

45CSR16

**TITLE 45
LEGISLATIVE RULE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AIR QUALITY**

**SERIES 16
STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES**

§45-16-1. General.

1.1. Scope. -- This rule establishes and adopts standards of performance for new stationary sources promulgated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to section 111(b) of the federal Clean Air Act, as amended. This rule codifies general procedures and criteria to implement the standards of performance for new stationary sources set forth in 40 CFR Part 60. The Secretary hereby adopts these standards by reference. The Secretary also adopts associated reference methods, performance specifications and other test methods which are appended to these standards.

1.2. Authority. -- W.Va. Code §22-5-4.

1.3. Filing Date. -- ~~May 15, 2017.~~

1.4. Effective Date. -- ~~June 1, 2017.~~

1.5. Incorporation By Reference. -- Federal Counterpart Regulation. The Secretary has determined that a federal counterpart rule exists, and in accordance with the Secretary's recommendation, with limited exception, this rule incorporates by reference 40 CFR Parts 60 and 65, to the extent referenced in 40 CFR Part 60, effective ~~June 1, 2016~~ June 1, 2017.

§45-16-2. Definitions.

2.1. "Administrator" means the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency or his or her authorized representative.

2.2. "Clean Air Act" ("CAA") means the federal Clean Air Act, found at 42 U.S.C. §7401 et seq.

2.3. "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Department of Environmental Protection or other person to whom the Secretary has delegated authority or duties pursuant to W.Va. Code §§22-1-6 or 22-1-8.

2.4. Other words and phrases used in this rule, unless otherwise indicated, shall have the meaning ascribed to them in 40 CFR Part 60. Words and phrases not defined therein shall have the meaning given to them in the federal Clean Air Act.

45CSR16

§45-16-3. Requirements.

3.1. No person may construct, reconstruct, modify, or operate or cause to be constructed, reconstructed, modified, or operated any source subject to the provisions of 40 CFR Part 60 which results or will result in a violation of this rule.

§45-16-4. Adoption of Standards.

4.1. Standards. -- The Secretary hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the provisions of 40 CFR Parts 60 and 65, to the extent referenced in 40 CFR Part 60, including any reference methods, performance specifications and other test methods which are appended to these standards and contained in 40 CFR Parts 60 and 65, effective ~~June 1, 2016~~ June 1, 2017, for the purposes of implementing a program for standards of performance for new stationary sources, except as follows:

4.1.a. 40 CFR §60.9 is amended to provide that information shall be available to the public in accordance with W.Va. Code §§22-5-1 et seq., 29B-1-1 et seq., and 45CSR31; and

4.1.b. Subparts B, C, Ca, Cb, Cc, Cd, Ce, Cf, Ea, Eb, Ec, WWW, XXX, AAAA, BBBB, CCCC, DDDD, EEEE, FFFF, LLLL and MMMM of 40 CFR Part 60 shall be excluded.

4.1.c. The following subparts of 40 CFR Part 60 relating to wood-burning heaters and appliances are expressly excluded and are not adopted or incorporated by reference in this rule:

4.1.c.1. The 2015 amendments to subpart AAA; and

4.1.c.2. Subpart QQQQ.

§45-16-5. Secretary.

5.1. Any and all references in 40 CFR Parts 60 and 65 to the “Administrator” are amended to be the “Secretary” except as follows:

5.1.a. Where the federal regulations specifically provide that the Administrator shall retain authority and not transfer authority to the Secretary;

5.1.b. Where provisions occur which refer to:

5.1.b.1. Alternate means of emission limitations;

5.1.b.2. Alternate control technologies;

5.1.b.3. Innovative technology waivers;

5.1.b.4. Alternate test methods;

5.1.b.5. Alternate monitoring methods;

45CSR16

5.1.b.6. Waivers/adjustments to recordkeeping and reporting;

5.1.b.7. Emissions averaging;

5.1.b.8. Applicability determinations; or

5.1.b.9. The authority to require testing under Section 114 of the Clean Air Act, as amended; or

5.1.c. Where the context of the regulation clearly requires otherwise.

§45-16-6. Permits.

6.1. Nothing contained in this adoption by reference shall be construed or inferred to mean that permit requirements in accordance with applicable rules shall be in any way be limited or inapplicable.

§45-16-7. Inconsistency Between Rules.

7.1. In the event of any inconsistency between this rule and any other rule of the Division of Air Quality, the inconsistency shall be resolved by the determination of the Secretary and the determination shall be based upon the application of the more stringent provision, term, condition, method or rule.

this chapter regarding no participation by investigative or prosecuting officers;

(3) The Public Representative and other Commission personnel assigned to represent the interests of the general public pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505 in the specific case or controversy at issue (regardless of normally assigned duties); and

(4) Contractors, consultants, and others hired by the Commission to provide an independent analysis of issues before the Commission (and Commission employees assigned thereto).

§ 3008.5 Prohibitions.

(a) Ex parte communications between Commission decision-making personnel, and the Postal Service or public stakeholders is prohibited.

(b) Commission decision-making personnel shall not rely upon any information obtained through ex parte communications unless the communications are made part of the record of the proceeding, where an opportunity for rebuttal has been provided, and reliance on the information will not cause undue delay or prejudice to any party.

(c) Paragraph (a) of this section does not constitute authority to withhold information from Congress.

§ 3008.6 Required action upon ex parte communications.

(a) Commission decision-making personnel who receive ex parte communications relevant to the merits of the proceeding shall decline to listen to such communications and explain that the matter is pending for determination. Any recipient thereof shall advise the communicator that the communication will not be considered, and shall promptly and fully inform the Commission in writing of the substance of and the circumstances attending the communication, so that the Commission will be able to take appropriate action.

(b) Commission decision-making personnel who receive, or who make or knowingly cause to be made, ex parte communications prohibited by this part shall promptly place, or cause to be placed, on the public record of the proceeding:

- (1) All such written communications;
- (2) Memoranda stating the substance of all such oral communications; and
- (3) All written responses, and memoranda stating the substance of all oral responses, to the materials described in paragraphs (b)(1) and (2) of this section.

(c) Requests for an opportunity to rebut, on the record, any facts or contentions contained in an ex parte

communication which have been placed on the public record of the proceeding pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section may be filed in writing with the Commission. The Commission will grant such requests only where it determines that the dictates of fairness so require. In lieu of actually receiving rebuttal material, the Commission may in its discretion direct that the alleged factual assertion and the proposed rebuttal be disregarded in arriving at a decision.

§ 3008.7 Penalty for violation of ex parte communication rules.

(a) The penalties for violation of ex parte communication rules specified in this section are applicable only to:

- (1) Nature of postal service proceedings conducted pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3661(c);
- (2) Appeal of Postal Service decisions to close or consolidate any post office conducted pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 404(d)(5); and
- (3) Rate or service complaints conducted pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3662.

(b) Upon notice of a communication knowingly made or knowingly caused to be made by a participant in violation of § 3008.5(a), the Commission or presiding officer may, to the extent consistent with the interests of justice and the policy of the underlying statutes, require the participant to show cause why his/her claim or interest in the proceeding should not be dismissed, denied, disregarded, or otherwise adversely affected on account of such violation.

(c) The Commission may, to the extent consistent with the interests of justice and the policy of the underlying statutes administered by the Commission, consider a violation of § 3008.5(a) sufficient grounds for a decision adverse to a party who has knowingly committed such violation or knowingly caused such violation to occur.

By the Commission.

Stacy L. Ruble,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016-15349 Filed 6-29-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 60

Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources

CFR Correction

In Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 60 (§ 60.1 to end of

part 60 sections), revised as of July 1, 2015, make the following corrections:

- 1. Reinstate the symbol < in the following places:
 - a. On page 85, in § 60.13, paragraph (h)(2)(viii), before the term “30 minutes”;
 - b. On page 667, in § 60.562-1, paragraph (a)(1)(ii) table 3, in row 1., in the second column, after “0.10” and before “5.5”;
 - c. On page 667, in § 60.562-1, paragraph (a)(1)(ii) table 3, in row 3., in the second column, after “5.5” and before “20”;
 - d. On page 706, in § 60.614, (f)(2) table 2, in the first column, in the first two entries, after “H_T”;
 - e. On page 719, in § 60.643, paragraph (a)(1)(ii), after “R”;
 - f. On page 734, in § 60.664, paragraph (f)(2) table 2, in the first column, in the first two entries, after “H_T”;
 - g. On page 1208, in § 60.5410, paragraph (g)(1)(ii), after “R”;
 - h. On page 1222, in § 60.5415, paragraph (g)(1)(ii), after “R”.
- 2. Reinstate the symbol ≤, in the following places:
 - a. On page 501, in § 60.332, paragraph (a)(4), in the first row of the table, after “N” and before “.015”;
 - b. On pages 1111-1112, in table 1 to subpart KKKK, in the second column, before the number “50” in the first, second, fifth, sixth, and ninth entries;
 - c. On pages 1111-1112, in table 1 to subpart KKKK, in the second column, before the number “850” in the third, seventh, tenth and eleventh entries’
 - d. On pages 1111-1112, in table 1 to subpart KKKK, in the second column, before the number “30” in the twelfth entry.
- 3. Reinstate the symbol ∃, in the following places:
 - a. On page 649, in § 60.543, paragraph (f)(2)(iv)(I), after “(n)” and before “3”;
 - b. On page 706, in § 60.614, (f)(2) table 2, in the first column, in the third and fourth entries, after “H_T”;
 - c. On page 719, in § 60.643, paragraph (a)(1)(i), after “R”;
 - d. On page 734, in § 60.664, paragraph (f)(2) table 2, in the first column, in the third and fourth entries, after “H_T”;
 - e. On page 1208, in § 60.5410, paragraph (g)(1)(i), after “R”;
 - f. On page 1222, in § 60.5415, paragraph (g)(1)(i), after “R”.
- 4. Reinstate the symbol > in the following places:
 - a. On pages 1111-1112, in table 1 to subpart KKKK, in the second column, before the number “50” in the third, seventh, tenth, and eleventh entries;
 - b. On pages 1111-1112, in table 1 to subpart KKKK, in the second column,

before the number “850” in the fourth and eighth entries;
 ■ c. On pages 1112, in table 1 to subpart KKKK, in the second column, before the number “30” in the thirteenth entry.
 [FR Doc. 2016-15707 Filed 6-29-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505-01-D

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0183; FRL-9947-45]

Pentaerythritol tetrakis (3-(3,5-di-tert-butyl-4-hydroxyphenyl)propionate); Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of pentaerythritol tetrakis (3-(3,5-di-tert-butyl-4-hydroxyphenyl)propionate) (CAS Reg. No. 6683-19-8) under 40 CFR 180.910 and 180.930 when used as an inert ingredient (antioxidant/stabilizer) in pesticide formulations applied to growing crops and raw agricultural commodities after harvest at a maximum concentration of 5% by weight in the formulation and applied to animals at a maximum concentration of 3% by weight in the formulation, respectively. BASF Corporation submitted a petition to EPA under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), requesting establishment of these exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance. These regulations eliminate the need to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of pentaerythritol tetrakis (3-(3,5-di-tert-butyl-4-hydroxyphenyl)propionate) for these uses.

DATES: This regulation is effective June 30, 2016. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before August 29, 2016, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

ADDRESSES: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0183, is available at <http://www.regulations.gov> or at the Office of Pesticide Programs Regulatory Public Docket (OPP Docket) in the Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), West William Jefferson Clinton Bldg., Rm. 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001. The Public Reading Room

is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305-5805. Please review the visitor instructions and additional information about the docket available at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Lewis, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; main telephone number: (703) 305-7090; email address: RDfRNNotices@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

- Crop production (NAICS code 111).
- Animal production (NAICS code 112).
- Food manufacturing (NAICS code 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

B. How can I get electronic access to other related information?

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-id.x?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl.

C. How can I file an objection or hearing request?

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. You must file your objection or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0183 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All objections and requests for a hearing must be in writing, and must be received by the Hearing Clerk on or before August 29, 2016. Addresses for

mail and hand delivery of objections and hearing requests are provided in 40 CFR 178.25(b).

In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in 40 CFR part 178, please submit a copy of the filing (excluding any Confidential Business Information (CBI)) for inclusion in the public docket. Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. Submit the non-CBI copy of your objection or hearing request, identified by docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0183, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

- *Mail:* OPP Docket, Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), (28221T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001.

- *Hand Delivery:* To make special arrangements for hand delivery or delivery of boxed information, please follow the instructions at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets/contacts.html>.

Additional instructions on commenting or visiting the docket, along with more information about dockets generally, is available at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

II. Petition for Exemption

In the **Federal Register** of April 25, 2016 (81 FR 24044) (FRL-9944-86), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408, 21 U.S.C. 346a, announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP IN-10829) by BASF Corporation, 100 Park Avenue, Florham Park, NJ 07932. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.910 and 180.930 be amended by establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of pentaerythritol tetrakis (3-(3,5-di-tert-butyl-4-hydroxyphenyl)propionate) (CAS Reg. No. 6683-19-8) when used as an inert ingredient antioxidant/stabilizer in pesticide formulations applied to growing crops and raw agricultural commodities after harvest under 40 CFR 180.910 at a maximum concentration of 5% by weight in the formulation; and applied to animals under 40 CFR 180.930 at a maximum concentration of 3% by weight in the formulation. That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Lewis & Harrison LLC on behalf of BASF Corporation, the petitioner, which is available in the docket, <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Docket No.	Type	Location	Effective date
USCG–2015–0991	Safety Zone	Jean Lafitte, LA	11/1/2015
USCG–2015–0981	Safety Zone	Henderson, KY	11/2/2015
USCG–2012–0309	Safety Zone	Chicago, IL	11/5/2015
USCG–2015–0994	Safety Zone	Kelley’s Island, OH	11/6/2015
USCG–2015–1004	Safety Zone	Marysville, MI	11/7/2015
USCG–2015–1014	Security Zone	Annapolis, MD	11/9/2015
USCG–2015–0996	Safety Zone	Mobile, AL	11/13/2015
USCG–2015–1049	Safety Zone	Pascagoula, MS	11/15/2015
USCG–2015–0995	Safety Zone	Mobile, AL	11/17/2015
USCG–2015–0976	Safety Zone	Parkville, MO	11/20/2015
USCG–2015–0903	Special Local Regulations	Englewood, FL	11/20/2015
USCG–2015–0872	Special Local Regulations	Chattanooga, TN	11/21/2015
USCG–2015–1020	Safety Zone	Wilmington, NC	11/21/2015
USCG–2015–1040	Security Zone	New York Harbor, NY	11/22/2015
USCG–2015–0972	Safety Zone	Piti, GU	11/25/2015
USCG–2015–1056	Safety Zone	St. Louis, MO	11/29/2015
USCG–2015–1045	Safety Zone	San Pedro, CA	12/2/2015
USCG–2015–0984	Safety Zone	Chickamauga L&D	12/3/2015
USCG–2015–1067	Security Zone	Cleveland, OH	12/3/2015
USCG–2015–1068	Safety Zone	Marietta, OH	12/3/2015
USCG–2015–0863	Safety Zone	Calhoun, KY	12/4/2015
USCG–2015–1058	Safety Zone	Newport News, VA	12/4/2015
USCG–2015–0878	Safety Zone	Lake Charles, LA	12/6/2015
USCG–2015–1012	Safety Zone	Wilmington, NC	12/6/2015
USCG–2015–1059	Special Local Regulations	San Juan, PR	12/6/2015
USCG–2015–0997	Safety Zone	Louisville, KY	12/8/2015
USCG–2015–0986	Safety Zone	New Johnsonville, TN	12/9/2015
USCG–2015–1104	Drawbridges	Alameda, CA	12/18/2015
USCG–2015–1109	Safety Zone	Buffalo, NY	12/19/2015
USCG–2015–1027	Safety Zone	San Francisco, CA	12/30/2015
USCG–2015–1062	Safety Zone	Boston, MA	12/31/2015
USCG–2015–1017	Safety Zone	Sacramento, CA	12/31/2015
USCG–2015–1071	Safety Zone	Long Beach, CA	12/31/2015
USCG–2015–1073	Drawbridges	Sacramento, CA	12/31/2015
USCG–2015–1069	Safety Zone	Marina Del Rey, CA	12/31/2015

Dated: June 13, 2016.

K. Kroutil,

Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard.

[FR Doc. 2016–16016 Filed 7–5–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 60

Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources; CFR Correction

Correction

In rule document 2016–15707 beginning on page 42542 in the issue of Thursday, June 30th, 2016, make the following correction:

On page 42542, in the third column, below the 44th line, remove the photographed text and insert, “3. Reinstate the symbol ∃, in the following places:”.

[FR Doc. C1–2016–15707 Filed 7–5–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

46 CFR Parts 1, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15

[Docket No. USCG–2016–0315]

Shipping; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule makes non-substantive technical, organizational, and conforming amendments to existing regulations throughout title 46 of the Code of Federal Regulations to reorganize Coast Guard offices responsible for administering the Mariner Credentialing Program. This rule will have no substantive effect on the regulated public.

DATES: This final rule is effective July 6, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket are part of docket USCG–2016–0315, and are available using the Federal eRulemaking Portal. You can find this docket on the Internet by going

to <http://www.regulations.gov>, inserting USCG–2016–0315 in the “Keyword” box, and then clicking “Search.”

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this final rule, call or email Mr. R. Sam Teague, Coast Guard; telephone 202–372–1425, email ronald.s.teague@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents for Preamble

- I. Abbreviations
- II. Regulatory History
- III. Basis and Purpose
- IV. Discussion of the Rule
- V. Regulatory Analyses
 - A. Regulatory Planning and Review
 - B. Small Entities
 - C. Assistance for Small Entities
 - D. Collection of Information
 - E. Federalism
 - F. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
 - G. Taking of Private Property
 - H. Civil Justice Reform
 - I. Protection of Children
 - J. Indian Tribal Governments
 - K. Energy Effects
 - L. Technical Standards
 - M. Environment

I. Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations

(e) * * *

EPA-APPROVED TENNESSEE NON-REGULATORY PROVISIONS

Name of non-regulatory SIP provision	Applicable geographic or nonattainment area	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
2008 Lead Maintenance Plan for the Bristol Area.	Bristol Area	7/10/2015	7/7/2016 [insert Federal Register citation].	

PART 81—DESIGNATION OF AREAS FOR AIR QUALITY PLANNING PURPOSES

■ 3. The authority citation for part 81 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*
Subpart C—Section 107 Attainment Status Designations

■ 4. In § 81.343, the table entitled “Tennessee—2008 Lead NAAQS” is

TENNESSEE—2008 LEAD NAAQS

amended by revising the entry “Bristol, TN:” to read as follows:

§ 81.343 Tennessee.

* * * * *

Designated area	Designation for the 2008 NAAQS ^a	
	Date ¹	Type
Bristol, TN: Sullivan County (part) Area is bounded by a 1.25 km radius surrounding the UTM coordinates 4042923 meters E., 386267 meters N., Zone 17, which surrounds the Exide Technologies Facility.	7/7/2016	Attainment

^a Includes Indian Country in each county or area, except as otherwise specified.

¹ December 31, 2011 unless otherwise noted.

[FR Doc. 2016–16002 Filed 7–6–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 60

[EPA–HQ–OAR–2014–0866; FRL–9948–65–OAR]

RIN 2060–AS43

Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is finalizing amendments to the standards of performance for stationary compression ignition (CI) internal combustion engines to allow manufacturers to design the engines so that operators can temporarily override performance inducements related to the emission control system for stationary CI internal combustion engines. The amendments apply to engines operating during emergency situations where the operation of the engine or equipment is

needed to protect human life, and to require compliance with Tier 1 emission standards during such emergencies. The EPA is also amending the standards of performance for certain stationary CI internal combustion engines located in remote areas of Alaska.

DATES: This final rule is effective on September 6, 2016.

ADDRESSES: *Docket:* The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2014–0866. All documents in the docket are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index. The EPA also relies on materials in Docket ID Nos. EPA–HQ–OAR–2008–0708, EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–0295, and EPA–HQ–OAR–2011–1032, and incorporates those dockets into the record for this final rule.

Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available (e.g., confidential business information or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute). Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the EPA Docket Center, EPA WJC West

Building, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding federal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the Air Docket is (202) 566–1742. Visit the EPA Docket Center homepage at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets> for additional information about the EPA’s public docket.

In addition to being available in the docket, an electronic copy of this final rule will be available on the World Wide Web (WWW). Following signature, a copy of this final rule will be posted at the following address: <http://www3.epa.gov/ttn/atw/icengines>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Melanie King, Energy Strategies Group, Sector Policies and Programs Division (D243–01), Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone number: (919) 541–2469; facsimile number: (919) 541–5450; email address: king.melanie@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Organization of this document. The information presented in this preamble is organized as follows:

- I. General Background
- II. Final Amendments
 - A. Temporary Override of Inducements in Emergency Situations
 - B. Remote Areas of Alaska
- III. Public Comments and Responses
 - A. Temporary Override of Inducements in Emergency Situations
 - B. Remote Areas of Alaska
- IV. Impacts of the Final Action
 - A. Economic Impacts
 - B. Environmental Impacts
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
 - A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review, and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review
 - B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
 - C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)
 - D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)
 - E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
 - F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
 - G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks
 - H. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use
 - I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)
 - J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
 - K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

I. General Background

On July 11, 2006, the EPA promulgated standards of performance for stationary CI internal combustion engines (71 FR 39154). These standards, known as new source performance standards (NSPS), implement section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act, and are issued for categories of sources that cause, or contribute significantly to, air pollution that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. The standards are codified at 40 CFR part 60 subpart IIII. The standards apply to new stationary sources of emissions, *i.e.*, sources whose construction, reconstruction, or modification begins after a standard for those sources is proposed. The NSPS for stationary CI internal combustion engines established limits on emissions of particulate matter (PM), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO) and non-methane hydrocarbons (NMHC). The emission standards are generally modeled after the EPA's standards for nonroad and marine diesel engines. The nonroad CI engine standards are phased in over several years and have Tiers with increasing levels of stringency. The engine model year in which the Tiers take effect varies for different size ranges of engines. The

Tier 4 final standards for new stationary non-emergency and nonroad CI engines generally begin with either the 2014 or 2015 model year.

In 2011, the EPA finalized revisions to the NSPS for stationary CI engines that amended the standards for engines with a displacement greater than 10 liters per cylinder, and also for engines located in remote areas of Alaska (76 FR 37954, June 28, 2011). In this action, the EPA is finalizing amendments to the NSPS regarding performance inducements for Tier 4 engines and the criteria for defining remote areas of Alaska. The final amendments are discussed below.

