Point of Contact

All written comments should be addressed to the following individual and office:

Denton B. McDerment, P.E.  
West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection  
Division of Air Quality  
601 57<sup>th</sup> Street SE  
Charleston, WV 25304  
Phone: 304/926-0499 ext. 1221 • Fax: 304/926-0478  
[denton.b.mcderment@wv.gov](mailto:denton.b.mcderment@wv.gov)

**Procedure for Requesting Public Hearing**

During the public comment period, any interested person may submit written comments on the draft permit and may request a public hearing, if no public hearing has already been scheduled. A request for public hearing shall be in writing and shall state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing. The Secretary shall grant such a request for a hearing if he/she concludes that a public hearing is appropriate. Any public hearing shall be held in the general area in which the facility is located.

**Response to Comments (Statement of Basis)**

No comments were received from either the public (including the permittee) or U.S. EPA.