II. Final Amendments

A. Temporary Override of Inducements in Emergency Situations

Many Tier 4 final engines are equipped by the engine manufacturer with selective catalytic reduction (SCR) to reduce emissions of NO_x. The consumable reactant in an SCR system is typically supplied as a solution of urea in water known as diesel exhaust fluid (DEF). Engines equipped with SCR generally include controls that limit the function of the engines if they are operated without DEF, or if the engine's electronic control module cannot otherwise confirm that the SCR system is properly operating. Such controls are generally called "inducements" because they induce the operator to properly maintain the SCR emission control system. In normal circumstances, if inducements begin, the engine operator is expected to perform any necessary maintenance to avoid shutdown. Manufacturers as well as owners or operators of nonroad and stationary CI Tier 4 certified engines have raised concerns regarding the inducements being triggered and engines shutting down during emergency situations. Additional background on Tier 4 engines and this amendment can be found in the proposal for this rulemaking (80 FR 68808, November 6, 2015). On August 8, 2014, the EPA promulgated provisions allowing manufacturers of nonroad engines certified to the emission standards in 40 CFR part 1039 to give operators the means to temporarily override emission control inducements during qualified emergency situations, such as those where operation of the engine is needed to protect human life (79 FR 46356, August 8, 2014). These provisions, which are codified in 40 CFR 1039.665, allow for auxiliary emission control devices (AECs) that help to ensure proper function of engines in qualified emergency situations. AECs are any element of design that senses

temperature, motive speed, engine revolutions per minute, transmission gear, or any other parameter for the purpose of activating, modulating, delaying, or deactivating the operation of any part of the emission control system. The provisions of 40 CFR 1039.665 allow the engine manufacturer to include a dormant feature in the engine's control software that could be activated to override emission control inducements. In this action, the EPA is adopting those same provisions for stationary CI engines certified to the standards in 40 CFR part 1039 and used in qualified emergency situations. It is important to emphasize that the EPA is confident that Tier 4 engines will function properly in the vast majority of emergency situations. Thus, the EPA expects that AECs allowed under this provision will rarely be activated. The EPA is adopting this provision merely as a precaution to ensure that stationary CI engines can continue to operate in emergency situations.

The final amendments allow engine manufacturers to design into their stationary CI engines a dormant AEC that can be activated for up to 120 engine hours per use during a qualified emergency situation to prevent emission controls from interfering with engine operation. The EPA is finalizing amendments that allow engine manufacturers to offer, and operators to request, re-activations of the AEC for additional time in increments of 120 engine hours in cases of a prolonged emergency situation. During the emergency situation, the engine must meet the Tier 1 emission standard in 40 CFR 89.112 that applies to the engine's rated power. Operators activating the AEC will be required to report the incident to the engine manufacturers, and engine manufacturers will submit an annual report to the EPA summarizing the use of these AECs during the prior year. These final amendments are discussed in more detail below.

1. Definition of Qualified Emergency Situation

The EPA is using the definition of qualified emergency situation established in the August 8, 2014, amendments for nonroad engines. This definition is found in the introductory text to 40 CFR 1039.665 and is cross-referenced in the NSPS for stationary CI internal combustion engines, specifically in 40 CFR 60.4204(f). The definition specifies that a qualified emergency situation is one in which the condition of an engine's emission controls poses a significant direct or indirect risk to human life. An example

of a direct risk would be an emission control condition that inhibits the performance of an engine being used to rescue a person from a life-threatening situation (for example, providing power to a medical facility during an emergency situation). An example of an indirect risk would be an emission control condition that inhibits the performance of an engine being used to provide electrical power to a data center that routes "911" emergency response telecommunications.

2. Basic AECD Criteria

Section 1039.665 specifies provisions allowing for AECDs that are necessary to ensure proper function of engines and equipment in emergency situations. It also includes specific criteria that the engine manufacturer must meet to ensure that any adverse environmental impacts are minimized. These criteria are cross-referenced in the NSPS for stationary CI engines and are as follows:

- The AECD must be designed so that it cannot be activated more than once without the specific permission of the certificate holder. Reactivation of the AECD must require the input of a temporary code or equivalent security feature.

- The AECD must become inactive within 120 engine hours of becoming active. The engine must also include a feature that allows the operator to deactivate the AECD once the emergency is over.

- The manufacturer must show that the AECD deactivates emission controls (such as inducement strategies) only to the extent necessary to address the expected emergency situation.

- The engine controls must be configured to record in non-volatile electronic memory the total number of activations of the AECD for each engine.

- The manufacturer must take appropriate additional steps to induce operators to report AECD activation and request resetting of the AECD. The EPA recommends including one or more persistent visible and/or audible alarms that are active from the point when the AECD is activated to the point when it is reset.

- The manufacturer must provide purchasers with instructions on how to activate the AECD in emergency situations, as well as information about penalties for overuse.

3. Emission Standards During Qualified Emergency Situations

The EPA is requiring stationary CI engines to meet different emission standards for the very narrow period of operation where there is an emergency situation with a risk to human life and

the owner or operator is warned that the inducement is about to occur. The emission standards that apply when the AECD is activated during the qualified emergency situation are the Tier 1 standards in 40 CFR 89.112. Engine manufacturers indicated that meeting the Tier 2 or 3 standards in 40 CFR 89.112 is not feasible because the base engine used in Tier 4 configurations does not have exhaust gas recirculation (EGR), which is the engine design technology used to meet the Tier 2 and 3 standards. The EGR is not needed for Tier 4 because NO_x is controlled by the SCR.¹ The Tier 1 requirement applies only when there is a qualified emergency situation and bypass of inducements is necessary to ensure continued operation of the engine. Once the emergency situation has ended and the AECD is deactivated, the engine must comply with the otherwise applicable emission standard specified in 40 CFR 60.4202. Engine manufacturers must demonstrate that the engine complies with the Tier 1 standard when the AECD is activated when applying for certification of an engine equipped with an AECD.

4. Approval, Recordkeeping and Reporting for Engine Manufacturers

Manufacturers may ask for approval of the use of emergency AECDs at any time; however, the EPA encourages manufacturers to obtain preliminary approval before submitting an application for certification. Otherwise, the EPA's review of the AECD, which may include many unique features, may delay the approval of the application for certification.

The manufacturer is required to keep records to document the use of emergency AECDs until the end of the calendar year 5 years after the onset of the relevant emergency situation. The manufacturer must submit an annual compliance report to the EPA within 90 calendar days of the end of each calendar year in which it authorizes use of an AECD. The annual report must include a description of each AECD activation and copies of the reports submitted by owners or operators (or statements that an owner or operator did not submit a report, to the extent of the manufacturer's knowledge). If an owner or operator fails to report the use of an emergency AECD to the manufacturer, the manufacturer, to the extent it has been made aware of the AECD activation, must send written notification to the operator that failure

to meet the submission requirements may subject the operator to penalties.

5. Engine Owner or Operator Requirements

Owners or operators who purchase engines with this dormant feature will receive instructions from the engine manufacturer on how to activate the AECD in qualified emergency situations, as well as information about penalties for overuse. The EPA would consider appropriate use of this feature to be during a situation where operation of a stationary CI engine is needed to protect human life (or where impaired operation poses a significant direct or indirect risk to human life), and temporarily overriding emission controls enables full operation of the equipment. The EPA is adopting this provision to give operators the means to obtain short-term relief one time without the need to contact the engine manufacturer or the EPA. In a qualified emergency situation, delaying the activation to obtain approval could put lives at risk, and would be unacceptable. However, the EPA retains the authority to evaluate, after the fact, whether it was reasonable to judge that there was a significant risk to human life to justify the activation of the AECD. Where the EPA determines that it was not reasonable to judge (1) that there was a significant risk to human life; or (2) that the emission control strategy was curtailing the ability of the engine to perform, the owner or operator may be subject to penalties for tampering with emission controls. The owner or operator requirements also include a specific prohibition on operating the engine with the AECD beyond the time reasonably needed for such operation. The owner or operator may also be subject to penalties for tampering if they continue to operate the engine with the AECD once the emergency situation has ended or the problem causing the emission control strategy to interfere with the performance of the engine has been or can reasonably be fixed. Nevertheless, the EPA will consider the totality of the circumstances when assessing penalties, and retain discretion to reduce penalties where the EPA determines that an owner or operator acted in good faith.

The owner or operator must send a written report to the engine manufacturer within 60 calendar days after activating an emergency AECD. If any consecutive reactivations occur, this report is still due 60 calendar days from the first activation. The report must include:

¹ See Document ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0866-0010.

- Contact name, mail and email addresses, and telephone number for the responsible company or entity.

- A description of the emergency situation, the location of the engine during the emergency, and the contact information for an official who can verify the emergency situation (such as a county sheriff, fire marshal, or hospital administrator).

- The reason for AECD activation during the emergency situation, such as the lack of DEF, or the failure of an emission-related sensor when the engine was needed to respond to an emergency situation.

- The engine's serial number (or equivalent).

- A description of the extent and duration of the engine operation while the AECD was active, including a statement describing whether or not the AECD was manually deactivated after the emergency situation ended.

Paragraph 40 CFR 1039.665(g) specifies that failure to provide this information to the engine manufacturer within the deadline is improper use of the AECD and is prohibited.

B. Remote Areas of Alaska

The EPA is finalizing an amendment to the NSPS for stationary CI internal combustion engines that would align the definition of remote areas of Alaska with the definition currently used in the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, which can be found at 40 CFR part 63, subpart ZZZZ. The amendment specifies that engines in areas that are accessible by the Federal Aid Highway System (FAHS) can be considered remote if each of the following conditions is met: (1) The only connection to the FAHS is through the Alaska Marine Highway System, or the stationary CI engine operation is within an isolated grid in Alaska that is not connected to the statewide electrical grid referred to as the Alaska Railbelt Grid; (2) at least 10 percent of the power generated by the engine on an annual basis is used for residential purposes; and (3) the generating capacity of the facility is less than 12 megawatts, or the engine is used exclusively for backup power for renewable energy. The Alaska Railbelt Grid is defined as the service areas of the six regulated public utilities that extend from Fairbanks to Anchorage and the Kenai Peninsula. These utilities are Golden Valley Electric Association; Chugach Electric Association; Matanuska Electric Association; Homer Electric Association; Anchorage Municipal Light & Power; and the City of Seward Electric

System. Background on the provisions related to remote areas of Alaska can be found in the proposal for this rulemaking (80 FR 68808, November 6, 2015).

The following NSPS provisions that currently apply to stationary CI internal combustion engines for engines that are located in areas of Alaska that are not accessible by the FAHS will be extended to stationary CI internal combustion engines located in the areas identified above:

- Exemption for all pre-2014 model year engines from diesel fuel sulfur requirements (see 40 CFR 60.4216(d));

- Allowance for owners and operators of stationary CI engines to use engines certified to marine engine standards, rather than land-based nonroad engine standards (see 40 CFR 60.4216(b));

- No requirement to meet emission standards that would necessitate the use of aftertreatment devices for NO_x, in particular, SCR (emission standards that are not based on the use of aftertreatment devices for NO_x will apply) (see 40 CFR 60.4216(c));

- No requirement to meet emission standards that would necessitate the use of aftertreatment devices for PM until the 2014 model year (see 40 CFR 60.4216(c)); and

- Allowance for the blending of used lubricating oil, in volumes of up to 1.75 percent of the total fuel, if the sulfur content of the used lubricating oil is less than 200 parts per million and the used lubricating oil is "on-spec," *i.e.*, it meets the on-specification levels and properties of 40 CFR 279.11 (see 40 CFR 60.4216(f)).

III. Public Comments and Responses

This section presents a summary of the public comments that the EPA received on the proposed amendments and the responses developed. The EPA received 7 public comments on the proposed rule. The comments can be obtained online from the Federal Docket Management System at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

A. Temporary Override of Inducements in Emergency Situations

Comment: Two commenters supported the proposed amendment to allow manufacturers of stationary CI engines certified to the emission standards in 40 CFR part 1039 to give engine operators the means to temporarily override emission control inducements while operating in qualified emergency situations. One commenter noted the critical need for the proposed amendment to ensure that stationary CI engines, when used in emergency situations, may continue to

operate to ameliorate the emergency and protect human life. The commenter noted that the EPA had already adopted the proposed provision for nonroad engines, and that it was essential for stationary engines as well. The commenter also supported the proposed amendment so that engines could be dual-certified for both stationary and nonroad use, which reduces the cost and burden of certification.

Response: No response necessary.

Comment: One commenter supported the proposed definition of an emergency situation. Another commenter stated that the EPA should not impose any limitations on the operating time of an engine during an emergency situation, and noted that in the NESHAP for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, emergencies are excluded from operating time limitations and should similarly be excluded here. The commenter stated that it is not necessary to newly incorporate a definition of a qualified emergency situation because there are applicable examples of emergency situations already provided in the definition of an emergency stationary internal combustion engine in the NSPS for stationary CI internal combustion engines. The commenter indicated that if the EPA believes it must finalize specific requirements for emergency operations, then the definition of a qualified emergency situation should be revised so that it is more generalized and more applicable to different types of emergency situations which would necessitate the operation of stationary CI engines. According to the commenter, the proposed definition of a qualified emergency situation and the associated examples of indirect and direct risk to human life apply very specifically to nonroad engines that are able to be transported. The commenter urged the EPA to acknowledge that the examples provided in 40 CFR 1039.665 are merely examples, and do not constitute limits on interpreting the definition of a qualified emergency situation for stationary CI engines. The commenter indicated the EPA should clarify that there are other possible emergency situations that might pose a risk to human life, or list additional examples.

Response: The definition of emergency stationary internal combustion engine in the NSPS for stationary CI internal combustion engines, and the similar definition in the NESHAP for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, defines a subcategory of engines that are subject to different standards, whether operating in an actual emergency or in other limited

non-emergency circumstances. The definition of a qualified emergency situation has a different purpose; it defines when the inducement can be overridden for a non-emergency engine. The definition of a qualified emergency situation where an inducement can be overridden is intended to be more limited to emergency situations where there is a significant direct or indirect risk to human life.

The EPA does not agree with the commenter that the proposed definition is not sufficiently generalized and that the examples provided are not representative of stationary engines. One of the examples is “an engine being used to provide electrical power to a data center that routes ‘911’ emergency response telecommunications,” which would likely be a stationary generator. The possible scenarios provided in the definition are merely examples and are not intended to be the only types of applications and situations that can qualify. The use of the word “example” in the definition is an indication that they are just examples and not limits on interpreting the definition. It would not be possible to provide examples of all of the potential uses of engines in qualified emergency situations.

Comment: One commenter recommended that the initial period for AECD operation should be 15 days (360 hours) rather than the proposed 120 hours, with follow-on increments of 120 hours activated by communications with the engine certificate holder. The commenter stated that the time limit should be designed to address a worst-case situation, such as a region-wide disaster and a remote area, where extended communications and/or supply chain disruptions may impact the engine operator and the certificate holder beyond 120 hours. According to the commenter, the threat of post-emergency analysis and punishment by the EPA will likely be sufficient to minimize overuse of the leeway provided by the proposed amendment.

Another commenter opposed any hour limit during an emergency situation. According to the commenter, because emergencies are sudden, uncontrollable, and unlikely, there is no need to limit the amount of override time allowable to keep engines running during emergencies. The commenter also expressed concern about the procedures set forth for reactivation of the AECD, and urged the EPA to remove the requirements for resetting of the AECD. The commenter stated that the engine manufacturer is not the appropriately qualified entity to determine a facility’s qualified emergency, and that there need not be

such stringent requirements for activation of the AECD, since the EPA has the authority to evaluate after the fact whether or not it was reasonable to justify the qualified emergency.

Response: The proposed definition of a qualified emergency situation specifies emergency situations for which an engine owner or operator may temporarily override emission control inducements. Should the engine owner or operator need to extend the override beyond the initial 120 hour period, it can work with the engine manufacturer to reset the AECD for additional time. Thus, the engine owner/operator will be able to override the emission controls throughout the duration of the qualified emergency situation. The limit on AECD activation periods and procedures for resetting the AECD are necessary to ensure that the time of the override is truly limited to the time necessary to address the emergency situation, and minimize excess emissions, which would lead to adverse environmental impacts. The commenters that suggested an initial 360 hour AECD activation period to address a “worst case scenario” or an unlimited activation period did not provide any specific example of a qualified emergency situation of longer than 120 hours where the procedures for resetting the AECD could not have been followed, or explain why 360 hours represents a “worst case scenario.” The EPA’s approach appropriately balances the need to provide regulatory relief in emergency circumstances with the need to deter overuse, and the EPA does not agree that an unlimited period is necessary or that a period of 360 hours or unlimited hours is preferable. In order to reactivate the AECD, the engine manufacturer is only required to have evidence that the emergency situation is continuing and is not required to judge if the situation is a qualifying emergency. As indicated in the proposal, it is expected that AECDS would be activated rarely, if ever, so the provisions are unlikely to impose a significant burden on engine owners/operators.

Further, the EPA’s decision to adopt requirements concerning initial AECD activation periods, reactivation and notification that are identical to such requirements in the nonroad engine rules is influenced by our desire to allow for dual certification of stationary and nonroad engines, which reduces the burden of the rule on engine manufacturers. The Truck and Engine Manufacturers Association noted in their public comments² that the ability

to dual certify nonroad and stationary engines reduces the number of engine families that a manufacturer must certify, reduces the number of engine models that dealers, distributors, and customers must inventory and manage, and reduces the number of engine families that the EPA must certify. According to the commenter, if the EPA were to foreclose the ability of manufacturers to continue to dual certify, significant costs and burdens would result. Given that the NSPS for stationary CI internal combustion engines places a great deal of the compliance demonstration burden on the engine manufacturer, it is reasonable to have the manufacturer’s compliance obligations be as consistent as possible for stationary and nonroad engines.

Comment: One commenter supported the recordkeeping process outlined in the proposed rule. Another commenter disagreed with the proposed requirements for the engine owner/operator to send a written report to the engine manufacturer detailing the activation of the emergency AECD. According to the commenter, the engine manufacturer has no authority to enforce penalties or regulations promulgated by the EPA, and, therefore, the commenter did not think it made logical sense for owners/operators to be required to submit reports to the engine manufacturers, nor are the engine manufacturers qualified to determine what constitutes a qualified emergency situation at the affected facility. The commenter stated that using the engine manufacturers to collect reports and then report this information to the EPA is unprecedented and creates an unnecessary middleman. The commenter recommended that the proposed provisions be revised so that owners/operators are required to report the information directly to the EPA, or to the appropriate permitting authority.

Response: Similar to the limit on AECD activation periods and the procedures for resetting the AECD, the recordkeeping process is necessary to ensure the AECD is used in true emergencies only and prevent adverse environmental impacts. The proposed reporting provisions do not require engine manufacturers to enforce penalties or EPA regulations. Rather, they require that, in cases where the manufacturer is aware of use of the AECD, the manufacturer must make the engine owner/operator aware that they may be subject to penalties from the EPA for failing to report the use of the AECD. There are other situations in the regulations where an engine manufacturer is required to indicate that an owner/operator may be subject to

² EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0866-0017.

penalties, such as the labeling requirement in 40 CFR 1039.20. The commenter did not provide any information to show that it would be unreasonable for engine manufacturers to compile information on the use of AECDs, and the engine manufacturers have not objected to the requirement. As stated previously, it is expected that AECDs will be activated rarely, if ever, so the reporting provisions are unlikely to impose a significant burden on engine owners/operators or engine manufacturers.

Comment: One commenter requested that the EPA clarify that manufacturers are not required to submit actual certification test-based data to demonstrate that engines equipped with an AECD that helps to ensure proper function of engines in qualified emergency situations will meet the Tier 1 emission standards in 40 CFR 89.112 when the AECD is activated. According to the commenter, submittal of certification test-based data would be unduly expensive and burdensome for engine manufacturers and the EPA. The commenter recommended that engine manufacturers be allowed to demonstrate that an engine complies with the Tier 1 emission standards when the AECD is activated by submitting the conversion efficiencies for the Tier 4 engine's emission control systems and using good engineering judgement to demonstrate that the engine complies with the Tier 1 standard. Specifically, according to the commenter, manufacturers could compare the conversion efficiency with the Tier 4 emission standard for the engine to demonstrate that the engine would meet the Tier 1 emission standard if the emission control system is disabled. The commenter noted that the EPA allows the demonstration of compliance through means other than the generation of actual certification data for the not-to-exceed standards in part 1039. The commenter suggested specific edits to 40 CFR 60.4210(j) to help clarify the required demonstration.

Response: The proposed rule was not intended to require certification test-based data to be submitted to demonstrate that the engines will meet the Tier 1 emission standards. The final rule includes language in 40 CFR 60.4210(j) to clarify that certification test-based data are not required for such demonstration. The intent of the provision is that engine manufacturers would demonstrate achievement of the Tier 1 emission standards at the time that the manufacturer applies for certification of the engine equipped with an AECD. Manufacturers must document that the engine complies with

the Tier 1 emission standards when the AECD is activated and provide any relevant testing, engineering analysis, or other information in sufficient detail to support such statement when applying for certification (or amending an existing certificate) of an engine equipped with an AECD.

B. Remote Areas of Alaska

Comment: Four commenters supported the proposed amendment to align the definition of remote areas of Alaska in the NSPS for stationary CI engines with the definition currently used in the NESHAP for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines. Commenters indicated that the proposed amendment would address the unique circumstances of engines located in remote areas of Alaska. No commenters opposed the proposed amendment.

Response: No response necessary.

Comment: One commenter requested that the EPA reconsider the effectiveness of, and need for, PM emission control equipment on new Tier 3 marine engines providing prime power in remote areas of Alaska. The commenter questioned the benefit of installing PM emission controls on engines certified to the Tier 3 marine engine standards, which have lower PM emissions than engines certified to the Tier 3 standards for nonroad engines. The commenter stated that it believes that the capital and operating cost, questionable reliability, and additional complexity resulting from the PM emission control requirement do not appear to be warranted or economically viable.

Response: This comment is outside the scope of the proposal, which did not seek comment on the appropriateness of the PM emission control requirement in 40 CFR 61.4216(c) for remote areas of Alaska.

IV. Impacts of the Final Action

A. Economic Impacts

The EPA does not expect any significant economic impacts as a result of this final rule. A significant economic impact for the amendment allowing the temporary override of inducements in emergency situations is not anticipated because AECDs are expected to be activated rarely (if ever), and, thus, the impacts to affected sources and consumers of affected output will be minimal.

The economic impact from the change to the criteria for remote areas of Alaska will be a cost savings for owners or operators of engines that are located in the additional areas that will now be

considered remote. The precise savings depends on the number and size of engines that will be installed each year. Information provided by the Alaska Energy Authority indicated that one to two new engines are expected to be installed each year. Information provided by the state of Alaska indicated that the expected initial capital cost savings per engine ranges from \$28,000 to \$163,000, depending on the size of the engine. There will also be annual operating and maintenance cost savings due to avoidance of the need to obtain and store DEF.

B. Environmental Impacts

The EPA does not expect any significant environmental impacts as a result of the amendment to allow a temporary override of inducements in emergency situations. The AECDs are expected to be activated rarely (if ever) and will only affect emissions for a very short period.

The EPA also does not expect significant environmental impacts as a result of the amendments to the criteria for remote areas of Alaska. As an example, allowing the use of a Tier 3 engine instead of a Tier 4 engine would result in less reductions for a 250 horsepower (HP) stationary CI engine of 5.4 tons per year (tpy) of NO_x, 0.1 tpy of NMHC, 1.6 tpy of CO, and 0.3 tpy of PM, assuming the engine operates full time (8,760 hours per year).³ As stated previously, the state of Alaska estimates that only one to two new engines will be installed each year in the additional remote areas.

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Additional information about these statutes and Executive Orders can be found at <http://www2.epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive-orders>.

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review, and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review

This action is not a significant regulatory action and was therefore not submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review.

³ Estimates are based on Tier 3 and Tier 4 emission factors for a 175–300 HP engine provided in Table A4 of Exhaust and Crankcase Emission Factors for Nonroad Engine Modeling—Compression-Ignition. NR-009d. Assessment and Standards Division, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA-420-R-10-018. July 2010. <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/models/nonrdmdl/nonrdmdl2010/420r10018.pdf>.

B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

The information collection activities in this rule have been submitted for approval to the OMB under the PRA. The Information Collection Request (ICR) document that the EPA prepared has been assigned EPA ICR number 2196.05. The only new information collection activity in this rule is the reporting by engine owners and operators and engine manufacturers that would occur if the AECD is activated during a qualified emergency situation. The EPA expects that it is unlikely that these AECDs will ever need to be activated. Therefore, the EPA estimates that there will be no additional burden from this reporting requirement.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for the EPA's regulations in 40 CFR are listed in 40 CFR part 9. When OMB approves this ICR, the Agency will announce that approval in the **Federal Register** and publish a technical amendment to 40 CFR part 9 to display the OMB control number for the approved information collection activities contained in this final rule. The OMB has previously approved the information collection activities contained in the existing regulations and has assigned OMB control number 2060-0590.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA. In making this determination, the impact of concern is any significant adverse economic impact on small entities. An agency may certify that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities if the rule relieves regulatory burden, has no net burden or otherwise has a positive economic effect on the small entities subject to the rule. As mentioned earlier in this preamble, the EPA is harmonizing the NSPS for stationary CI engines in this action with an existing rule issued by the EPA for nonroad CI engines. Thus, this action is reducing regulatory impacts to small entities as well as other affected entities. The EPA is also including additional remote areas of Alaska in the regulatory flexibility provisions already in the rule for remote areas of Alaska, which further reduces the burden of the existing rule on small entities and other affected entities. We have, therefore, concluded that this action will relieve

regulatory burden for all directly regulated small entities.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)

This action does not contain any unfunded mandate as described in UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531-1538, and does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. The action imposes no enforceable duty on any state, local, or tribal governments or the private sector.

E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

This action does not have federalism implications. It will not have substantial direct effects on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This action does not have tribal implications as specified in Executive Order 13175. It will not have substantial direct effects on tribal governments, on the relationship between the federal government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the federal government and Indian tribes, as specified in Executive Order 13175. This final rule would impose compliance costs primarily on engine manufacturers, depending on the extent to which they take advantage of the flexibilities offered. The final amendments to expand the areas that are considered remote areas of Alaska would reduce the compliance costs for owners and operators of stationary engines in those areas. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this action.

G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

The EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 as applying to those regulatory actions that concern environmental health or safety risks that the EPA has reason to believe may disproportionately affect children, per the definition of "covered regulatory action" in section 2-202 of the Executive Order. This action is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it does not concern an environmental health risk or safety risk.

H. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13211 because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)

This rulemaking does not involve technical standards.

J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

The EPA believes that this action does not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations, low-income populations and/or indigenous peoples, as specified in Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994). The provisions being finalized in this action are designed to eliminate risks to human life and are expected to be used rarely, if at all, and will only affect emissions for a very short period. Other changes the EPA is finalizing have minimal effect on emissions.

K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

This action is subject to the CRA, and the EPA will submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 60

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: June 28, 2016.

Gina McCarthy,
Administrator.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, title 40, chapter I, part 60 of the Code of the Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 60—STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 60 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart III—Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines

■ 2. Amend § 60.4201 by revising paragraph (f)(1) and adding paragraph (h) to read as follows:

§ 60.4201 What emission standards must I meet for non-emergency engines if I am a stationary CI internal combustion engine manufacturer?

* * * * *

(f) * * *

(1) Remote areas of Alaska; and

* * * * *

(h) Stationary CI ICE certified to the standards in 40 CFR part 1039 and equipped with auxiliary emission control devices (AECs) as specified in 40 CFR 1039.665 must meet the Tier 1 certification emission standards for new nonroad CI engines in 40 CFR 89.112 while the AEC is activated during a qualified emergency situation. A qualified emergency situation is defined in 40 CFR 1039.665. When the qualified emergency situation has ended and the AEC is deactivated, the engine must resume meeting the otherwise applicable emission standard specified in this section.

■ 3. Amend § 60.4202 by revising paragraph (g)(1) to read as follows:

§ 60.4202 What emission standards must I meet for emergency engines if I am a stationary CI internal combustion engine manufacturer?

* * * * *

(g) * * *

(1) Remote areas of Alaska; and

* * * * *

■ 4. Amend § 60.4204 by adding paragraph (f) to read as follows:

§ 60.4204 What emission standards must I meet for non-emergency engines if I am an owner or operator of a stationary CI internal combustion engine?

* * * * *

(f) Owners and operators of stationary CI ICE certified to the standards in 40 CFR part 1039 and equipped with AECs as specified in 40 CFR 1039.665 must meet the Tier 1 certification emission standards for new nonroad CI engines in 40 CFR 89.112 while the AEC is activated during a qualified emergency situation. A qualified emergency situation is defined in 40 CFR 1039.665. When the qualified emergency situation has ended and the AEC is deactivated, the engine must resume meeting the otherwise applicable emission standard specified in this section.

■ 5. Amend § 60.4210 by adding paragraph (j) to read as follows:

§ 60.4210 What are my compliance requirements if I am a stationary CI internal combustion engine manufacturer?

* * * * *

(j) Stationary CI ICE manufacturers may equip their stationary CI internal combustion engines certified to the emission standards in 40 CFR part 1039 with AECs for qualified emergency situations according to the requirements of 40 CFR 1039.665. Manufacturers of stationary CI ICE equipped with AECs as allowed by 40 CFR 1039.665 must meet all of the requirements in 40 CFR 1039.665 that apply to manufacturers. Manufacturers must document that the engine complies with the Tier 1 standard in 40 CFR 89.112 when the AEC is activated. Manufacturers must provide any relevant testing, engineering analysis, or other information in sufficient detail to support such statement when applying for certification (including amending an existing certificate) of an engine equipped with an AEC as allowed by 40 CFR 1039.665.

■ 6. Amend § 60.4211 by adding paragraph (h) to read as follows:

§ 60.4211 What are my compliance requirements if I am an owner or operator of a stationary CI internal combustion engine?

* * * * *

(h) The requirements for operators and prohibited acts specified in 40 CFR 1039.665 apply to owners or operators of stationary CI ICE equipped with AECs for qualified emergency situations as allowed by 40 CFR 1039.665.

■ 7. Amend § 60.4214 by adding paragraph (e) to read as follows:

§ 60.4214 What are my notification, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements if I am an owner or operator of a stationary CI internal combustion engine?

* * * * *

(e) Owners or operators of stationary CI ICE equipped with AECs pursuant to the requirements of 40 CFR 1039.665 must report the use of AECs as required by 40 CFR 1039.665(e).

■ 8. Amend § 60.4216 by revising paragraphs (b) through (d) and (f) to read as follows:

§ 60.4216 What requirements must I meet for engines used in Alaska?

* * * * *

(b) Except as indicated in paragraph (c) of this section, manufacturers, owners and operators of stationary CI ICE with a displacement of less than 10 liters per cylinder located in remote areas of Alaska may meet the requirements of this subpart by

manufacturing and installing engines meeting the requirements of 40 CFR parts 94 or 1042, as appropriate, rather than the otherwise applicable requirements of 40 CFR parts 89 and 1039, as indicated in §§ 60.4201(f) and 60.4202(g).

(c) Manufacturers, owners and operators of stationary CI ICE that are located in remote areas of Alaska may choose to meet the applicable emission standards for emergency engines in §§ 60.4202 and 60.4205, and not those for non-emergency engines in §§ 60.4201 and § 60.4204, except that for 2014 model year and later non-emergency CI ICE, the owner or operator of any such engine that was not certified as meeting Tier 4 PM standards, must meet the applicable requirements for PM in §§ 60.4201 and 60.4204 or install a PM emission control device that achieves PM emission reductions of 85 percent, or 60 percent for engines with a displacement of greater than or equal to 30 liters per cylinder, compared to engine-out emissions.

(d) The provisions of § 60.4207 do not apply to owners and operators of pre-2014 model year stationary CI ICE subject to this subpart that are located in remote areas of Alaska.

* * * * *

(f) The provisions of this section and § 60.4207 do not prevent owners and operators of stationary CI ICE subject to this subpart that are located in remote areas of Alaska from using fuels mixed with used lubricating oil, in volumes of up to 1.75 percent of the total fuel. The sulfur content of the used lubricating oil must be less than 200 parts per million. The used lubricating oil must meet the on-specification levels and properties for used oil in 40 CFR 279.11.

■ 9. Amend § 60.4219 by adding in alphabetical order the definitions for “*Alaska Railbelt Grid*” and “*Remote areas of Alaska*” to read as follows:

§ 60.4219 What definitions apply to this subpart?

* * * * *

Alaska Railbelt Grid means the service areas of the six regulated public utilities that extend from Fairbanks to Anchorage and the Kenai Peninsula. These utilities are Golden Valley Electric Association; Chugach Electric Association; Matanuska Electric Association; Homer Electric Association; Anchorage Municipal Light & Power; and the City of Seward Electric System.

* * * * *

Remote areas of Alaska means areas of Alaska that meet either paragraph (1) or (2) of this definition.

(1) Areas of Alaska that are not accessible by the Federal Aid Highway System (FAHS).

(2) Areas of Alaska that meet all of the following criteria:

(i) The only connection to the FAHS is through the Alaska Marine Highway System, or the stationary CI ICE operation is within an isolated grid in Alaska that is not connected to the statewide electrical grid referred to as the Alaska Railbelt Grid.

(ii) At least 10 percent of the power generated by the stationary CI ICE on an annual basis is used for residential purposes.

(iii) The generating capacity of the source is less than 12 megawatts, or the stationary CI ICE is used exclusively for backup power for renewable energy.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2016-16045 Filed 7-6-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 228

[EPA-R01-OW-2016-0068; FRL-9948-61-Region 1]

Ocean Disposal; Amendments to Restrictions on Use of Dredged Material Disposal Sites in the Central and Western Regions of Long Island Sound; Connecticut

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) today is amending federal regulations that designated, and placed restrictions on the use of, the Central Long Island Sound and Western Long Island Sound dredged material disposal sites, located offshore from New Haven and Stamford, Connecticut, respectively. The amended regulations incorporate standards and procedures for the use of those sites consistent with those recommended in the Long Island Sound Dredged Material Management Plan, which was completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on January 11, 2016. The Dredged Material Management Plan identifies a wide range of alternatives to open-water disposal and recommends standards and procedures for determining which alternatives to pursue for different dredging projects, so as to reduce or eliminate the open-water disposal of dredged material.

DATES: This final regulation is effective on August 8, 2016.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket Identification No. EPA-R01-OW-2016-0068. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Publically available docket materials are also available from EPA's Web site <https://www.epa.gov/ocean-dumping/dredged-material-management-long-island-sound>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Stephen Perkins, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, New England Regional Office, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, Mail Code: OEP06-3, Boston, MA 02109-3912, telephone (617) 918-1501, electronic mail: perkins.stephen@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Organization of this document. The following outline is provided to aid in locating information in this preamble.

- I. Background
- II. Response to Comments
- III. Changes From the Proposed Rule
- IV. Compliance With Statutory and Regulatory Requirements
- V. Final Action
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Background

On February 10, 2016, EPA published in the *Federal Register* (81 FR 7055) a proposed rule (the Proposed Rule) amending federal regulations that designated, and placed restrictions on the use of, the Central Long Island Sound (CLDS) and Western Long Island Sound (WLDS) dredged material disposal sites, located offshore from New Haven and Stamford, Connecticut, respectively. The existing restrictions on the sites were imposed when EPA designated CLDS and WLDS (70 FR 32498) (the 2005 Rule), to ensure appropriate use and management of the designated disposal sites and to support the common goal of New York and Connecticut to reduce or eliminate the disposal of dredged material in Long Island Sound.

To support this goal, the restrictions in the 2005 Rule contemplated that there would be a regional dredged material management plan (DMMP) for Long Island Sound that would help to guide the management of dredged material from projects which occur after completion of the DMMP. The amended restrictions in this Final Rule incorporate standards and procedures for the use of those sites consistent with those recommended in the Long Island Sound DMMP, which was completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) on January 11, 2016.

The restrictions imposed on the sites in the 2005 Rule also included

conditions that specified that use of the sites would be suspended if, within 120 days of completion of the DMMP, and subject to EPA's consideration of public comments, EPA does not issue legally binding final amendments adopting such procedures and standards. Any such suspension in the use of the sites would be lifted if and when EPA issues the required final rule.

II. Response to Comments

EPA received comments on the Proposed Rule from 119 individuals, groups or entities. Comments were received from the Connecticut Congressional Delegation, USACE, the states of Connecticut and New York, a number of municipalities, environmental groups, harbor and marine trade groups, and many private citizens. Approximately eighty percent of the commenters supported the Proposed Rule, with some offering suggested improvements. The remainder expressed opposition in part or in whole to the Proposed Rule. A document containing copies of all of the public comments received by EPA and a document containing EPA's response to each of the comments have been placed in the public docket and on the Web site identified in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document. There was significant overlap among the comments received. Below, EPA summarizes the main points of the commenters and provides responses.

Comment #1. A number of commenters, including the states of Connecticut and New York, asked that EPA be explicit in retaining the common goal of the 2005 Rule—to reduce or eliminate open-water disposal of dredged material in Long Island Sound.

Response #1. EPA did not intend to signal any change to the goal of the 2005 Rule. In fact, the goal was so stated in the first paragraph of the Background section of the Proposed Rule. EPA did not include the goal statement in the proposed regulations because it was previously included in a provision addressing development of the DMMP and EPA deleted that provision because the DMMP had been completed. Again, EPA did not by this deletion intend to signal a change in the goal. Therefore, to address this comment, EPA has added a sentence, restating the common goal, in the introductory paragraph (b)(4)(vi) in the Final Rule.

Comment #2. The states of Connecticut and New York proposed similar ideas for revisions to the Proposed Rule intended to spur increased beneficial use and result in staged reductions in open water



FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 81

Monday,

No. 167

August 29, 2016

Part II

Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR Part 60

Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills; Final Rule

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 60**

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0451; FRL-9949-55-OAR]

RIN 2060-AS23

Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is finalizing a new subpart that updates the Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills (Emission Guidelines). The EPA reviewed the landfills Emission Guidelines based on changes in the landfills industry since the Emission Guidelines were promulgated in 1996. The EPA's review of the Emission Guidelines for municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills considered landfills that accepted waste after November 8, 1987, and commenced construction, reconstruction, or modification on or before July 17, 2014. Based on this review, the EPA has determined that it is appropriate to revise the Emission Guidelines to reflect changes to the population of landfills and the results of an analysis of the timing and methods for reducing emissions. This action will achieve additional reductions in emissions of landfill gas and its components, including methane, by lowering the emissions threshold at which a landfill must install controls. This action also incorporates new data and information received in response to an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking and a proposed rulemaking and addresses other regulatory issues including surface emissions monitoring, wellhead monitoring, and the definition of landfill gas treatment system.

The revised Emission Guidelines, once implemented through revised state plans or a revised federal plan, will reduce emissions of landfill gas, which contains both nonmethane organic compounds and methane. Landfills are a significant source of methane, which is a potent greenhouse gas pollutant. These avoided emissions will improve air quality and reduce the potential for public health and welfare effects associated with exposure to landfill gas emissions.

DATES: This final rule is effective on October 28, 2016.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the

regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of October 28, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0451. All documents in the docket are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information concerning this final rule, contact Ms. Hillary Ward, Fuels and Incineration Group, Sector Policies and Programs Division, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (E143-05), Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711; telephone number: (919) 541-3154; fax number: (919) 541-0246; email address: ward.hillary@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Acronyms and Abbreviations. The following acronyms and abbreviations are used in this document.

ANPRM Advance notice of proposed rulemaking
ANSI American National Standards Institute
BMP Best management practice
Btu British thermal unit
CAA Clean Air Act
CBI Confidential business information
CDX Central Data Exchange
CEDRI Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface
CFR Code of Federal Regulations
CO₂ Carbon dioxide
CO_{2e} Carbon dioxide equivalent
EPA Environmental Protection Agency
ERT Electronic Reporting Tool
FID Flame ionization detector
GCCS Gas collection and control system
GHG Greenhouse gas
GHGRP Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program
GWP Global warming potential
HAP Hazardous air pollutant
HOV Higher operating value
IAMS Integrated assessment models
ICR Information collection request
IPCC Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IWG Interagency working group
LFG Landfill gas
LFGCost Landfill Gas Energy Cost Model
m³ Cubic meters
Mg Megagram
Mg/yr Megagram per year
mph Miles per hour
MSW Municipal solid waste
mtCO_{2e} Metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent

MW Megawatt
MWh Megawatt hour
NAICS North American Industry Classification System
NESHAP National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NMOC Nonmethane organic compound
NRC National Research Council
NSPS New source performance standards
NTTAA National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
OAQPS Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
OMB Office of Management and Budget
PM Particulate matter
PM_{2.5} Fine particulate matter
ppm Parts per million
ppmvd Parts per million by dry volume
RCRA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RD&D Research, development, and demonstration
RFA Regulatory Flexibility Act
SBAR Small Business Advocacy Review
SC-CH₄ Social cost of methane
SC-CO₂ Social cost of carbon dioxide
SEM Surface emissions monitoring
SO₂ Sulfur dioxide
SSM Startup, shutdown, and malfunction
Tg Teragram
TIP Tribal implementation plan
TTN Technology Transfer Network
U.S. United States
USGCRP U.S. Global Change Research Program
VCS Voluntary consensus standard
VOC Volatile organic compound

Organization of This Document. The following outline is provided to aid in locating information in this preamble.

- I. Executive Summary
 - A. Purpose of Regulatory Action
 - B. Summary of Major Provisions
 - C. Costs and Benefits
- II. General Information
 - A. Does this action apply to me?
 - B. Where can I get a copy of this document and other related information?
- III. Background
 - A. Landfill Gas Emissions and Climate Change
 - B. What are the public health and welfare effects of landfill gas emissions?
 - C. What is the EPA's authority for reviewing the Emission Guidelines?
 - D. What is the purpose and scope of this action?
 - E. How would the changes in applicability affect sources currently subject to subparts Cc and WWW?
- IV. Summary of the Final Emission Guidelines
 - A. What are the control requirements?
 - B. What are the monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements?
 - C. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions
- V. Summary of Significant Changes Since Proposal
 - A. Changes to Monitoring, Recordkeeping, and Reporting
 - B. Tier 4
 - C. Changes to Address Closed or Non-Productive Areas
 - D. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions

- E. Other Corrections and Clarifications
- VI. Rationale for Significant Changes Since Proposal
 - A. Changes to Monitoring, Recordkeeping, and Reporting
 - B. Tier 4
 - C. Changes to Address Closed or Non-Productive Areas
 - D. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions
 - E. Other Corrections and Clarifications
- VII. Impacts of This Final Rule
 - A. What are the air quality impacts?
 - B. What are the water quality and solid waste impacts?
 - C. What are the secondary air impacts?
 - D. What are the energy impacts?
 - E. What are the cost impacts?
 - F. What are the economic impacts?
 - G. What are the benefits?
- VIII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
 - A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review
 - B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
 - C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)
 - D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)
 - E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
 - F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments
 - G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks
 - H. Executive Order 13211: Actions that Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use
 - I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) and 1 CFR part 51
 - J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
 - K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

I. Executive Summary

A. Purpose of Regulatory Action

This action finalizes changes to the MSW landfills Emission Guidelines resulting from the EPA's review of the Emission Guidelines under Clean Air Act (CAA) section 111. The EPA's review identified a number of advances in technology and operating practices for reducing emissions of landfill gas (LFG) and the final changes are based on our evaluation of those advances and our understanding of LFG emissions. The resulting changes to the Emission Guidelines will achieve additional reductions in emissions of LFG and its components, including methane. This final rule is consistent with the President's 2013 Climate Action Plan,¹ which directs federal agencies to focus on "assessing current emissions data,

addressing data gaps, identifying technologies and best practices for reducing emissions, and identifying existing authorities and incentive-based opportunities to reduce methane emissions." The final rule is also consistent with the President's Methane Strategy,² which directs the EPA's regulatory and voluntary programs to continue to pursue emission reductions through regulatory updates and to encourage LFG energy recovery through voluntary programs. These directives are discussed in detail in section III.A of this preamble. This regulatory action also resolves or clarifies several implementation issues that were previously addressed in amendments proposed on May 23, 2002 (67 FR 36475) and September 8, 2006 (71 FR 53271).

1. Need for Regulatory Action

The EPA reviewed the Emission Guidelines to determine the potential for achieving additional reductions in emissions of LFG. Significant changes have occurred in the landfill industry over time, including changes to the size and number of existing landfills, industry practices, and gas control methods and technologies. Based on the EPA's review, we are finalizing changes to the Emission Guidelines. The changes will achieve additional emission reductions of LFG and its components (including methane), which will reduce air pollution and the resulting harm to public health and welfare. Landfills are a significant source of methane, a potent greenhouse gas, for which there are cost-effective means of reduction, so this rule is an important element of the United States' work to reduce emissions that are contributing to climate change. In addition, the changes provide more effective options for demonstrating compliance, and provide clarification of several implementation issues raised during the amendments proposed in 2002 and 2006. Additional information supporting the EPA's decision to review the Emission Guidelines can be found in Section I.A. of the Emission Guidelines proposal (80 FR 52100, August 27, 2015).

2. Legal Authority

The EPA is not statutorily obligated to conduct a review of the Emission Guidelines, but has the discretion to do so when circumstances indicate that it is appropriate. The EPA determined that it was appropriate to review the

Emission Guidelines based on changes in the landfill industry and changes in operation of landfills, including the size, trends in gas collection and control system installations, and age of landfills since the Emission Guidelines were promulgated in 1996. The EPA compiled new information on landfills through data collection efforts for a statutorily mandated review of the existing new source performance standards (NSPS) (40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW), public comments received on the NSPS proposal (79 FR 41796, July 17, 2014), public comments received on the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) (79 FR 41772, July 17, 2014), and public comments received on the Emission Guidelines proposal (80 FR 52100, August 27, 2015) for use in reviewing the Emission Guidelines. This information allowed the EPA to assess current practices, emissions, and the potential for additional emission reductions.

The EPA interprets CAA section 111(d) as providing discretionary authority to update emission guidelines, and by extension to require states to update standards of performance, in appropriate circumstances. The EPA believes this is the best, and perhaps only, permissible interpretation of the CAA. It is consistent with the gap filling nature of section 111(d), the general purposes of the CAA to protect and enhance air quality. Moreover, this is supported because Congress's grant of authority to issue regulations carries with it the authority to amend or update regulations³ that they have issued.⁴ "Regulatory agencies do not establish rules of conduct to last forever; they are supposed, within the limits of the law and of fair and prudent administration, to adapt their rules and practices to the Nation's needs in a volatile, changing economy. They are neither required nor supposed to regulate the present and the future within the inflexible limits of yesterday."⁵

To interpret the CAA otherwise would mean that Congress intended to

³ Congress has provided the Agency with broad authority to issue regulations "as necessary to carry out [her] functions under" the Act. This broad grant of authority further supports the reasonableness of EPA's interpretation.

⁴ See *Trujillo v. General Electric Co.*, 621 F.2d 1084, 1086 (10th Cir. 1980) ("Administrative agencies have an inherent authority to reconsider their own decisions, since the power to decide in the first instance carries with it the power to reconsider.") (citing *Albertson v. FCC*, 182 F.2d 397, 399 (D.C. Cir. 1950)). See 621 F.2d at 1088 ("The authority to reconsider may result in some instances, as it did here, in a totally new and different determination.")

⁵ *American Trucking Ass'n v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry.*, 387 U.S. 397, 416 (1967).

¹ Executive Office of the President, "The President's Climate Action Plan" June 2013. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/image/president27climateactionplan.pdf>.

² Executive Office of the President, "Climate Action Plan Strategy to Reduce Methane, March 2014. https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/strategy_to_reduce_methane_emissions_2014-03-28_final.pdf.

allow existing sources to operate forever without any consideration of the need for updated controls simply because, at some point in the distant past, the EPA had previously required these sources to be regulated. The EPA's interpretation is consistent with the gap filling nature of section 111(d), whereas the opposite interpretation would undermine it. By its terms, section 111(d) was designed to address emissions from existing sources of non-national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS), non-CAA section 112 hazardous air pollutants.⁶ A one-off approach would mean that the EPA would be unable to address the threats from these sources even as we improve our understanding of the danger presented by the pollutant at issue or new or improved control options become available. Indeed, this lack of authority would exist even in cases such as the instant one where some affected sources had not yet been required to invest in emission controls.

The overall structure of the CAA also supports EPA's interpretation. The primary goal of the CAA is: "[T]o protect and enhance the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population." CAA section 101(b)(1), 42 U.S.C. 7401(b)(1). The CAA goes about this in a number of ways. Under section 111 the chosen approach is through the identification of the best system of emission reduction available to reduce emissions to the atmosphere which takes into account the cost of achieving such reductions and any nonair quality health and environmental impact and energy

⁶ CAA subsection 111(d)(1)(A)(i), provides that regulation under CAA section 111(d) is intended to cover pollutants that are not regulated under either the criteria pollutant/NAAQS provisions or section 112 of the CAA. Thus, section 111(d) is designed to regulate pollutants from existing sources that fall in the gap not covered by the criteria pollutant provisions or the hazardous air pollutant provisions. This gap-filling purpose can be seen in the early legislative history of the CAA. As originally enacted in the 1970 CAA, the precursor to CAA section 111 (which was originally section 114) was described as covering pollutants that would not be controlled by the criteria pollutant provisions or the hazardous air pollutant provisions. See S. Committee Rep. to accompany S. 4358 (Sept. 17, 1970), 1970 CAA Legis. Hist. at 420 ("It should be noted that the emission standards for pollutants which cannot be considered hazardous (as defined in section 115 [which later became section 112]) could be established under section 114 [later, section 111]. Thus, there should be no gaps in control activities pertaining to stationary source emissions that pose any significant danger to public health or welfare."); Statement by S. Muskie, S. Debate on S. 4358 (Sept. 21, 1970), 1970 CAA Legis. Hist. at 227 ("[T]he bill [in section 114] provides the Secretary with the authority to set emission standards for selected pollutants which cannot be controlled through the ambient air quality standards and which are not hazardous substances.").

requirements. These systems change over time. Where such changes have the effect of substantially reducing harmful air emissions, it would be illogical that the EPA would be precluded from requiring existing sources to update their controls in recognition of those changes, particularly when those sources may continue to operate for decades. Similarly, if, after a rule was finalized, factual information were to arise revealing that the initial standards were too stringent to be met, it would be illogical that EPA would be precluded from revising the standards accordingly. Had Congress intended to preclude the EPA from updating the emission guidelines to reflect changes, it would surely have specifically said so, something it did not do.

The fact that the EPA has the authority to update the emission guidelines does not, however, mean that it is unconstrained in exercising that authority. Rather, the decision whether to update a particular set of emission guidelines must be made on a rule-specific basis after considering the same factors the EPA considered in establishing those guidelines, including the level of reductions achievable and the cost of achieving those reductions, and, as appropriate, taking into account controls sources installed to comply with the initial emission guidelines. The EPA has determined that it is appropriate to update the emission guidelines for municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills. The EPA's final rule is not a requirement to install new and different control equipment (compared to the existing rule), but rather to install the same basic controls, *i.e.*, a well-designed and well-operated landfill gas collection and control system, on an accelerated basis. While this will result in some additional cost, the EPA believes that cost is fully justified given the substantial reduction in emissions of landfill gas and its constituent components, including methane, that will result. As indicated in the final rule, lowering the threshold above which landfill owners/operators must install a gas collection and control system from 50 Mg of non-methane organic compounds (NMOC) per year to 34 Mg/year will result in an additional reduction in NMOC emissions of 1,810 Mg/yr and a concomitant reduction in methane emissions of 0.285 million Mg/yr. In these circumstances, the EPA believes that it not only has the legal authority to update the emission guidelines, but that doing so is imminently reasonable.

B. Summary of Major Provisions

The final Emission Guidelines apply to landfills that accepted waste after November 8, 1987,⁷ and that commenced construction, reconstruction, or modification on or before July 17, 2014 (the date of publication of proposed revisions to the landfills NSPS, 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX). The final rule provisions are described below.

Thresholds for Installing Controls. The final Emission Guidelines retain the current design capacity thresholds of 2.5 million megagrams (Mg) and 2.5 million cubic meters (m³), but reduce the nonmethane organic compounds (NMOC) emission threshold for the installation and removal of a gas collection and control system (GCCS) from 50 Mg/yr to 34 Mg/yr for landfills that are not closed as of September 27, 2017. (A megagram is also known as a metric ton, which is equal to 1.1 U.S. short tons or about 2,205 pounds.) An MSW landfill that exceeds the design capacity thresholds must install and start up a GCCS within 30 months after LFG emissions reach or exceed an NMOC level of 34 Mg/yr. Consistent with the existing Emission Guidelines, the owner or operator of a landfill may control the gas by routing it to a non-enclosed flare, an enclosed combustion device, or a treatment system that processes the collected gas for subsequent sale or beneficial use.

Emission Threshold Determination. The EPA is finalizing an alternative site-specific emission threshold determination methodology for when a landfill must install and operate a GCCS. This alternative methodology, referred to as "Tier 4," is based on surface emissions monitoring (SEM) and demonstrates whether or not surface emissions are below a specific threshold. The Tier 4 SEM demonstration allows landfills that exceed the threshold using modeled NMOC emission rates using Tier 1 or 2 to demonstrate that actual site-specific surface methane emissions are below a specific threshold. A landfill that can demonstrate that surface emissions are below 500 parts per million (ppm) for four consecutive quarters does not trigger the requirement to install a GCCS even if Tier 1, 2, or 3 calculations

⁷ This date in 1987 is the date on which permit programs were established under the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of the Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) which amended the Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA), 42 U.S.C. 6901–6992k. This date was also selected as the regulatory cutoff in the Emission Guidelines for landfills no longer receiving wastes because the EPA judged states would be able to identify active facilities as of this date.

indicate that the 34 Mg/yr threshold has been exceeded. Landfills that have calculated NMOC emissions of 50 Mg/yr or greater are not eligible for the Tier 4 emission threshold determination in order to prevent conflicting requirements between subpart Cf and the landfills NESHAP (40 CFR part 63, subpart AAAA). Many landfills that are subject to subpart Cf will also be subject to the landfills NESHAP. The landfills NESHAP requires landfills that exceed the size threshold (2.5 million Mg and 2.5 million m³) and exceed the NMOC emissions threshold (50 Mg/yr) to install and operate a GCCS.

Closed Landfill Subcategory. Because closed landfills do not produce as much LFG as an active landfill, the EPA is finalizing a separate subcategory for landfills that close on or before September 27, 2017. Landfills in this subcategory will continue to be subject to an NMOC emission threshold of 50 Mg/yr for determining when controls must be installed or can be removed.

Low LFG Producing Areas. The EPA is also finalizing criteria for determining when it is appropriate to cap or remove all or a portion of the GCCS. The final criteria for capping or removing all or a portion of the GCCS are: (1) The landfill is closed, (2) the GCCS has operated for at least 15 years or the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows, and (3) the calculated NMOC emission rate at the landfill is less than 34 Mg/yr on three successive test dates. The final rule does not contain a GCCS removal criterion based on surface emissions monitoring.

Landfill Gas Treatment. In the final Emission Guidelines, the EPA has addressed two issues related to LFG treatment. First, the EPA is clarifying that the use of treated LFG is not limited to use as a fuel for a stationary combustion device but may be used for other beneficial uses such as vehicle fuel, production of high-Btu thermal unit (Btu) gas for pipeline injection, or use as a raw material in a chemical manufacturing process. Second, the EPA is finalizing a definition of *treated landfill gas* that applies to LFG processed in a treatment system meeting the requirements in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf, and defining *treatment system* as a system that filters, de-waters, and compresses LFG for sale or beneficial use. The definition of treatment system allows the level of treatment to be tailored to the type and design of the specific combustion equipment or the other beneficial use such as vehicle fuel, production of high-Btu gas for pipeline injection, or use as a raw material in a chemical

manufacturing process in which the LFG is used. Owners or operators must develop a site-specific treatment system monitoring plan that includes monitoring parameters addressing all three elements of treatment (filtration, de-watering, and compression) to ensure the treatment system is operating properly for the intended end use of the treated LFG. They also must keep records that demonstrate that such parameters effectively monitor filtration, de-watering, and compression system performance necessary for the end use of the treated LFG.

Wellhead Operational Standards. The EPA is finalizing changes to certain operational standards (*i.e.*, the requirement to meet specific operating limits) for nitrogen/oxygen level at the wellheads. Landfill owners or operators are not required to take corrective action based on exceedances of specified operational standards for nitrogen/oxygen levels at wellheads, but they must continue to monitor and maintain records of nitrogen/oxygen levels on a monthly basis in order to inform any necessary adjustments to the GCCS and must maintain records of monthly readings. The operational standard, corrective action, and corresponding recordkeeping and reporting remain for temperature and maintaining negative pressure at the wellhead.

Surface Monitoring. The EPA is finalizing a requirement to monitor all surface penetrations at existing landfills. In final 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf, landfills must conduct SEM at all cover penetrations and openings within the area of the landfill where waste has been placed and a gas collection system is required to be in place and operating according to the operational standards in final 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf. Specifically, landfill owners or operators must conduct surface monitoring on a quarterly basis at the specified intervals and where visual observations indicate elevated concentrations of LFG, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover and all cover penetrations.

Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction. The EPA is finalizing a requirement that standards of performance in the Emission Guidelines apply at all times, including periods of startup, shutdown, and malfunction (SSM). The EPA is also finalizing an alternative standard during SSM events: In the event the collection or control system is not operating, the gas mover system must be shut down and all valves in the collection and control system contributing to venting of the gas to the atmosphere must be

closed within 1 hour of the collection or control system not operating.

Other Clarifications. The EPA is finalizing a number of clarifications to address several issues that have been raised by landfill owners or operators during implementation of the current NSPS and Emission Guidelines. These clarifications include adding criteria for when an affected source must update its design plan and clarifying when landfill owners or operators must submit requests to extend the timeline for taking corrective action. The EPA is also updating several definitions in the Emission Guidelines. In addition, while the EPA is not mandating organics diversion, we are finalizing two specific compliance flexibilities in the Emission Guidelines to encourage wider adoption of organics diversion and GCCS best management practices (BMPs) for emission reductions at landfills. These compliance flexibilities are discussed in section V.A.1 and VI.A.1 (wellhead monitoring) and section V.B and section VI.B (Tier 4 emission threshold determination) of this preamble.

C. Costs and Benefits

The final Emission Guidelines are expected to significantly reduce emissions of LFG and its components, which include methane, volatile organic compounds (VOC), and hazardous air pollutants (HAP). Landfills are a significant source of methane emissions, and in 2014, landfills represented the third largest source of human-related methane emissions in the U.S. This rulemaking applies to existing landfills that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction on or before July 17, 2014 and accepted waste after 1987. The EPA estimates 1,851 existing landfills that accepted waste after 1987 and opened prior to 2014.

To comply with the emission limits in the final rule, MSW landfill owners or operators are expected to install the least-cost control for collecting, and treating or combusting LFG. The annualized net cost for the final Emission Guidelines is estimated to be \$54.1 million (2012\$) in 2025, when using a 7 percent discount rate. The annualized costs represent the costs compared to no changes to the current Emission Guidelines (*i.e.*, baseline) and include \$92.6 million to install and operate a GCCS, as well as \$0.76 million to complete the corresponding testing and monitoring. These control costs are offset by \$39.3 million in revenue from electricity sales, which is incorporated into the net control costs for certain landfills that are expected to generate revenue by using the LFG to produce electricity.

Installation of a GCCS to comply with the 34 Mg/yr NMOC emissions threshold at open landfills would achieve reductions of 1,810 Mg/yr NMOC and 285,000 metric tons methane (about 7.1 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (mtCO₂e)) beyond the baseline in year 2025. In addition, the final rule is expected to result in the net reduction of an additional 277,000 Mg CO₂, due to reduced demand for electricity from the grid as landfills generate electricity from LFG. The NMOC portion of LFG can contain a variety of air pollutants, including VOC and various organic HAP. VOC emissions are precursors to both fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and ozone formation. These pollutants, along with methane, are associated with substantial health effects, welfare effects, and climate effects. The EPA expects that the reduced emissions will result in improvements in air quality and lessen the potential for health effects associated with exposure to air pollution related emissions, and result

in climate benefits due to reductions of the methane component of LFG.

The EPA estimates that the final rule's estimated methane emission reductions and secondary CO₂ emission reductions in the year 2025 would yield global monetized climate benefits of \$200 million to approximately \$1.2 billion, depending on the discount rate. Using the average social cost of methane (SC-CH₄) and the average social cost of CO₂ (SC-CO₂), each at a 3-percent discount rate, results in an estimate of about \$440 million in 2025 (2012\$).

The SC-CH₄ and SC-CO₂ are the monetary values of impacts associated with marginal changes in methane and CO₂ emissions, respectively, in a given year. It includes a wide range of anticipated climate impacts, such as net changes in agricultural productivity, property damage from increased flood risk, and changes in energy system costs, such as reduced costs for heating and increased costs for air conditioning.

With the data available, we are not able to provide health benefit estimates

for the reduction in exposure to HAP, ozone, and PM_{2.5} for this rule. This is not to imply that there are no such benefits of the rule; rather, it is a reflection of the difficulties in modeling the direct and indirect impacts of the reductions in emissions for this sector with the data currently available.

Based on the monetized benefits and costs, the annual net benefits of the final guidelines are estimated to be \$390 million (\$2012) in 2025, based on the average SC-CH₄ at a 3 percent discount rate, average SC-CO₂ at a 3 percent discount rate, and costs at a 7 percent discount rate.

II. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

This final rule addresses existing MSW landfills, *i.e.*, landfills accepting waste after 1987 and on which construction was commenced on or before July 17, 2014, and associated solid waste management programs. Potentially affected categories include those listed in Table 1 of this preamble.

TABLE 1—REGULATED ENTITIES

Category	NAICS ^a	Examples of affected facilities
Industry: Air and water resource and solid waste management	924110	Solid waste landfills.
Industry: Refuse systems—solid waste landfills	562212	Solid waste landfills.
State, local, and tribal government agencies	924110	Administration of air and water resource and solid waste management programs.

^aNorth American Industry Classification System.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be regulated by the new subpart. To determine whether your facility would be regulated by this action, you should carefully examine the applicability criteria in final 40 CFR 60.32f of subpart Cf. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of the final subpart to a particular entity, contact the person listed in the preceding **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

B. Where can I get a copy of this document and other related information?

In addition to being available in the docket, an electronic copy of this action is available through EPA's Technology Transfer Network (TTN) Web site, a forum for information and technology exchange in various areas of air pollution control. Following signature by the EPA Administrator, the EPA will post a copy of this action at <http://www.epa.gov/ttnatw01/landfill/landflpg.html>. Following publication in the **Federal Register**, the EPA will post

the **Federal Register** version of this final rule and technical documents at this same Web site.

III. Background

The Emission Guidelines for MSW landfills were promulgated on March 12, 1996, and subsequently amended on June 16, 1998, February 24, 1999, and April 10, 2000, to make technical corrections and clarifications. Amendments were proposed on May 23, 2002, and September 8, 2006, to address implementation issues, but those amendments were never finalized. On July 17, 2014, the EPA issued an ANPRM for the MSW landfills Emission Guidelines (79 FR 41772). The purpose of that action was to request public input on controls and practices that could further reduce emissions from existing MSW landfills and to evaluate that input to determine if changes to the Emission Guidelines were appropriate. On July 17, 2014, the EPA issued a concurrent proposal for revised NSPS for new MSW landfills (79 FR 41796). On August 27, 2015 (80 FR 52100), the EPA proposed a review of the Emission

Guidelines to build on progress to date to (1) Achieve additional reductions in emissions of LFG and its components, (2) account for changes in the landfill industry and changes in operation of the landfills, including the size, trends in GCCS installations, and age of landfills, as reflected in new data, (3) provide new options for demonstrating compliance, and (4) to complete efforts regarding unresolved implementation issues. The EPA considered information it received in response to the ANPRM (79 FR 41772) and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (80 FR 52100) for existing landfills in evaluating these final Emission Guidelines. We are also finalizing some of the amendments proposed on May 23, 2002, and September 8, 2006 to improve implementation of the Emission Guidelines. The respective frameworks of NSPS and Emission Guidelines have been similar since they were first promulgated in 1996 (*e.g.*, size threshold, emission threshold, monitoring requirements, etc). In response to public comments, which include implementation concerns

associated with the potential for different approaches and requirements between revised final rules, the EPA is finalizing similar requirements for the NSPS and Emission Guidelines.

A. Landfill Gas Emissions and Climate Change

In June 2013, President Obama issued a Climate Action Plan that directed federal agencies to focus on “assessing current emissions data, addressing data gaps, identifying technologies and best practices for reducing emissions, and identifying existing authorities and incentive-based opportunities to reduce methane emissions.”⁸ Methane is a potent greenhouse gas (GHG) that is 28–36 times greater than carbon dioxide (CO₂) and has an atmospheric life of about 12 years.⁹ Because of methane’s potency as a GHG and its atmospheric life, reducing methane emissions is one of the best ways to achieve near-term beneficial impact in mitigating global climate change.

The “Climate Action Plan: Strategy to Reduce Methane Emissions”¹⁰ (the Methane Strategy) was released in March 2014. The strategy recognized the methane reductions achieved through the EPA’s regulatory and voluntary programs to date. It also directed the EPA to continue to pursue emission reductions through regulatory updates and to encourage LFG energy recovery through voluntary programs.

The EPA recognized the climate benefits associated with reducing methane emissions from landfills nearly 25 years ago. The 1991 NSPS Background Information Document¹¹ asserted that the reduction of methane emissions from MSW landfills was one of many options available to reduce global warming. The NSPS for MSW landfills, promulgated in 1996, also recognized the climate co-benefits of

controlling methane (61 FR 9917, March 12, 1996).

A recent study assessed EPA regulations and voluntary programs over the period 1993–2013 and found that they were responsible for the reduction of about 130 million metric tons of methane emissions (equal to about 18 percent of the total U.S. methane emissions over that time period), leading to a reduction in atmospheric concentrations of methane of about 28 parts per billion in 2013¹² (compared to an observed increase in methane concentrations of about 80 ppb over those 20 years).

The review and final revision of the MSW landfills Emission Guidelines capitalizes on additional opportunities to achieve methane reductions while acknowledging historical agency perspectives and research on climate, a charge from the President’s Climate Action Plan, the Methane Strategy, and improvements in the science surrounding GHG emissions.

LFG is a collection of air pollutants, including methane and NMOC. LFG is typically composed of 50-percent methane, 50-percent CO₂, and less than 1-percent NMOC by volume. The NMOC portion of LFG can contain various organic HAP and VOC. When the Emission Guidelines and NSPS were promulgated in 1996, NMOC was selected as a surrogate for MSW LFG emissions because NMOC contains the air pollutants that at that time were of most concern due to their adverse effects on public health and welfare. Today, methane’s effects on climate change are also considered important. In 2014, methane emissions from MSW landfills represented 18.2 percent of total U.S. methane emissions and 1.9 percent of total U.S. GHG emissions (in carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e)).¹³ In 2014, MSW landfills continued to be the third largest source of human-related methane emissions in the U.S., releasing an estimated 133.1 million metric tons of CO₂e. For these reasons and because additional emissions reductions can be achieved at a reasonable cost, the EPA is finalizing changes to the Emission

Guidelines that are based on reducing the NMOC and methane components of LFG.

B. What are the public health and welfare effects of landfill gas emissions?

1. Public Health Effects of VOC and Various Organic HAP

VOC emissions are precursors to both PM_{2.5} and ozone formation. As documented in previous analyses (U.S. EPA, 2006¹⁴, 2010¹⁵, and 2014¹⁶), exposure to PM_{2.5} and ozone is associated with significant public health effects. PM_{2.5} is associated with health effects, including premature mortality for adults and infants, cardiovascular morbidity such as heart attacks, and respiratory morbidity such as asthma attacks, acute bronchitis, hospital admissions and emergency room visits, work loss days, restricted activity days and respiratory symptoms, as well as welfare impacts such as visibility impairment.¹⁷ Ozone is associated with public health effects, including hospital and emergency department visits, school loss days and premature mortality, as well as ecological effects (e.g., injury to vegetation and climate change).¹⁸ Nearly 30 organic HAP have been identified in uncontrolled LFG, including benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene, and vinyl chloride.¹⁹ Benzene is a known human carcinogen.

¹⁴ U.S. EPA. *RIA. National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter*, Chapter 5. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC. October 2006. Available on the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/Chapter%205-Benefits.pdf>.

¹⁵ U.S. EPA. *RIA. National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone*. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC. January 2010. Available on the Internet at http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/s1-supplemental_analysis_full.pdf.

¹⁶ U.S. EPA. *RIA. National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone*. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC. December 2014. Available on the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/ttnecas1/regdata/RIAs/20141125ria.pdf>.

¹⁷ U.S. EPA. *Integrated Science Assessment for Particulate Matter (Final Report)*. EPA-600-R-08-139F. National Center for Environmental Assessment—RTP Division. December 2009. Available at <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=216546>.

¹⁸ U.S. EPA. *Air Quality Criteria for Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants (Final)*. EPA/600/R-05/004aF-cF. Washington, DC: U.S. EPA. February 2006. Available on the Internet at <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/GFM/recordisplay.cfm?deid=149923>.

¹⁹ U.S. EPA. 1998. *Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. “Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Fifth Edition, Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources, Chapter 2: Solid Waste Disposal, Section 2.4: Municipal Solid Waste Landfills”*. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch02/final/c02s04.pdf>.

⁸ Executive Office of the President, “The President’s Climate Action Plan” June 2013. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/image/president27sclimateactionplan.pdf>.

⁹ The IPCC updates GWP estimates with each new assessment report, and in the latest assessment report, AR5, the latest estimate of the methane GWP ranged from 28–36, compared to a GWP of 25 in AR4. The impacts analysis in this final rule is based on the 100-year GWP from AR4 (25) instead of AR5 to be consistent with and comparable to key Agency emission quantification programs such as the Inventory of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks (GHG Inventory), and the GHGRP.

¹⁰ Executive Office of the President, “Climate Action Plan Strategy to Reduce Methane, March 2014. https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/strategy_to_reduce_methane_emissions_2014-03-28_final.pdf.

¹¹ Air Emissions from Municipal Solid Waste Landfills-Background Information for Proposed Standards and Guidelines, U.S. EPA (EPA-450/3-90-011a) (NTIS PB 91-197061) page 2–15.

¹² Melvin, A.M.; Sarofim, M.C.; Crimmins, A.R., “Climate benefits of U.S. EPA programs and policies that reduced methane emissions 1993–2013”, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2016, in press. <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/acs.est.6b00367>. DOI 10.1021/acs.est.6b00367.

¹³ Total U.S. methane emissions were 731 teragrams (Tg) CO₂e and total U.S. GHG emissions were 6,870.5 Tg in 2014. A teragram is equal to 1 million Mg. (A megagram is also known as a metric ton, which is equal to 1.1 U.S. short tons or about 2,205 pounds.) U.S. EPA “Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2014.” Table ES-2. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/usinventoryreport.html>.

2. Climate Impacts of Methane Emissions

In addition to the improvements in air quality and resulting benefits to human health and the non-climate welfare effects discussed above, reducing emissions from landfills is expected to result in climate co-benefits due to reductions of the methane component of LFG. Methane is a potent GHG with a global warming potential (GWP) 28–36 times greater than CO₂, which accounts for methane's stronger absorption of infrared radiation per ton in the atmosphere, but also its shorter lifetime (on the order of 12 years compared to centuries or millennia for CO₂).^{20, 21} According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 5th Assessment Report, methane is the second leading long-lived climate forcer after CO₂ globally.²²

Methane is also a precursor to ground-level ozone, which can cause a number of harmful effects on public health and the environment. Additionally, ozone is a short-lived climate forcer that contributes to global warming.

In 2009, based on a large body of robust and compelling scientific evidence, the EPA Administrator issued an Endangerment Finding under CAA section 202(a)(1).²³ In the Endangerment Finding, the Administrator found that the current, elevated concentrations of GHGs in the atmosphere—already at levels unprecedented in human history—may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare of current and future generations in the U.S. We summarize these adverse effects on public health and welfare briefly here.

²⁰ IPCC, 2013: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

²¹ As previously noted, this rulemaking uses the AR4 100-year GWP value for methane (25), rather than AR5, for CO₂ equivalency calculations to be consistent with and comparable to key Agency emission quantification programs such as the Inventory of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks (GHG Inventory), and the GHGRP.

²² IPCC, 2013: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

²³ "Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act," 74 FR 66496 (Dec. 15, 2009) ("Endangerment Finding").

3. Public Health Impacts Detailed in the 2009 Endangerment Finding

The 2009 Endangerment Finding documented that climate change caused by human emissions of GHGs threatens the health of Americans. By raising average temperatures, climate change increases the likelihood of heat waves, which are associated with increased deaths and illnesses. While climate change also increases the likelihood of reductions in cold-related mortality, evidence indicates that the increases in heat mortality will be larger than the decreases in cold mortality in the United States. Compared to a future without climate change, climate change is expected to increase ozone pollution over broad areas of the U.S., including in the largest metropolitan areas with the worst ozone problems, and thereby increase the risk of morbidity and mortality. Climate change is also expected to cause more intense hurricanes and more frequent and intense storms of other types and heavy precipitation, with impacts on other areas of public health, such as the potential for increased deaths, injuries, infectious and waterborne diseases, and stress-related disorders. Children, the elderly, and the poor are among the most vulnerable to these climate-related health effects.

4. Public Welfare Impacts Detailed in the 2009 Endangerment Finding

The 2009 Endangerment Finding documented that climate change impacts touch nearly every aspect of public welfare. Among the multiple threats caused by human emissions of GHGs, climate changes are expected to place large areas of the country at serious risk of reduced water supplies, increased water pollution, and increased occurrence of extreme events such as floods and droughts. Coastal areas are expected to face a multitude of increased risks, particularly from rising sea level and increases in the severity of storms. These communities face storm and flooding damage to property, or even loss of land due to inundation, erosion, wetland submergence and habitat loss.

Impacts of climate change on public welfare also include threats to social and ecosystem services. Climate change is expected to result in an increase in peak electricity demand. Extreme weather from climate change threatens energy, transportation, and water resource infrastructure. Climate change may also exacerbate ongoing environmental pressures in certain settlements, particularly in Alaskan indigenous communities, and is very

likely to fundamentally rearrange U.S. ecosystems over the 21st century. Though some benefits may balance adverse effects on agriculture and forestry in the next few decades, the body of evidence points towards increasing risks of net adverse impacts on U.S. food production, agriculture and forest productivity as temperature continues to rise. These impacts are global and may exacerbate problems outside the U.S. that raise humanitarian, trade, and national security issues for the U.S.

5. New Scientific Assessments

In 2009, based on a large body of robust and compelling scientific evidence, the EPA Administrator issued the Endangerment Finding under CAA section 202(a)(1).²⁴ In the Endangerment Finding, the Administrator found that the current, elevated concentrations of GHGs in the atmosphere—already at levels unprecedented in human history—may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare of current and future generations in the U.S. The D.C. Circuit later upheld the Endangerment Finding from all challenges. *Coalition for Responsible Regulation v. EPA*, 684 F. 3d 102, 116–26 (D.C. Cir. 2012).

Since the administrative record concerning the Endangerment Finding closed following the EPA's 2010 Reconsideration Denial, the climate has continued to change, with new records being set for a number of climate indicators such as global average surface temperatures, Arctic sea ice retreat, CO₂ concentrations, and sea level rise. Additionally, a number of major scientific assessments have been released that improve understanding of the climate system and strengthen the case that GHGs endanger public health and welfare both for current and future generations. These assessments, from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), and the National Research Council (NRC), include: IPCC's 2012 Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (SREX) and the 2013–2014 Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), the USGCRP's 2014 National Climate Assessment, Climate Change Impacts in the United States (NCA3), and the NRC's 2010 Ocean Acidification: A National Strategy to Meet the Challenges of a Changing

²⁴ "Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act," 74 FR 66496 (Dec. 15, 2009) ("Endangerment Finding").

Ocean (Ocean Acidification), 2011 Report on Climate Stabilization Targets: Emissions, Concentrations, and Impacts over Decades to Millennia (Climate Stabilization Targets), 2011 National Security Implications for U.S. Naval Forces (National Security Implications), 2011 Understanding Earth's Deep Past: Lessons for Our Climate Future (Understanding Earth's Deep Past), 2012 Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future, 2012 Climate and Social Stress: Implications for Security Analysis (Climate and Social Stress), and 2013 Abrupt Impacts of Climate Change (Abrupt Impacts) assessments.

The conclusions of the recent scientific assessments confirm and strengthen the science that supported the 2009 Endangerment Finding. The NCA3 indicates that climate change "threatens human health and well-being in many ways, including impacts from increased extreme weather events, wildfire, decreased air quality, threats to mental health, and illnesses transmitted by food, water, and disease-carriers such as mosquitoes and ticks."²⁵ Most recently, the USGCRP released a new assessment, "The Impacts of Climate Change on Human Health in the United States: A Scientific Assessment" (also known as the USGCRP Climate and Health Assessment). This assessment finds that "climate change impacts endanger our health" and that in the United States we have "observed climate-related increases in our exposure to elevated temperatures; more frequent, severe, or longer lasting extreme events; diseases transmitted through food, water, or disease vectors such as ticks and mosquitoes; and stresses to mental health and well-being." The assessment determines that "[e]very American is vulnerable to the health impacts associated with climate change." Climate warming will also likely "make it harder for any given regulatory approach to reduce ground-level ozone pollution", and, unless offset by reductions of ozone precursors, it is likely that "climate-driven increases in ozone will cause premature deaths, hospital visits, lost school days, and acute respiratory symptoms."²⁶

Assessments state that certain populations are particularly vulnerable to climate change. The USGCRP Climate and Health Assessment assesses several

disproportionately vulnerable populations, including those with low income, some communities of color, immigrant groups, indigenous peoples, pregnant women, vulnerable occupational groups, persons with disabilities, and persons with preexisting or chronic medical conditions. The Climate and Health Assessment also concludes that children's unique physiology and developing bodies contribute to making them particularly vulnerable to climate change. Children also have unique behaviors and exposure pathways that could increase their exposure to environmental stressors, like contaminants in dust or extreme heat events. Impacts from climate change on children are likely from heat waves, air pollution, infectious and waterborne illnesses, disruptions in food safety and security, and mental health effects resulting from extreme weather events. For example, climate change can disrupt food safety and security by significantly reducing food quality, availability and access. Children are more susceptible to this disruption because nutrition is important during critical windows of development and growth. Older people are at much higher risk of mortality during extreme heat events and pre-existing health conditions also make older adults susceptible to cardiac and respiratory impacts of air pollution and to more severe consequences from infectious and waterborne diseases. Limited mobility among older adults can also increase health risks associated with extreme weather and floods.

The new assessments also confirm and strengthen the science that supported the 2009 Endangerment Finding. The NRC assessment Understanding Earth's Deep Past stated that "[b]y the end of this century, without a reduction in emissions, atmospheric CO₂ is projected to increase to levels that Earth has not experienced for more than 30 million years." In fact, that assessment stated that "the magnitude and rate of the present GHG increase place the climate system in what could be one of the most severe increases in radiative forcing of the global climate system in Earth history."²⁷ Because of these unprecedented changes in atmospheric concentrations, several assessments state that we may be approaching critical, poorly understood thresholds. The NRC Abrupt Impacts report analyzed the potential for abrupt climate change in the physical climate system and abrupt impacts of ongoing

changes that, when thresholds are crossed, could cause abrupt impacts for society and ecosystems. The report considered destabilization of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet (which could cause 3–4 m of potential sea level rise) as an abrupt climate impact with unknown but probably low probability of occurring this century. The report categorized a decrease in ocean oxygen content (with attendant threats to aerobic marine life); increase in intensity, frequency, and duration of heat waves; and increase in frequency and intensity of extreme precipitation events (droughts, floods, hurricanes, and major storms) as climate impacts with moderate risk of an abrupt change within this century. The NRC Abrupt Impacts report also analyzed the threat of rapid state changes in ecosystems and species extinctions as examples of an irreversible impact that is expected to be exacerbated by climate change. Species at most risk include those whose migration potential is limited, whether because they live on mountaintops or fragmented habitats with barriers to movement, or because climatic conditions are changing more rapidly than the species can move or adapt. While some of these abrupt impacts may be of low or moderate probability in this century, the probability for a significant change in many of these processes after 2100 was judged to be higher, with severe impacts likely should the abrupt change occur. Future temperature changes will be influenced by what emissions path the world follows. In its high emission scenario, the IPCC AR5 projects that global temperatures by the end of the century will likely be 2.6 °C to 4.8 °C (4.7 to 8.6 °F) warmer than today. There is very high confidence that temperatures on land and in the Arctic will warm even faster than the global average. However, according to the NCA3, significant reductions in emissions would lead to noticeably less future warming beyond mid-century, and therefore less impact to public health and welfare. According to the NCA3, regions closer to the poles are projected to receive more precipitation, while the dry subtropics expand (colloquially, this has been summarized as wet areas getting wet and dry regions getting drier), while "[t]he widespread trend of increasing heavy downpours is expected to continue, with precipitation becoming less frequent but more intense." Meanwhile, the NRC Climate Stabilization Targets assessment found that the area burned by wildfire in parts of western North America is expected to grow by 2 to 4 times for 1 °C (1.8 °F) of warming. The NCA also found that

²⁵ USGCRP, Third National Climate Assessment, p. 221.

²⁶ See also Kleeman, M.J., S.-H. Chen, and R.A. Harley. 2010. Climate change impact on air quality in California: Report to the California Air Resources Board. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/qpr/past/04-349.pdf>.

²⁷ National Research Council, Understanding Earth's Deep Past, p. 138.

“[e]xtrapolation of the present observed trend suggests an essentially ice-free Arctic in summer before mid-century.” Retreating snow and ice, and emissions of carbon dioxide and methane released from thawing permafrost, are very likely to amplify future warming.

Since the 2009 Endangerment Finding, the IPCC AR5, the USGCRP NCA3, and three of the new NRC assessments provide estimates of projected global average sea level rise. These estimates, while not always directly comparable as they assume different emissions scenarios and baselines, are at least 40 percent larger than, and in some cases more than twice as large as, the projected rise estimated in the IPCC AR4 assessment, which was referred to in the 2009 Endangerment Finding. The NRC Sea Level Rise assessment projects a global average sea level rise of 0.5 to 1.4 meters by 2100. The NRC National Security Implications assessment suggests that “the Department of the Navy should expect roughly 0.4 to 2 meters global average sea-level rise by 2100.” The NRC Climate Stabilization Targets assessment states that a global average temperature increase of 3 °C will lead to a global average sea level rise of 0.5 to 1 meter by 2100. These NRC and IPCC assessments continue to recognize and characterize the uncertainty inherent in accounting for melting ice sheets in sea level rise projections.

In addition to future impacts, the NCA3 emphasizes that climate change driven by human emissions of GHGs is already happening now and it is happening in the U.S. According to the IPCC AR5 and the NCA3, there are a number of climate-related changes that have been observed recently, and these changes are projected to accelerate in the future:

- The planet warmed about 0.85 °C (1.5 °F) from 1880 to 2012. It is extremely likely (>95 percent probability) that human influence was the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century, and likely (>66 percent probability) that human influence has more than doubled the probability of occurrence of heat waves in some locations. In the Northern Hemisphere, the last 30 years were likely the warmest 30 year period of the last 1400 years.

- Global sea levels rose 0.19 m (7.5 inches) from 1901 to 2010. Contributing to this rise was the warming of the oceans and melting of land ice. It is likely that 275 gigatons per year of ice melted from land glaciers (not including ice sheets) since 1993, and that the rate of loss of ice from the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets increased

substantially in recent years, to 215 gigatons per year and 147 gigatons per year respectively since 2002. For context, 360 gigatons of ice melt is sufficient to cause global sea levels to rise 1 mm.

- Annual mean Arctic sea ice has been declining at 3.5 to 4.1 percent per decade, and Northern Hemisphere snow cover extent has decreased at about 1.6 percent per decade for March and 11.7 percent per decade for June.

- Permafrost temperatures have increased in most regions since the 1980s, by up to 3 °C (5.4 °F) in parts of Northern Alaska.

- Winter storm frequency and intensity have both increased in the Northern Hemisphere. The NCA3 states that the increases in the severity or frequency of some types of extreme weather and climate events in recent decades can affect energy production and delivery, causing supply disruptions, and compromise other essential infrastructure such as water and transportation systems.

In addition to the changes documented in the assessment literature, there have been other climate milestones of note. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), methane concentrations in 2014 were about 1,823 parts per billion, 150 percent higher than concentrations were in 1750. After a few years of nearly stable concentrations from 1999 to 2006, methane concentrations have resumed increasing at about 5 parts per billion per year.²⁸ Concentrations today are likely higher than they have been for at least the past 800,000 years.²⁹ Arctic sea ice has continued to decline, with September of 2012 marking the record low in terms of Arctic sea ice extent, 40 percent below the 1979–2000 median. Sea level has continued to rise at a rate of 3.2 mm per year (1.3 inches/decade) since satellite observations started in 1993, more than twice the average rate of rise in the 20th century prior to 1993.³⁰ And 2015 was the warmest year globally in the modern global surface temperature record, going back to 1880, breaking the record previously held by 2014; this now means that the last 15 years have been 15 of the 16 warmest years on record.³¹

²⁸ Ed Dlugokencky, NOAA/ESRL (www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends_ch4/).

²⁹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2014. Climate change indicators in the United States, 2014. Third edition. EPA 430-R-14-004. www.epa.gov/climatechange/indicators.

³⁰ Blunden, J., and D. S. Arndt, Eds., 2015: State of the Climate in 2014. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 96 (7), S1–S267.

³¹ <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/sotc/global/201513>.

These assessments and observed changes raise concerns that reducing emissions of GHGs across the globe is necessary in order to avoid the worst impacts of climate change, and underscore the urgency of reducing emissions now. In 2011 the NRC Committee on America’s Climate Choices listed a number of reasons “why it is imprudent to delay actions that at least begin the process of substantially reducing emissions.”³² For example, they stated:

- The faster emissions are reduced, the lower the risks posed by climate change. Delays in reducing emissions could commit the planet to a wide range of adverse impacts, especially if the sensitivity of the climate to GHGs is on the higher end of the estimated range.

- Waiting for unacceptable impacts to occur before taking action is imprudent because the effects of GHG emissions do not fully manifest themselves for decades and, once manifested, many of these changes will persist for hundreds or even thousands of years.

- In the committee’s judgment, the risks associated with maintaining business as usual are a much greater concern than the risks associated with engaging in strong response efforts.

Overview of Climate Change Impacts in the United States

The NCA3 assessed the climate impacts in eight regions of the U.S., noting that changes in physical climate parameters such as temperatures, precipitation, and sea ice retreat were already having impacts on forests, water supplies, ecosystems, flooding, heat waves, and air quality. The U.S. average temperatures have similarly increased by 1.3 to 1.9 degrees F since 1895, with most of that increase occurring since 1970, and the most recent decade was the U.S.’s hottest as well as the world’s hottest. Moreover, the NCA3 found that future warming is projected to be much larger than recent observed variations in temperature, with 2 to 4 degrees F warming expected in most areas of the U.S. over the next few decades, and up to 10 degrees F possible by the end of the century assuming continued increases in emissions. Extreme heat events will continue to become more common, and extreme cold less common. Additionally, precipitation is considered likely to increase in the northern states, decrease in the southern states, and with the heaviest precipitation events projected to increase everywhere.

³² NRC, 2011: America’s Climate Choices, The National Academies Press, p. 2.

In the Northeast, temperatures increased almost 2 °F from 1895 to 2011, precipitation increased by about 5 inches (10 percent), and sea level rise of about a foot has led to an increase in coastal flooding. In the future, if emissions continue to increase, the Northeast is projected to experience 4.5 to 10 °F of warming by the 2080s. This is expected to lead to more heat waves, coastal and river flooding, and intense precipitation events. Sea levels in the Northeast are expected to increase faster than the global average because of subsidence, and models suggest changing ocean currents may further increase the rate of sea level rise.

In the Southeast, average annual temperature during the last century cycled between warm and cool periods. A warm peak occurred during the 1930s and 1940s followed by a cool period and temperatures then increased again from 1970 to the present by an average of 2 °F. Louisiana has already lost 1,880 square miles of land in the last 80 years due to sea level rise and other contributing factors. The Southeast is exceptionally vulnerable to sea level rise, extreme heat events, hurricanes, and decreased water availability. Major risks of further warming include significant increases in the number of hot days (95 °F or above) and decreases in freezing events, as well as exacerbated ground level ozone in urban areas. Projections suggest that there may be fewer hurricanes in the Atlantic in the future, but they will be more intense, with more Category 4 and 5 storms. The NCA identified New Orleans, Miami, Tampa, Charleston, and Virginia Beach as cities at particular risk of flooding.

In the Northwest, temperatures increased by about 1.3 °F between 1895 and 2011. Snowpack in the Northwest is an important freshwater source for the region. More precipitation falling as rain instead of snow has reduced the snowpack, and warmer springs have corresponded to earlier snowpack melting and reduced stream flows during summer months. Drier conditions have increased the extent of wildfires in the region. Average annual temperatures are projected to increase by 3.3 °F to 9.7 °F by the end of the century (depending on future global GHG emissions), with the greatest warming is expected during the summer. Continued increases in global GHG emissions are projected to result in up to a 30 percent decrease in summer precipitation. Warmer waters are expected to increase disease and mortality in important fish species, including Chinook and sockeye salmon.

In Alaska, temperatures have changed faster than anywhere else in the U.S. Annual temperatures increased by about 3 °F in the past 60 years. Warming in the winter has been even greater, rising by an average of 6 °F. Glaciers in Alaska are melting at some of the fastest rates on Earth. Permafrost soils are also warming and beginning to thaw. Drier conditions had already contributed to more large wildfires in the 10 years prior to the NCA3 than in any previous decade since the 1940s, when recordkeeping began, and subsequent years have seen even more wildfires. By the end of this century, continued increases in GHG emissions are expected to increase temperatures by 10 to 12 °F in the northernmost parts of Alaska, by 8 to 10 °F in the interior, and by 6 to 8 °F across the rest of the state. These increases will exacerbate ongoing arctic sea ice loss, glacial melt, permafrost thaw and increased wildfire, and threaten humans, ecosystems, and infrastructure.

In the Southwest, temperatures are now about 2 °F higher than the past century, and are already the warmest that region has experienced in at least 600 years. The NCA notes that there is evidence that climate-change induced warming on top of recent drought has influenced tree mortality, wildfire frequency and area, and forest insect outbreaks. At the time of publication of the NCA, even before the last 2 years of extreme drought in California, tree ring data was already indicating that the region might be experiencing its driest period in 800 years. The Southwest is projected to warm an additional 5.5 to 9.5 °F over the next century if emissions continue to increase. Winter snowpack in the Southwest is projected to decline (consistent with recent record lows), reducing the reliability of surface water supplies for cities, agriculture, cooling for power plants, and ecosystems. Sea level rise along the California coast is projected to worsen coastal erosion, increase flooding risk for coastal highways, bridges, and low-lying airports, and pose a threat to groundwater supplies in coastal cities. Also, “[t]he combination of a longer frost-free season, less frequent cold air outbreaks, and more frequent heat waves accelerates crop ripening and maturity, reduces yields of corn, tree fruit, and wine grapes, stresses livestock, and increases agricultural water consumption.” Increased drought, higher temperatures, and bark beetle outbreaks are likely to contribute to continued increases in wildfires.

The rate of warming in the Midwest has markedly accelerated over the past few decades. Temperatures rose by more

than 1.5 °F from 1900 to 2010, but between 1980 and 2010 the rate of warming was three times faster than from 1900 through 2010. Precipitation generally increased over the last century, with much of the increase driven by intensification of the heaviest rainfalls. Several types of extreme weather events in the Midwest (e.g., heat waves and flooding) have already increased in frequency and/or intensity due to climate change. In the future, if emissions continue increasing, the Midwest is expected to experience 5.6 to 8.5 °F of warming by the 2080s, leading to more heat waves. Specific vulnerabilities highlighted by the NCA include long-term decreases in agricultural productivity, changes in the composition of the region’s forests, increased public health threats from heat waves and degraded air and water quality, negative impacts on transportation and other infrastructure associated with extreme rainfall events and flooding, and risks to the Great Lakes including shifts in invasive species, increases in harmful algal blooms, and declining beach health.

High temperatures (more than 100 °F in the Southern Plains and more than 95 °F in the Northern Plains) are projected to occur much more frequently by mid-century. Increases in extreme heat will increase heat stress for residents, energy demand for air conditioning, and water losses. In Hawaii, other Pacific islands, and the Caribbean, rising air and ocean temperatures, shifting rainfall patterns, changing frequencies and intensities of storms and drought, decreasing base flow in streams, rising sea levels, and changing ocean chemistry will affect ecosystems on land and in the oceans, as well as local communities, livelihoods, and cultures. Low islands are particularly at risk.

In Hawaii and the Pacific islands, “[w]armer oceans are leading to increased coral bleaching events and disease outbreaks in coral reefs, as well as changed distribution patterns of tuna fisheries. Ocean acidification will reduce coral growth and health. Warming and acidification, combined with existing stresses, will strongly affect coral reef fish communities.” For Hawaii and the Pacific islands, future sea surface temperatures are projected to increase 2.3 °F by 2055 and 4.7 °F by 2090 under a scenario that assumes continued increases in emissions.

Methane Specific Impacts. Methane is also a precursor to ground-level ozone, which can cause a number of harmful effects on health and the environment. Additionally, ozone is a short-lived climate forcer that contributes to global

warming. In remote areas, methane is an important precursor to tropospheric ozone formation.³³ Almost half of the global annual mean ozone increase since preindustrial times is believed to be due to anthropogenic methane.³⁴ Projections of future emissions also indicate that methane is likely to be a key contributor to ozone concentrations in the future.³⁵ Unlike nitrogen oxide (NO_x) and VOC, which affect ozone concentrations regionally and at hourly time scales, methane emissions affect ozone concentrations globally and on decadal time scales given methane's relatively long atmospheric lifetime compared to these other ozone precursors.³⁶ Reducing methane emissions, therefore, may contribute to efforts to reduce global background ozone concentrations that contribute to the incidence of ozone-related health effects.^{37 38 39} These benefits are global and occur in both urban and rural areas.

C. What is the EPA's authority for reviewing the Emission Guidelines?

The EPA is not statutorily obligated to conduct a review of the Emission Guidelines, but has the discretionary authority to do so when circumstances indicate that it is appropriate. The EPA has determined that it is appropriate to conduct a review of and finalize certain changes to the Emission Guidelines due to changes in the landfill industry and changes in operation of the landfills, including the size, trends in GCCS installations (such as the types of MSW landfills that have installed gas collection systems), and age of landfills since the Emission Guidelines were promulgated in 1996 and the opportunities for significant reductions in methane and other pollutants at reasonable cost. The EPA compiled new information on MSW landfills through data collection efforts for a statutorily mandated review of the NSPS, public comments received on the NSPS proposal, and public comments received on an ANPRM, as well as a proposed

rulemaking for a review of the Emission Guidelines. This information allowed the EPA to conduct an assessment of current practices, emissions and potential for additional emission reductions.

D. What is the purpose and scope of this action?

The purpose of this action is to (1) Present the results of the EPA's review of the Emission Guidelines, (2) finalize revisions to the Emission Guidelines based on that review, and (3) resolve or provide clarification regarding several implementation issues that were addressed in prior proposed amendments published on May 23, 2002 (67 FR 36475) and September 8, 2006 (71 FR 53271) as they apply to existing sources. The final revisions appear in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf.⁴⁰ Although the EPA is not required to respond to comments received on the July 17, 2014, ANPRM (79 FR 41772) for the MSW landfills Emission Guidelines or comments it received on the concurrent proposal for revised NSPS for new MSW landfills in this document, the EPA is summarizing several comments it received to provide a framework and support the rationale for the final revisions to the Emission Guidelines.

E. How would the changes in applicability affect sources currently subject to subparts Cc and WWW?

Landfills currently subject to 40 CFR part 60, subparts Cc and WWW, are considered "existing" with the promulgation of this new subpart Cf and are ultimately affected by any changes to the Emission Guidelines resulting from this review. Each MSW landfill for which construction, modification, or reconstruction commenced on or before July 17, 2014, the date of proposal of the standard for new landfills under subpart XXX, is an existing source as of the effective date of this rule. Under CAA section 111, a source is either new, *i.e.*, construction, modification, or reconstruction commenced after a proposed NSPS is published in the **Federal Register** (CAA section 111(a)(1)) or existing, *i.e.*, any source other than a new source (CAA section 111(a)(6)). Because the revised Emission Guidelines apply to existing sources, any source that is not subject to subpart XXX will be subject to the revised Emission Guidelines. Any existing

MSW landfill that modifies or reconstructs after July 17, 2014 would become a new source subject to the NSPS subpart XXX.

Consistent with the general approach evinced by CAA section 111, sources currently subject to subpart WWW would need to continue to comply with the requirements in that rule until they become subject to more stringent requirements in the revised Emission Guidelines as implemented through a revised state or federal plan. The current Emission Guidelines, subpart Cc, refer to subpart WWW for their substantive requirements. That is, the requirements regarding the installation and operation of a well-designed and well-operated GCCS and compliance with the specified emission limits are the same in both rules. Thus, because the EPA is finalizing its proposal to revise the Emission Guidelines to increase their stringency, a landfill currently subject to 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW, would need to comply with the more stringent requirements in a revised state plan or federal plan implementing the revised Emission Guidelines (40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf). States with designated facilities must develop (or revise) and submit a state plan to the EPA within 9 months of promulgation of any revisions to the Emission Guidelines (40 CFR 60.23). Any revisions to an existing state plan and any newly adopted state plan must be established following the requirements of 40 CFR part 60, subpart B. To assist regulatory agencies in preparing state plans, the EPA developed the document "Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, Volume 2: Summary of Requirements for Section 111(d) State Plans for Implementing the Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Emission Guidelines." This volume describes the elements of a state plan and explains the state plan development and review process. The requirements include making the state plan publicly available and providing the opportunity for public discussion. MSW Landfills, Volume 2 is available on the TTN Web site at <https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/atw/landfill/landflpg.html>. Note that MSW Landfills, Volume 2 was written for implementing the 1996 Emission Guidelines and contains a schedule corresponding to the 1996 Emission Guidelines. For these 2016 Emission Guidelines, state plans are due May 30, 2017.

Once the EPA receives a complete state plan or plan revision, and completes its review of that plan or plan revision, the EPA will propose the plan or plan revision for approval or disapproval. The EPA will approve or disapprove the plan or plan revision

³³ U.S. EPA. 2013. "Integrated Science Assessment for Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants (Final Report)." EPA-600-R-10-076F. National Center for Environmental Assessment—RTP Division. Available at www.epa.gov/ncea/isa/.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ West, J.J., Fiore, A.M. 2005. "Management of tropospheric ozone by reducing methane emissions." *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 39:4685–4691.

³⁸ Anenberg, S.C., et al. 2009. "Intercontinental impacts of ozone pollution on human mortality." *Environ. Sci. & Technol.* 43: 6482–6487.

³⁹ Sarofim, M.C., Waldhoff, S.T., Anenberg, S.C. 2015. "Valuing the Ozone-Related Health Benefits of Methane Emission Controls." *Environ. Resource Econ.* DOI 10.1007/s10640-015-9937-6.

⁴⁰ Rather than merely updating 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cc, the existing emissions guidelines, the EPA has determined that the most appropriate way to proceed is to establish a new subpart that includes both the verbatim restatement of certain provisions in the existing Emission Guidelines and revisions to, or the addition of, other provisions.

according to the schedule in 40 CFR part 60, subpart B. The EPA will publish notice of state plan approvals or disapprovals in the **Federal Register** and will include an explanation of its decision. The EPA also intends to revise the existing federal plan (40 CFR part 62, subpart GGG) to incorporate the changes and other requirements adopted in this final action revising the Emission Guidelines. The revised federal plan will apply in states that have either never submitted a state plan or not received approval of any necessary revised state plan until such time as an initial state plan or revised state plan is approved. Fifteen states and territories implement the original Emission Guidelines promulgated at subpart Cc under the Federal Plan (40 CFR part 62, subpart GGG) The revised federal plan would also apply in Indian country unless and until replaced by a tribal implementation plan (TIP).⁴¹

Because many of the landfills currently subject to 40 CFR part 60, subparts Cc and WWW, are closed, the EPA is finalizing provisions to minimize the burden on these closed landfills while continuing to protect air quality, as discussed in sections V.C and VI.C of this preamble.

IV. Summary of the Final Emission Guidelines

A. What are the control requirements?

1. Design Capacity and Emissions Thresholds

The revised Emission Guidelines retain the current design capacity thresholds of 2.5 million Mg and 2.5 million m³, but reduce the NMOC emission threshold for the installation and removal of a GCCS from 50 Mg/yr to 34 Mg/yr for landfills that are not closed as of September 27, 2017. An MSW landfill that exceeds the design capacity thresholds must install and start up a GCCS within 30 months after reporting that LFG emissions reach or exceed a NMOC level of 34 Mg/yr NMOC. The owner or operator of a landfill may control the gas by routing it to a non-enclosed flare, an enclosed combustion device, or a treatment system that processes the collected gas for subsequent sale or beneficial use.

⁴¹ Indian tribes may, but are not required to, seek approval for treatment in a manner similar to a state for purposes of developing a tribal implementation plan implementing the Emission guidelines. If a tribe obtains such approval and submits a proposed TIP, the EPA will use the same criteria and follow the same procedure in approving that plan as it does with state plans. The federal plan will apply to all affected facilities located in Indian country unless and until EPA approves an applicable TIP.

2. Tier 4

The current Emission Guidelines (40 CFR part 60, subpart Cc) provide that owners or operators determine whether the landfill has exceeded the NMOC emissions threshold using one of three available modeling procedures, known as Tiers 1, 2, and 3. The EPA is finalizing in subpart Cf an additional optional methodology based on site-specific surface methane emissions to determine when a landfill must install and operate a GCCS. This alternative emission threshold methodology, referred to as "Tier 4," is based on SEM and demonstrates that surface methane emissions are below a specific threshold. The Tier 4 SEM demonstration allows certain landfills that exceed modeled NMOC emission rates using Tier 1 or 2 to demonstrate that site-specific surface methane emissions are below a surface concentration threshold (a landfill need not model emissions under Tier 3 before using Tier 4). A landfill that can demonstrate that surface emissions are below 500 ppm for four consecutive quarters does not trigger the requirement to install a GCCS even if Tier 1, 2, or 3 calculations indicate that the 34 Mg/yr threshold has been exceeded. Owners or operators continue to keep detailed records of each quarterly monitoring demonstration and must submit a Tier 4 surface emissions report annually. If a landfill measures a surface emissions reading of greater than 500 ppm methane, the landfill must submit a GCCS design plan and install and operate a GCCS.

Tier 4 is based on the results of quarterly site-specific methane emissions monitoring of the perimeter of the landfill and entire surface of the landfill along a pattern that traverses the landfill at 30-meter (98-ft) intervals, in addition to monitoring areas where visual observations may indicate elevated concentrations of LFG, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover and all cover penetrations. If the landfill opts to use Tier 4 for its emission threshold determination and there is any measured concentration of methane of 500 ppm or greater from the surface of the landfill, the owner or operator must install a GCCS, and the landfill cannot go back to using Tiers 1, 2, or 3 modeling to demonstrate that emissions are below the NMOC threshold.

Tier 4 is allowed only if the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that NMOC emissions are greater than or equal to 34 Mg/yr, but less than 50 Mg/yr using Tier 1 or Tier 2. If both Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicate NMOC emissions of

50 Mg/yr or greater, Tier 4 cannot be used. In addition, a wind barrier must be used for Tier 4 when the average wind speed exceeds 4 miles per hour (mph) (or 2 meters per second), or gusts are above 10 mph. Tier 4 measurements cannot be conducted if the average wind speed exceeds 25 mph. Wind speed must be measured with an on-site anemometer with a continuous recorder and data logger for the entire duration of the monitoring event. The average wind speed must be determined at 5-minute intervals. The gust must be determined at 3-second intervals. Further, when conducting Tier 4 monitoring, the sampling probe must be held no more than 5 centimeters above the landfill (*e.g.*, using a mechanical device such as a wheel on a pole). Tier 4 measurements cannot be conducted if the average wind speed exceeds 25 mph.

In addition, landfills with a non-regulatory GCCS are allowed to operate the GCCS during the Tier 4 SEM demonstration, however, the GCCS must have operated at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration.

3. Subcategory of Closed Landfills

Because many landfills are closed and do not produce as much LFG, the EPA is finalizing the proposed subcategory for landfills that close on or before September 27, 2017. Landfills in this subcategory will continue to be subject to an NMOC emission threshold of 50 Mg/yr for determining when controls must be installed or can be removed, consistent with the NMOC thresholds in subparts Cc and WWW of 40 CFR part 60. These closed landfills would also be exempt from initial reporting requirements (*i.e.*, initial design capacity, initial NMOC emission rate, GCCS design plan, initial annual report, closure report, equipment removal report, and initial performance test report), provided that the landfill already met these requirements under subparts Cc or WWW of 40 CFR part 60.

4. Criteria for Removing GCCS

Landfill emissions increase as waste is added to a landfill, but decline over time; as waste decays, a landfill produces less and less methane and other pollutants. In the proposed Emission Guidelines (80 FR 52112), the EPA recognized that many open landfills subject to the Emission Guidelines contain inactive areas that have experienced declining LFG flows. Therefore, the EPA is finalizing criteria for determining when it is appropriate to cap, remove, or decommission a portion of the GCCS. The criteria for capping, removing, or decommissioning

the GCCS are: (1) The landfill is closed, (2) the GCCS has operated for at least 15 years or the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows, and (3) the calculated NMOC emission rate at the landfill is less than 34 Mg/yr on three successive test dates. For landfills in the closed subcategory, the NMOC emission rate threshold for removing controls is 50 Mg/yr.

5. Excluding Non-Productive Areas From Control

The EPA is finalizing a provision that allows the use of actual flow data when estimating NMOC emissions for the purposes of excluding low- or non-producing areas of the landfill from control. Owners or operators of landfills with physically separated, closed areas may either model NMOC emission rates, or may determine the flow rate of LFG using actual measurements, to determine NMOC emissions. Using actual flow measurements yields a more precise measurement of NMOC emissions for purposes of demonstrating the closed area represents less than 1 percent of the landfills total NMOC emissions. The Emission Guidelines historically allowed owners or operators to exclude from control areas that are non-productive. In this final action, the retained the 1 percent criteria level, rather than raising it, to prevent landfills from excluding areas from control unless emissions were very low. But, to help owners or operators demonstrate that a non-productive area may be excluded from control, the final rule allow the owner or operator to use site-specific flow measurements to determine NMOC emissions.

6. Landfill Gas Treatment

The EPA is finalizing two provisions related to LFG treatment. First, the EPA is clarifying that the use of treated LFG is not limited to use as a fuel for a stationary combustion device but also allows other beneficial uses such as vehicle fuel, production of high-Btu gas for pipeline injection, and use as a raw material in a chemical manufacturing process. Second, the EPA is defining "treated landfill gas" as LFG processed in a treatment system meeting the requirements in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf, and defining "treatment system" as a system that filters, de-waters, and compresses LFG for sale or beneficial use. Owners or operators must develop a site-specific treatment system monitoring plan that includes monitoring parameters addressing all three elements of treatment (filtration, de-watering, and compression) to ensure

the treatment system is operating properly for each intended end use of the treated LFG. They also must keep records that demonstrate that such parameters effectively monitor filtration, de-watering, and compression system performance necessary for each end use of the treated LFG. The treatment system monitoring plan must be submitted as part of the landfill's title V permit application. The permitting authority will review the permit application, including the treatment system monitoring plan, as part of the general permitting process. The treatment system monitoring parameters would be included in the permit as applicable requirements and thus become enforceable conditions (*i.e.*, the landfill monitors the treatment system monitoring parameters and maintains them in the specified range).

B. What are the monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements?

1. Wellhead Monitoring

The operational standard, corrective action, and corresponding recordkeeping and reporting remain for temperature and maintaining negative pressure at the wellhead. The EPA is removing the operational standards for nitrogen/oxygen levels at wellheads. Thus, the EPA is removing the corresponding requirement to take corrective action for exceedances of nitrogen/oxygen at wellheads. These adjustments to the wellhead monitoring parameters apply to all landfills. Although landfill owners or operators are not required to take corrective action based on exceedances of nitrogen/oxygen levels at wellheads, they are required to monitor nitrogen/oxygen levels at wellheads on a monthly basis to inform any necessary adjustments to the GCCS and must maintain records of all monthly readings. The landfill owner or operator must make these records available to the Administrator upon request.

2. Surface Monitoring

The EPA is finalizing the proposed requirement to monitor all surface penetrations. Landfills must conduct SEM at all cover penetrations and openings within the area of the landfill where waste has been placed and a GCCS is required to be in place and operating according to the operational standards in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf. Specifically, landfill owners or operators must conduct surface monitoring on a quarterly basis around the perimeter of the collection area and along a pattern that traverses the landfill

at no more than 30 meter intervals, at all cover penetrations, and where visual observations may indicate the presence of elevated concentrations of LFG, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover. Cover penetrations include wellheads, but do not include items such as survey stakes, fencing or litter fencing, flags, signs, trees, and utility poles.

3. Corrective Action

The owner or operator must measure the LFG temperature at the wellhead and gauge pressure in the gas collection header applied to each individual well on a monthly basis. If there is an exceedance (*i.e.*, LFG temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) or positive pressure), the owner or operator must initiate corrective action within 5 days. If the temperature exceedance or positive pressure cannot be resolved within 15 days, then the owner or operator must determine the appropriate corrective action by conducting a root cause analysis and correct the exceedance as soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days after the first measurement of the temperature exceedance or positive pressure. For corrective action that takes longer than 60 days to fully implement, the owner or operator must also conduct a corrective action analysis and develop an implementation schedule for the corrective action that does not exceed 120 days. The owner or operator must also notify the Administrator of any corrective action exceeding 60 days within 75 days and also include a description of the root cause analysis, corrective action analysis and implementation schedule in the annual report. If corrective action is expected to take longer than 120 days after the initial exceedance, the owner or operator must submit the corrective action plan and corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator for approval within 75 days of the first measurement of positive pressure. Owners or operators must keep records of corrective action analyses. Owners or operators must include corrective action records in the annual compliance report for corrective actions that take more than 60 days to implement.

4. Update and Approval of Design Plan

The EPA is reaffirming some requirements and revising others to address design plans. Design plans must continue to be prepared and approved by a professional engineer. The landfill owner or operator must then notify the Administrator that the plan is completed and provide a copy of the

plan's signature page. The Administrator will now have 90 days to make a decision about whether the plan should be submitted for review. If the Administrator chooses to review, the approval process continues as outlined in this section. However, if the Administrator indicates that submission is not required or doesn't respond within 90 days, the landfill owner or operator can continue to implement the plan with the recognition that they are proceeding at their own risk. In the event that the design plan is required to be modified to obtain approval, the owner/operator must take any steps necessary to conform any prior actions to the approved design plan and any failure to do so could result in an enforcement action.

The EPA is also finalizing two criteria for when an affected source must update its design plan and submit it to the Administrator for approval. A revised design plan must be submitted on the following timeline: (1) Within 90 days of expanding operations to an area not covered by the previously approved design plan; and (2) prior to installing or expanding the gas collection system in a manner other than the one described in the previous design plan. The final rule continues to require landfill owners or operators to prepare both an initial and revised design plan.

5. Electronic Reporting

The EPA is requiring owners or operators of existing MSW Landfills to submit electronic copies of certain required performance test reports, NMOC emission rate reports, annual reports, Tier 4 emission rate reports, and wet landfilling practices through the EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) using the Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface (CEDRI). Owners or operators are allowed to maintain electronic copies of the records in lieu of hardcopies to satisfy federal recordkeeping requirements.

The requirement to submit performance test data electronically to the EPA applies only to those performance tests conducted using test methods that are supported by the Electronic Reporting Tool (ERT). A listing of the pollutants and test methods supported by the ERT is available at: www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ert/ert_info.html. When the EPA adds new methods to the ERT, a notice will be sent out through the Clearinghouse for Inventories and Emissions Factors (CHIEF) Listserv (www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories/emissions-inventory-listservs) and a notice of availability will be added to the ERT Web site. You are encouraged to check

the ERT Web site regularly for up-to-date information on methods supported by the ERT.

The EPA believes that the electronic submittal of the reports addressed in this rulemaking will increase the usefulness of the data contained in those reports, is in keeping with current trends in data availability, will further assist in the protection of public health and the environment and will ultimately result in less burden on the regulated community. Electronic reporting can also eliminate paper-based, manual processes, thereby saving time and resources, simplifying data entry, eliminating redundancies, minimizing data reporting errors and providing data quickly and accurately to the affected facilities, air agencies, the EPA and the public.

The EPA Web site that stores the submitted electronic data, WebFIRE, will be easily accessible to everyone and will provide a user-friendly interface that any stakeholder could access. By making the records, data, and reports addressed in this rulemaking readily available, the EPA, the regulated community, and the public will benefit when the EPA conducts its CAA-required reviews. As a result of having reports readily accessible, our ability to carry out comprehensive reviews will be increased and achieved within a shorter period of time.

We anticipate fewer or less substantial information collection requests (ICRs) in conjunction with prospective CAA-required reviews may be needed. Under an electronic reporting system, the EPA would have air emissions and performance test data in hand; we would not have to collect these data from the regulated industry. The data would provide useful information on actual emissions, types of controls in place, locations of facilities, and other data that the EPA uses in conducting required reviews or future assessments. We expect this to result in a decrease in time spent by industry to respond to data collection requests. We also expect the ICRs to contain less extensive stack testing provisions, as we will already have stack test data electronically. Reduced testing requirements would be a cost savings to industry. The EPA should also be able to conduct these required reviews more quickly. While the regulated community may benefit from a reduced burden of ICRs, the general public benefits from the agency's ability to provide these required reviews more quickly, resulting in increased public health and environmental protection.

Air agencies could benefit from more streamlined and automated review of

the electronically submitted data. Having reports and associated data in electronic format will facilitate review through the use of software "search" options, as well as the downloading and analyzing of data in spreadsheet format. The ability to access and review air emission report information electronically will assist air agencies to more quickly and accurately determine compliance with the applicable regulations, potentially allowing a faster response to violations which could minimize harmful air emissions. This benefits both air agencies and the general public.

For a more thorough discussion of electronic reporting required by this rule, see the discussion in the proposed NSPS (79 FR 41818) and the 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines (80 FR 52127). In summary, in addition to supporting regulation development, control strategy development, and other air pollution control activities, having an electronic database populated with performance test data will save industry, air agencies, and the EPA significant time, money, and effort while improving the quality of emission inventories and air quality regulations and enhancing the public's access to this important information.

6. Landfills Recirculating Leachate or Adding Other Liquids

In the ANPRM and proposed Emission Guidelines, the EPA solicited input on whether additional action should be taken to address emissions from wet landfills. As discussed in section VI.A.3 of this preamble, there were a wide variety of perspectives provided in the public comments, and while many commenters supported separate thresholds for wet landfills, the EPA did not receive sufficient data to support a separate subcategory for landfills adding leachate or other liquids. In addition, the EPA has several other pending regulatory actions that could affect wet landfills. Accordingly, the EPA believes it is appropriate to further assess emissions from wet landfills prior to taking additional action. Therefore, the EPA is finalizing electronic reporting of additional data elements, as discussed in Section V.A.3 of this preamble, to inform potential action on wet landfills in the future.

C. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions

The standards in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf, apply at all times, including periods of startup or shutdown, and periods of malfunction. The EPA is reaffirming the work practice standard applicable during SSM events wherein

the landfill owner or operator is required to shut down the gas mover system and close all valves in the collection and control system potentially contributing to the venting of the gas to the atmosphere within 1 hour of the collection or control system not operating. The landfill owner or operator must also keep records and submit reports of all periods when the collection and control device is not operating.

V. Summary of Significant Changes Since Proposal

A. Changes to Monitoring, Recordkeeping, and Reporting

1. Wellhead Monitoring

Although the EPA is finalizing the proposed removal of wellhead operational standards for nitrogen/oxygen, the EPA has decided to retain the operational standards for temperature. The temperature standards were considered to be an essential indicator for fires, as discussed in Section VI.A.1 of this preamble.

2. Corrective Action

We are revising the procedural requirements for correcting positive pressure and temperature by allowing owners or operators 60 days to correct exceedances. If the owner or operator cannot achieve negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) by 60 days after the initial exceedance, owners or operators must conduct a root cause analysis to identify the most appropriate corrective action, which can include, but is not limited to, expanding the GCCS. For corrective action that takes longer than 60 days, owners or operators must develop an implementation schedule to complete the corrective action as soon as practicable, but no more than 120 days following the initial positive pressure or temperature reading. Additionally, owners or operators must keep records of the corrective action analysis. Owners or operators must submit the corrective action and corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator for approval when implementation of the corrective action is expected to take longer than 120 days after the initial exceedance.

This change provides flexibility to owners or operators in determining the appropriate remedy, as well as the timeline for implementing the remedy.

3. Landfills Recirculating Leachate or Adding Other Liquids

The EPA is adding additional electronic reporting requirements for wet areas of landfills. The additional

reporting applies to areas of the landfill that have recirculated leachate within the last 10 years and to areas where other liquids were added within the last 10 years.

The EPA is requiring these landfills to annually report quantities of liquids added and/or leachate recirculated. The first report will contain historical quantities, where those data are available in on-site records. The EPA is also requiring the landfill to report the surface area over which the liquids are added or the leachate is recirculated during each reporting year. The EPA is also requiring the landfill to report the total waste disposed in the area with recirculated leachate or added liquids as well as the annual waste acceptance rates in those same areas. As discussed in Section VI.A.3 of this preamble, this additional electronic reporting for wet landfills will inform potential future action on wet landfills.

4. Portable Gas Analyzers

We are allowing the use of portable gas composition analyzers in conjunction with Method 3A to monitor the oxygen level at a wellhead. A portable analyzer may be used to monitor the oxygen level at a wellhead provided that it is calibrated and meets all QA/QC requirements according to Method 3A. ASTM D6522-11 may be used as an alternative to Method 3A for wellhead monitoring as long as all the quality assurance is conducted as required by ASTM D6522-11. To use ASTM D6522-11, the sample location must be prior to combustion.

This change allows owners or operators to employ devices that are commonly used in practice to measure wellhead parameters. This change also eliminates the need for the landfill owner or operator to request portable analyzers as an alternative, as well as the need for agency review or approval of such requests. In addition to providing reliable results when used properly, portable analyzers have a number of benefits, including common use, the ability to provide additional information on gas composition, and the ability to download data to a spreadsheet for easy access and analysis.

5. More Precise Location Data

The EPA is finalizing a requirement for landfills to report the latitude and longitude coordinates of each surface emissions exceedance (500 ppm methane or greater), as proposed, except the instrument accuracy must be at least 4 meters instead of 3 meters. This change will provide a more robust and long-term record of GCCS performance.

Landfill owners or operators and regulators can use locational data to gain perspective on how the LFG collection system is functioning over time and owners or operators will be able to track trends in GCCS performance and cover practices to ensure a well operating system and minimize emissions.

B. Tier 4

The EPA is finalizing the use of Tier 4 SEM as an alternative way of determining when a landfill must install a GCCS; however, in the final rule, the final Tier 4 emissions threshold determination can be used only at landfills that have modeled NMOC emissions using Tier 1 or Tier 2 of greater than or equal to 34 Mg/yr but less than 50 Mg/yr because the landfills NESHAP (40 CFR part 63, subpart AAAA) requires landfills that have modeled NMOC emissions of 50 Mg/yr or greater to install and operate a GCCS irrespective of surface emissions. If both Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicate NMOC emissions of 50 Mg/yr or greater, Tier 4 cannot be used (a landfill need not model emissions under Tier 3 before using Tier 4). In order to verify that the landfill is eligible for Tier 4, the EPA is finalizing a provision to require landfill owners or operators that choose to use Tier 4 to continue to conduct Tier 1 and Tier 2 NMOC emission rate calculations and report results in the annual report.

The EPA is also limiting the use of Tier 4 at landfills with a GCCS installed. In order for a landfill with an operational GCCS to qualify for Tier 4, the GCCS must have operated for at least 75 percent of the 12 months prior to initiating Tier 4 testing. The EPA is finalizing reporting and recordkeeping requirements for the annual operating hours of destruction devices in order to verify that a landfill with a GCCS installed and opting for Tier 4 meets the GCCS criteria for having operated the system.

In addition, the EPA is finalizing specific requirements for the use of Tier 4 for emission threshold determinations related to wind speed. Since accurate measurements can be compromised in even moderately windy conditions, the EPA is requiring the owner or operator to use a wind barrier, similar to a funnel or other device, to minimize surface air turbulence when onsite wind speed exceeds the limits in the rule. Thus, when a wind barrier is used, the final rule allows the Tier 4 surface emissions demonstration to proceed when the average on-site wind speed exceeds 4 mph, or gusts exceed 10 mph. Tier 4 measurements cannot be conducted if the average wind speed exceeds 25

mph. Although we are aware of the use of wind barriers in the field, the EPA intends to provide additional guidance on their use. In addition, the owner or operator must take digital photographs of the instrument setup, including the wind barrier. The photographs must be time and date-stamped and taken at the first sampling location prior to sampling and at the last sampling location after sampling at the end of each sampling day, for the duration of the Tier 4 monitoring demonstration. The owner or operator must maintain those photographs per the recordkeeping requirements. Wind speed must be measured with an on-site anemometer with a continuous recorder and data logger for the entire duration of the monitoring event. The average wind speed must be determined at 5-minute intervals. The gust must be determined at 3-second intervals. Further, when taking surface measurements, the sampling probe must be held no more than 5 centimeters above the landfill surface (e.g., using a mechanical device such as a wheel on a pole).

The EPA is also finalizing reporting and recordkeeping requirements to ensure that a GCCS is installed in a timely manner and to improve the transparency of SEM testing. To ensure that a GCCS is installed in a timely manner, the EPA is requiring a GCCS to be installed and operated within 30 months of the most recent NMOC emission rate report in which the calculated NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 Mg/yr according to Tier 2, once there is any measured concentration of methane of 500 ppm or greater from the surface of the landfill. To improve the transparency of SEM testing, landfill owners or operators must notify the delegated authority 30 days prior to conducting Tier 4 tests and maintain records of all SEM monitoring data and calibrations. In addition, landfill owners or operators must take and store digital photographs of the instrument setup. The photographs must be time and date-stamped and taken at the first sampling location prior to sampling and at the last sampling location after sampling at the end of each sampling day, for the duration of the Tier 4 monitoring demonstration.

C. Changes To Address Closed or Non-Productive Areas

1. Closed Landfill Subcategory

The closed landfill subcategory is expanded to include those landfills that close on or before September 27, 2017 which is 13 months after publication of the final Emission Guidelines. This change gives landfills that closed or are

planning to close time to complete the steps to reach closure.

2. Criteria for Removing or Decommissioning GCCS

The GCCS can be capped or removed when a landfill owner or operator demonstrates that (1) the landfill is closed, (2) the GCCS has operated for at least 15 years or the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows, and (3) the calculated NMOC emission rate at the landfill is less than 34 Mg/yr on three consecutive test dates (50 Mg/yr for the closed landfill subcategory). The final rule does not contain a GCCS removal criterion based on SEM.

D. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions

In the 2015 Emission Guidelines proposal (80 FR 52103), the EPA clarified that standards apply at all times, including periods of SSM. The EPA also added requirements to estimate emissions during SSM events. Consistent with *Sierra Club v. EPA*, 551 F.3d 1019 (D.C. Cir. 2008), the EPA is clarifying that the standards in the Emission Guidelines, once implemented through an EPA-approved state plan or a promulgated federal plan, apply at all times. In recognition of the unique nature of landfill emissions, and consistent with the need for standards to apply at all times, including during periods of SSM, the EPA is reaffirming a work practice standard that applies during SSM events. During such events, owners or operators must shut down the gas mover system and close within 1 hour all valves in the collection and control system contributing to the potential venting of the gas to the atmosphere. The landfill owner or operator must also keep records and submit reports of all periods when the collection and control device is not operating.

E. Other Corrections and Clarifications

The use of EPA Method 25A and Method 18 (on a limited basis, e.g., specific compounds like methane) are included in the final rule. Method 25A in conjunction with Method 18 (for methane) or Method 3C can be used to determine NMOC for the outlet concentrations less than 50 ppm NMOC as carbon.

VI. Rationale for Significant Changes Since Proposal

After considering public comments and further analyzing the available data, the EPA made several changes in this final rule relative to what we proposed.

A complete list of public comments received on the proposed rule and the responses to them can be viewed in the document "Responses to Public Comments on EPA's Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills and Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills: Proposed Rules" (hereafter "Response to Comments document"), which is available in Docket EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0451. This section of the preamble summarizes comments and presents responses to those comments for only those provisions that have changed since the 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines.

A. Changes to Monitoring, Recordkeeping, and Reporting

1. Wellhead Monitoring

In the 2014 proposed NSPS, the EPA requested comment on alternative wellhead monitoring requirements, including potential exclusion from the temperature and nitrogen/oxygen monitoring requirements, or a reduction in the frequency of this monitoring. For example, the EPA indicated that it could reduce the frequency of wellhead monitoring for these three parameters (temperature and nitrogen/oxygen) from monthly to a quarterly or semi-annual schedule. The EPA requested comments on whether the potential exclusion should apply to a subset of landfills or landfill areas based on beneficial use of LFG.

In the 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines, the EPA proposed to remove the operational standards (i.e., the requirement to meet operating limits) for temperature and nitrogen/oxygen at the wellheads, thus removing the corresponding requirement to take corrective action for exceedances of these parameters. This approach was taken to eliminate the need for owners or operators to request higher operating values (HOVs) for these parameters, submit alternative timelines for corrective action, or expand the GCCS to address exceeding these wellhead standards. The EPA proposed to maintain the requirement to monitor nitrogen/oxygen and temperature on a monthly basis, but to remove the requirement to report exceedances from fluctuations or variations in these parameters in the annual reports. Instead of annual reporting, the EPA proposed that landfill owners or operators maintain the records of this monthly monitoring on site to inform any necessary adjustments to the GCCS and make these records available to the Administrator upon request. The EPA proposed to maintain the requirement to

operate the GCCS at negative pressure and in a manner that collects the most LFG and minimizes losses of LFG through the surface of the landfill. The EPA also requested comments on whether it should add a requirement to monitor wellhead flow rate, or any other wellhead monitoring parameters, that would help to ensure a well-operated GCCS (80 FR 52138).

Comment: Several commenters want the EPA to maintain the wellhead operational standards, including states, industry consultants, and environmental organizations, with one environmental organization stating that these wellhead parameters are the only warning signal for potential fire hazards. One state stated that the removal of the operational standards could lead to some landfill owners or operators not operating the GCCS in an effective manner, thus creating a potential for increased LFG emissions through the landfill surface.

Many other commenters supported removing the nitrogen/oxygen and temperature operational standards, including industry, some states, and the Small Business Association. Several commenters indicated that a lack of response to or approval of HOV requests or alternative timelines for corrective action, despite appropriate justification, is a significant administrative barrier in the current Emission Guidelines. These commenters stated that a lack of response to or approval of HOVs results in owners or operators having to install new wells to correct for temperature or oxygen exceedances even though such expansion of the GCCS does not correct the exceedance and may be contrary to a well-operated GCCS. One commenter stated that removing the operational standards would alleviate one of the most significant barriers to installing interim gas collection measures and would alleviate the corresponding administrative burden of requesting HOVs. Other commenters stated that removing the operational standards would not only reduce administrative burden, but would also facilitate early installation of GCCS and the use of appropriate best management practices to maximize gas collection. Two commenters from state agencies agreed with removing the operational standards, and agreed with retaining monthly monitoring of temperature and nitrogen/oxygen and retaining the corresponding monitoring data.

Several commenters suggested that certain monitoring data should be reported on a semi-annual basis so that agencies can identify or prevent fires. For example, state agency commenters suggested that the EPA require semi-

annual reporting of wellhead readings above 5 percent oxygen and 130 degrees Fahrenheit, which was supported by supplemental comments received from the industry and industry trade organizations. One commenter also suggested reporting of any subsurface fire. One regional agency wanted the results to be reported if temperature exceeds 150 °F and also suggested reporting any methane to carbon dioxide ratio less than 1.

Commenters that supported removal of the operational standards for temperature and nitrogen/oxygen also contended that the nitrogen/oxygen and temperature wellheads parameters are poor indicators of landfill fires or inhibited decomposition and that landfill owners or operators already have their own incentive to prevent landfill fires. Commenters added that expanding the LFG collection system by drilling new wells may introduce more air into the landfill, which can exacerbate a fire and actually increase oxygen content. Commenters (0451–0178, 0451–0167, 0215–0191, 0215–0121) that favored retaining the operational standards for temperature and nitrogen/oxygen contend that temperature and nitrogen/oxygen data are essential to inform regulators of the presence of the potential for a landfill fire.

Response: After carefully considering public comments and available data, the EPA is removing the operational standards (*i.e.*, the requirement to meet operating limits) for nitrogen/oxygen, but not temperature. Landfill owners or operators must continue to monitor nitrogen/oxygen on a monthly basis, however, to ensure that the GCCS is well maintained and operated, collects the most LFG, and minimizes losses of LFG through the surface of the landfill. Landfill owners or operators must maintain records of this monthly monitoring and make these records available to the Administrator upon request. The EPA is requiring monthly monitoring and recordkeeping for these wellhead monitoring parameters (*i.e.*, oxygen, nitrogen, temperature, and pressure), since these are key indicators that are already being monitored by landfill owner or operators to determine how well the landfill is being operated, including the capturing and destroying landfill gas, promoting efficient anaerobic decomposition and/or preventing landfill fires.

Because of concerns regarding fire hazards, the EPA is retaining the operational standard for temperature. Landfill owners or operators must electronically submit, as part of their annual report, all readings that show

LFG temperatures greater than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit), and document the root cause and corrective action taken to correct for this exceedance, as discussed in section VI.A.2 of this preamble. While several commenters supported removing the temperature parameter, other commenters were concerned with fire risks if the parameter was removed. In addition, given the EPA experience with consent decrees and other enforcement actions involving elevated temperature values, the EPA has decided to retain temperature as an operating standard in the final rule. This overall approach will reduce the number of requests for higher operating values and alternative timeliness for nitrogen/oxygen parameters. In addition, note that regulatory agencies can request data records of oxygen, nitrogen, or temperature monitoring, as measured on a monthly basis, at any time.

Landfills are subject to 40 CFR part 60, subpart A. These provisions require landfill owners or operators, to the extent practicable, to maintain and operate any affected facility including associated air pollution control equipment in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions. Due to the extreme environmental consequences of a subsurface landfill fire, these provisions obligate landfill owners or operators to take all practical steps necessary to avoid landfill fires. While this action removes requirements to meet operational standards for nitrogen/oxygen at wellheads and to make corrective actions, landfill owners or operators must continue all due diligence to ensure that the GCCS is not overdrawn, thereby creating a flammable subsurface environment.

Because the corrective action requirements for certain parameters have been retained, the EPA is reaffirming its provisions for HOVs. The HOV provisions were originally enacted to address variations in temperature between landfills and between wells. With a sufficient demonstration (*i.e.*, supporting data showing the elevated parameter does not cause fires or significantly inhibit anaerobic decomposition by killing methanogens), an HOV may be established for temperature, nitrogen, or oxygen at a particular well. The EPA encourages regulatory authorities review requests for HOVs in a timely manner and to make use of these mechanisms where

appropriate.⁴² States may also consider HOVs when developing state plans.

2. Corrective Action

In a 1998 **Federal Register** notice (63 FR 32748, June 16, 1998), the EPA amended the wellhead monitoring provisions of 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW, to allow an alternative timeline for correcting wellhead exceedances to be submitted to the Administrator for approval. The rule change made the wellhead monitoring provisions consistent with the SEM provisions, which allow an alternative remedy and corresponding timeline for correcting an exceedance to be submitted to the Administrator for approval. The EPA noted in the 1998 preamble that any timeline extending more than 120 days must be approved by the regulating agency. Since 1998, questions have been raised about the timing of correcting wellhead exceedances and whether a landfill needs agency approval for corrective action timelines that exceed 15 calendar days but are less than the 120 days allowed for expanding the GCCS.

In the 2015 Emission Guidelines proposal, the EPA clarified its intent and outlined a corresponding timeline for correcting positive pressure at a wellhead. The EPA proposed that a landfill must submit an alternative corrective action timeline request to the Administrator for approval if the landfill cannot restore negative pressure within 15 calendar days of the initial failure to maintain negative pressure and the landfill is unable to (or does not plan to) expand the gas collection system within 120 days of the initial exceedance. The EPA explained in the preamble that it did not specify a schedule in the proposed rule language by when a landfill would need to submit alternative timeline requests because the EPA determined that investigating and determining the appropriate corrective action, as well as the schedule for implementing corrective action, would be site specific and depend on the reason for the exceedance (80 FR 52126). In addition, the EPA requested comment (80 FR 52126) on an alternative timeline that extends the requirement for notification from 15 days to as soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days from when an exceedance is identified. In the 2014 ANPRM, the EPA had requested

comment on the same approach, as well as whether 60 days is the appropriate time to make necessary repairs.

Comment: The EPA received comments on the proposed changes, including the time allowed for corrective action and for submitting alternative timeline requests for approval by the Administrator. Regarding the timeframe for submitting a request, several state agencies recommended extending the 15-day timeline for a request to be submitted and indicated that 15 days is not sufficient time to evaluate the problem and plan for corrective action, which may often involve construction activities. There were varied opinions from the state agencies on what length of time beyond 15 days is appropriate. Two agencies supported an extension to as soon as practicable but no later than 60 days, other agencies specified that the request should be submitted within 30 days from the initial exceedance.

Industry representatives from private and publicly owned landfills as well as waste industry consultants opposed the requirement to submit a request for an alternative corrective action timeline within 15 days. The commenters were concerned that 15 days is not enough time to assess the appropriate solution across miles of interconnected piping. In addition, the commenters were concerned that a 15-day time period would increase the paperwork for both the landfill and the reviewing regulatory agency. One commenter indicated that while many repairs can be completed within 60 days, some repairs, especially in cold weather climates, may take longer. One industry commenter suggested that a timeframe of 90 days to complete any adjustments or repairs is appropriate. If the corrections could not be made within 90 days, the commenter stated that the landfill would be prepared to have the system expanded within 120 days.

Industry commenters raised the issue that the timeline for corrective action for surface exceedances in the current subpart WWW regulations, 40 CFR 60.755(c)(4)(v), allows 120 days to install a new well or other collection device or submit an alternative timeline for another corrective action. These commenters also indicated that the 1998 NSPS amendments modified the corrective action for wellhead parameter exceedances to be consistent with the timeframe allowed for correcting surface exceedances (63 FR 32748, June 16, 1998). The commenters also noted that the 1998 amendments recognized that installation of a new well may not always be the appropriate corrective

action for remedying a wellhead exceedance.

Despite the 1998 rule amendments, several of these industry commenters note that interpretation and implementation of the 1998 amendments to 40 CFR 60.755(a)(3) have been inconsistent, with some agencies only requiring the landfill owner or operator to submit requests if the corrective action will take longer than 120 days. Other states have taken the position that any exceedances that cannot be resolved within 15 days must automatically result in a requirement to expand the GCCS. One commenter referenced determinations that required landfills to submit an alternative timeline request within 15 days. One commenter indicated that the original rule never anticipated notification and a request for an alternative compliance timeline within 15 days, while another commenter indicated that the state of Texas requires landfills to submit alternative timelines only if the corrective action requires more than 120 days to complete.

In consideration of the 1998 final rule notice, industry commenters recommended that EPA require landfill owners or operators to submit an alternative timeline request for approval as soon as practicable and only in circumstances in which a system expansion or alternative corrective action will require more than 120 days to complete. One of the commenters (Republic 0451-0176) suggested that this approach was consistent with the Petroleum Refineries NSPS (40 CFR part 60, subpart Ja). The commenter noted that while the Landfills NSPS requires special approval to avoid the default corrective action of expanding the GCCS, the Refineries NSPS requires a root cause analysis to identify the appropriate corrective action, without specifying a default approach. The Refineries NSPS requires a root cause analysis and a corrective action analysis for exceedances and requires the facility to implement the corrective action within 45 days. If the corrective action cannot be completed in 45 days, the refinery must document and record all corrective actions completed to date. For actions not fully completed by day 45, they must develop an implementation schedule, as soon as practicable, for beginning and completing all corrective action.

One commenter provided some ideas for landfills to demonstrate good faith effort to comply with the 120-day corrective action schedule. They suggested the rules clarify that the landfill owner or operator is required to submit a notification to the agency that

⁴² The EPA asserts the importance of case specific HOV requests and approvals. However, to address concerns from HOV request reviewers and those submitting requests, an example of regulatory guidance for HOV demonstrations can be found at http://www.epa.ohio.gov/portals/34/document/guidance/gd_1002.pdf.

identifies and describes the diagnosis performed, the results of the diagnosis, identifies the corrective measure or alternative remedy to be implemented and reason(s) why system expansion is not appropriate to correct the exceedance. Under such an approach, corrective measures other than expansion that take 0–60 days to complete from the initial exceedance would not require any notification or approval but they would be documented in the annual compliance report. For corrective actions other than expansion that take longer than 60 days but less than 120 days to complete, the landfill owner or operator would notify the regulatory agency by day 75 from the date of the initial exceedance. This would allow 45 days for the agency to review and comment, and such notification would not require agency approval so as not to delay the site from proceeding with and completing the corrective action, as long as the corrective actions are completed within the 120-day timeframe.

Industry commenters indicated that the timeline for corrective action is affected by other regulations. Two of these commenters noted that any corrective action that involves disturbing the final landfill cover could delay diagnosing the problem. All of these commenters also noted that a 60-day timeframe is problematic for landfills affected by the Asbestos NESHAP (40 CFR part 61, subpart M), which requires a 45-day notification prior to disturbing areas that may have asbestos containing material.

Response: The EPA is retaining the corrective action requirements for temperature in addition to negative pressure. The EPA recognizes the importance of temperature as a critical indicator of landfill fires and its effect on methanogens. Further removal of the corrective action requirements for temperature could have the unintended consequence of improper operation of a GCCS which could lead to a subsurface fire. Due to the importance of this parameter, e-reporting requirements for excessive temperature have also been established to better assess landfill fires.⁴³

After carefully considering the comments received and evaluating the available data, the EPA is finalizing corrective action requirements that generally give owners or operators 60

days to investigate and determine the appropriate corrective action and then implement that action. The EPA has retained the requirements for temperature and positive pressure, in that if positive pressure or temperature exceedances exist, action must be initiated to correct the exceedances within 5 calendar days. This requirement has been retained to ensure the landfill takes prompt action to ensure the GCCS remains well-operated. The EPA recognizes, however, that the appropriate corrective action, as well as a schedule to implement it, is site-specific and depends on the reason for the exceedance. Therefore, for corrective action that takes longer than 60 days after the initial exceedance to implement, the EPA is providing flexibility for the landfill to determine the appropriate course of action based on a root cause analysis. Specifically, if the owner or operator cannot achieve negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) at the GCCS wellhead within 15 days, then the owner or operator must conduct a root cause analysis and correct the exceedance as soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days after positive pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) was first measured. An implementation schedule is required for exceedances that will take longer than 60 days to correct. A root cause analysis is an assessment conducted through a process of investigation to determine the primary cause, and any other contributing cause(s), of positive pressure at a wellhead or temperature above 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit). The root cause analysis and documentation of the corrective action taken to restore negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) must be kept on site as a record, but they do not have to be submitted or approved.

If negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) cannot be achieved within 60 days, then the owner or operator must develop an implementation schedule to complete the corrective action(s) as soon as practicable, but no more than 120 days following the positive pressure or temperature reading. The owner or operator must also notify the Administrator within 75 days. The implementation schedule, root cause analysis, and documentation of the corrective action taken to restore negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) must be submitted in the facility's next

annual report, but these items do not have to be approved.

If the exceedance cannot be corrected (or is not expected to be corrected) within 120 days, then the owner or operator must submit the root cause analysis, plan for corrective action to restore negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit), and the corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator. The Administrator must approve the plan for corrective action and the corresponding timeline. The owner or operator must submit the proposed corrective action and timeline to the Administrator for approval as soon as practicable but no later than 75 days after the initial exceedance. Requiring approval by the Administrator for corrective action timelines that extend beyond 120 days is consistent with the corrective action timeline for surface emissions in 40 CFR 60.36f(c)(4)(v). This approach also prevents the landfill owner or operator from delaying submittals for corrective action requests until day 120. Once the negative pressure has been restored, the facility must document the corrective actions taken in the facility's next annual report.

For corrective action required to address positive pressure or temperature, the owner or operator must keep a record of the root cause analysis conducted, including a description of the recommended corrective action(s); the date for corrective action(s) already completed following the positive pressure reading and; and for action(s) not already completed within 60 days of the initial positive pressure reading, a schedule for implementation, including proposed commencement and completion dates. For corrective actions taking longer than 60 days to correct the exceedance, the owner or operator would also include in the annual report the root cause analysis, recommended corrective action(s), date corrective actions were completed, and schedule for implementing corrective actions. The owner or operator must also notify the Administrator within 75 days. For corrective actions taking longer than 120 days to correct the exceedance, the owner or operator would include, in a separate notification submitted to the Administrator for approval as soon as practicable, but no later than 75 days after the initial positive pressure or elevated temperature reading, the root cause analysis, recommended corrective action(s), date corrective actions taken to date were completed, and proposed schedule for implementing corrective actions.

⁴³ The need to rely on temperature in addition to pressure is also illustrated in the report titled *Subsurface Heating Events at Solid Waste and Construction and Demolition Debris Landfills: Best Management Practices* at http://www.epa.state.oh.us/Portals/34/document/guidance/gd_1009.pdf.

3. Landfills Recirculating Leachate or Adding Other Liquids

In the ANPRM and proposed Emission Guidelines, the EPA solicited input on whether additional action should be taken to address emissions from wet landfills (*i.e.*, landfills that recirculate leachate or add liquids). Commenters differed on whether the EPA should require separate thresholds or different lag times for landfills that recirculate leachate or add liquids. (The lag time is the time period between when the landfill exceeds the emission rate threshold and when controls are required to be installed and started up.)

Comments: Commenters supported more environmentally protective requirements for wet landfills and asserted that wet landfills produce more methane but actually collect less. Commenters said that the EPA should shorten the lag time for installing controls for these landfills. Other commenters opposed separate requirements for wet landfills and contended that additional requirements for wet landfills would achieve minimal emission reductions and would result in a significant additional burden for landfills that recirculate leachate. One commenter said that the EPA should focus on potential emission reductions at landfills that recirculate leachate.

Commenters also differed on what methane generation rate (k-value) should be used in the landfill Emission Guidelines for wet landfills. One commenter indicated that they have previously provided several studies on k-values for wet landfills to EPA and urged the EPA to update the emission factors for wet landfills based on this literature prior to adjusting the control requirements at landfills recirculating leachate or adding other liquids. Another commenter asked the EPA to use higher, more representative k-values, or perhaps a sensitivity analysis for a range of k-values to estimate the impacts of controlling emissions from wet landfills in the landfills Emission Guidelines.

Response: Based on the diverse nature of the feedback provided and several other outstanding EPA actions affecting the control requirements and emission factors for wet landfills, the EPA is not creating separate emission threshold or lag time requirements for wet landfills in this action. Instead, the EPA believes it is appropriate to further assess emissions from wet landfills prior to taking additional action on control requirements or changes to the k-values. As a result, the EPA is finalizing additional electronic reporting requirements for wet landfills with a

design capacity of 2.5 million Mg or greater to inform potential future action on wet landfills. The final rule is limiting reporting of these additional data to wet landfills that meet the current size threshold of 2.5 million Mg of design capacity to be consistent with the universe of landfills that are affected by the rule.

Specifically, the final Emission Guidelines require annual electronic reporting of the volume of leachate recirculated (gallons per year) and the volume of other liquids added (gallons per year), as well as the surface area over which the leachate is recirculated (or sprayed), and the surface area (acres) over which any liquids are applied. The quantity of leachate recirculated or liquids added should be based on company records or engineering estimates. The initial report will collect historical data for the 10 years preceding the initial annual reporting year, to the extent the data are available in on-site records, along with data corresponding to the initial reporting year. After the initial report, the other annual electronic reports will include only the quantities of leachate recirculated and/or added liquid and their corresponding surface areas for each the subsequent reporting year. The EPA believes many landfills, especially those operating with a Research, Development, and Demonstration (RD&D) permit, already keep records and may submit reports containing quantities of liquids added. So, the effort to track these additional data is expected to be minimal. RD&D permits are issued through Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) subtitle D, part 258 regulations for MSW landfills. The EPA is also aware of some state rules that require reporting of leachate or added liquids outside of the Clean Air Act reporting requirements. Consolidating these data in an electronic format in a central repository can help inform how leachate or added liquids affect LFG generation and collection whether air emission standards should be adjusted for wet landfills.

The EPA is also requiring the landfill to report the total waste disposed (Mg) in the area with recirculated leachate and/or added liquids, as well as the annual waste acceptance rates (Mg/yr) in those same areas. Recognizing that the waste quantities may be tracked at the scale house entry to the landfill and not the specific cell where the liquids are added, the EPA is allowing the landfill to report data based on on-site records or engineering estimates.

The EPA is exempting landfills in the closed landfill subcategory from this

wet landfill report recognizing that this information would be difficult to obtain from this subcategory of landfills, these landfills are unlikely to still be adding liquids if closed, and also because the gas generation from these landfills is on the downward side of their gas generation curve. In addition, for similar reasons the EPA is allowing owners or operators of landfills to discontinue annual reporting of the wet landfill report after the landfill has submitted its closure report.

The EPA is also aware of annual LFG collected and annual LFG generation data electronically reported to 40 CFR part 98, subpart HH, of the GHGRP and therefore the EPA is not requesting reporting of these data in this rule to avoid duplicative requests. However, the EPA may link the wet landfill practices data collected under the landfills NSPS with the annual gas collected data under subpart HH in order to inform how liquids addition affects LFG emissions. Similarly, the EPA understands that precipitation may affect gas generation. However, since precipitation data are readily available through the National Weather Service, the EPA is not requiring reporting of this parameter. Instead, the EPA will use existing electronic data already available to link up with data collected under this final rule. These additional data will be used to assess the appropriateness of potential future action on wet areas of landfills.

The Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) requires each federal agency to obtain OMB approval before undertaking a collection of information directed to 10 or more people. The PRA applies whether a "collection of information is mandatory, voluntary, or required to obtain or retain a benefit." The EPA believes the additional data on wet landfills will be beneficial for evaluating whether separate thresholds for wet landfills are appropriate when revising future MSW landfill standards. Because the EPA understands that many of the data elements in the wet landfill report, including quantities of leachate or other liquids added and the surface areas over which those liquids are added are tracked at a state level as part of a leachate management or RDD permit, the EPA does not anticipate these data. Additionally, the EPA is allowing landfill owners or operators to report the data elements in the wet landfill monitoring report using either engineering estimates or on-site records to minimize the burden on respondents, depending on the types of records the landfill owner/operator may keep.

This is a new rule and a new collections submitted to OMB under

EPA ICR number 2522.02. This collection is similar to collections for subpart Cc. Thus, many of the line item burden estimates in this ICR estimate are the same as the burdens submitted to OMB under ICR number 1893.06 for the most recent ICR renewal for subpart Cc.

4. Portable Gas Analyzers

Commenters on the proposed NSPS (79 FR 41796) requested that the EPA specify that portable gas composition analyzers are an acceptable alternative to Methods 3A or 3C, and noted that these devices are commonly used in practice to measure wellhead parameters and are calibrated according to the manufacturer's specifications. Currently, approvals of these analyzers are done on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, in the preamble for the proposed revisions of the Emission Guidelines (80 FR 52141), the EPA requested data or information on using a portable gas composition analyzer according to Method 3A for wellhead monitoring. The EPA also requested data on other reference methods used for calibrating these analyzers.

Comment: Many commenters supported the use of portable gas composition analyzers and requested that the EPA specify that these analyzers may be used as an approved alternative monitoring method for well monitoring. Three state agencies indicated the use of the portable analyzers is common practice. One of these agencies stated that Method 3A and Method 3C are designed to be used in "quasi-GEMS" and/or "laboratory benchtop" situations and most landfill operators are not using this type of equipment to test wellhead LFG; instead, landfill operators are using handheld-size portable analyzers. Another state agency stated that portable gas composition analyzers (e.g., Landtec GEM 2000) are a standard for conducting MSW landfill well monitoring and the analyzers provide additional information on gas composition than what the current Emission Guidelines require, which provides operators with a better understanding of the condition of the landfill. This commenter said that a primary advantage of portable gas composition analyzers, for both landfills and regulators, is that these devices take and record the monitored readings (as well as other information on gas composition that is not required to be monitored in the Emission Guidelines), which can then be downloaded into a spreadsheet and prevent landfills from making data collection mistakes. The commenter suggested that the EPA and state air pollution control agencies

would benefit if the EPA were to require landfills to submit, in their semi-annual reports, all of the monitoring data recorded by portable gas composition analyzers.

One commenter stated that most portable gas composition analyzers can be used to measure the oxygen level at the wellhead and can be calibrated according to Method 3A, but are unlikely to be calibrated according to Method 3C (to measure oxygen or nitrogen levels) because such calibration requires the use of gas chromatograph equipment with a thermal conductivity detector and integrator. The commenter said that Method 3A is straightforward and does not specify a particular technology. Several commenters specifically referenced the comments from an equipment manufacturer that provided specific details on how its Landtec GEM Series portable analyzers are able to comply with each specific requirement in Method 3A, including the calibration requirements. Two of these commenters said that portable gas composition analyzers should be allowed in both the Emissions Guidelines and NSPS. Another of these commenters requested that the EPA add language to the rule to recognize that balance gas is commonly used as a surrogate for nitrogen.

With regard to the EPA's request for data on other reference methods used for calibrating portable gas composition analyzers, one commenter suggested that the EPA allow ASTM D6522 as an alternative to Method 3A because an analyzer can easily be calibrated for oxygen alone following ASTM D6522. The commenter stated that although the QA/QC procedures in ASTM D6522 are different from Method 3A, they are just as rigorous as Method 3A. The commenter stated that it has extensive data available showing portable gas composition analyzers are routinely calibrated according to ASTM Method D6522 for measuring NO_x, CO, and oxygen during engine testing. This commenter also stated that any analyzer or device must be calibrated according to an EPA approved method and not just manufacturer's specifications.

Response: The EPA appreciates the commenters providing information regarding the use of portable gas composition analyzers for landfill monitoring. Commenters provided data showing that their portable gas composition analyzers are used to monitor the oxygen level at a wellhead and are capable of meeting the calibration requirements in Method 3A. Therefore, in this action, we are clarifying the use of portable gas composition analyzers with Method 3A.

A portable gas composition analyzer may be used to monitor the oxygen level at a wellhead provided that the analyzer is calibrated and meets all QA/QC according to Method 3A. Although we did not receive enough information regarding calibration methods that could be used on a portable gas composition analyzer to monitor the nitrogen level at a wellhead, any portable combustion monitor analyzer that uses gas chromatography and thermal conductivity technology may be used with Method 3C. Other technologies for the measurement of nitrogen may be used in lieu of Method 3C through the administrative alternative test method process outlined in 40 CFR 60.8(b)(2).

Regarding the suggestion to allow ASTM D6522-11 as an alternative to Method 3A, the EPA thanks the commenter for their perspective. As long as all the quality assurance is conducted as required by ASTM D6522-11, then ASTM D6522-11 may be used as an alternative to Method 3A for wellhead monitoring (prior to combustion). Examples of quality assurance required by ASTM D6522-11 include, but are not limited to: analyzers must have a linearity check, interference check, bias check using mid-level gases, stability check, and be calibrated before a test; and a calibration error check and the interference verification must be conducted after the testing has occurred. Due to a different sample matrix typically found in post-combustion gas streams as stated in the applicability of ASTM D6522-11, the interference check must be done on the oxygen measurement with the appropriate gases (e.g., carbon dioxide, VOC mixture, and methane) and concentration ranges. The ASTM D6522-11 method also has calibrations before and calibration checks after testing. According to Methods 3A, 3C, and ASTM D6522-11, the data are valid only when they pass the bias check or zero and upscale calibration error check. The EPA does not believe manufacturers' specifications are rigorous enough to ensure data are of a proper quality.

5. More Precise Location Data

The EPA proposed more specific requirements for reporting the locations where measured methane surface emissions are 500 ppm above background (80 FR 52124). Specifically, the EPA proposed to require landfills to report the latitude and longitude coordinates of each SEM exceedance using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 3 meters. This includes surface methane readings above 500 ppm for landfills conducting quarterly SEM with

GCCS in place, as well as landfills that are conducting Tier 4 SEM to determine the timing of GCCS installation.

Comments: Several commenters supported and several commenters opposed the EPA's proposed requirement to report the latitude and longitude coordinates of each methane surface emissions exceedance using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 3 meters.

Of those commenters that supported the requirement, one said that making global positioning system (GPS) coordinates of each exceedance available would assist owners or operators in determining the location and timing of exceedances relative to the GCCS components and would also assist in inspections and enforcement. This commenter added that these requirements provided important compliance monitoring assurances as well as important information to landfill owners or operators regarding their GCCS effectiveness. Other supportive commenters argued that all SEM data and GPS coordinates should be recorded, no matter whether there is an exceedance. One of these commenters, a state agency, said that the NSPS and Emission Guidelines have historically required retention of only exceedance data, but GPS data correlated with SEM readings would be an invaluable addition to the monitoring procedure. Another commenter said recording all SEM data (rather than only exceedances) was necessary to show compliance with the monitoring requirement; and by linking the methane readings with positioning data, the time required to process the data would be reduced. Commenters said that by correlating the SEM readings directly with the location of the reading, facilities and their regulators could easily gain a clear picture of how the LFG collection system was functioning and anticipate problems before they arose by tracking trends in the data.

Of the commenters that opposed the requirement that owners or operators of landfills report the latitude and longitude coordinates of each exceedance using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 3 meters, one said it was unclear why coordinate information must be reported, given that it merely adds burden for sites to collect and report as well as for agencies to review. Two of these commenters argued that the added expense to purchase an instrument (*i.e.*, a GPS device), use that GPS device in the field, and then plot the GPS data on a map, may provide no additional value to the operator compared to marking exceedances with marker flags. One of

these commenters stated that 3 meters is too much of an error range such that the use of GPS alone may not allow the operator to return to the exact spot of the exceedance, and may still necessitate the use of a marker flag. Another of these commenters added that the existing approach of marking exceedances at their exact physical location with a marker flag is actually more accurate because it does not rely on a technology with accuracy limitations.

Some of the commenters that oppose the requirement said that it is unclear from the docket materials (*e.g.*, the Regulatory Impact Analysis) whether the EPA evaluated: (1) If GPS equipment can achieve an accuracy of at least 3 meters; (2) the cost to purchase or rent GPS equipment; and/or (3) the size and weight of the GPS equipment with regard to requiring a technician to carry another field monitoring instrument. One of these commenters added that because GPS equipment is not typically integrated into other monitoring devices, monitoring technicians will be required to carry the GPS equipment in addition to the monitoring equipment, which could be difficult and present a safety concern.

Response: The EPA is finalizing a requirement for landfills to report the latitude and longitude coordinates of each surface emissions exceedance, as proposed, except the instrument accuracy must be at least 4 meters instead of 3 meters. GPS technology is readily available and is currently in use at landfills in California and other landfills employing electronic LFG data management systems. These GPS devices have the ability to identify latitude and longitude coordinates in decimal degrees with at least five decimal places. This level of accuracy and precision is consistent with the requirements in Petroleum Refinery Sector Risk and Technology Review and New Source Performance Standards (80 FR 75250). The EPA is aware of one device that is already in use by some landfills in California to conduct surface emissions monitoring and to create a more comprehensive understanding of the GCCS. The instrument, containing a flame ionization detector (FID), is linked by Bluetooth wireless technology to a GPS-enabled handheld field instrument. This instrument has an accuracy of 2–4 meters.

When reviewing site records on the location of the traversed path and where surface emission leaks were identified, inspectors will be able to identify areas of the landfill where surface monitoring activities may be incomplete, which may assist with targeting inspections to

problem areas of the landfill. In addition, more precise location data will allow the landfill owner or operator to overlay the coordinates of surface exceedances against maps of the GCCS to determine spatial and temporal patterns of exceedances relative to GCCS components. Both the landfill owner or operator and regulators can use locational data to gain perspective on how the LFG collection system is functioning over time and will allow the landfill to track trends in GCCS performance and cover practices.

Using GPS locational data will provide a more robust and long-term record of GCCS performance compared to the short-term practice of simply marking an exceedance location with a marker flag. Owners or operators may continue the practice of marking exceedances with a flag, but GPS data will allow the landfill owner or operator to return readily to the location of the exceedance to not only take the required corrective action, but also to track and inform long-term performance of the GCCS to minimize emissions.

The EPA included the rental price of a Trimble Integrated Landfill Gas Solution device, which combines a FID linked by Bluetooth wireless technology to a GPS-enabled handheld field instrument, in the revised testing and monitoring cost analysis for both the final Emission Guidelines and final NSPS. The GPS location is recorded in real time as the technician traverses the path so the labor involved in gathering and recording the data with GPS coordinates is expected to be minimal. In fact, the recording of each surface reading and the corresponding locational data is automatic, in contrast to the older technology, which may have involved handwriting an exceedance in a notebook and then transposing the data to a computer after returning from the field. Eliminating transposing the data could reduce data entry errors and improve data accuracy and credibility. The GPS device is already in use by landfills that maintain an electronic LFG data management system to map long-term trends in GCCS performance. The GPS device weighs approximately 21 ounces (including battery weight) and can be clipped to a belt or attached to a backpack to allow the technician to complete the monitoring safely.

B. Tier 4

In the 2015 Emission Guidelines proposal, the EPA proposed Tier 4 as an alternative site-specific emission threshold determination for when a landfill must install and operate a GCCS (80 FR 52112). For both Tier 4 SEM for

determining the timing for GCCS installation and SEM to ensure a well operated GCCS, the EPA considered limiting SEM during windy conditions. Specifically, in the Emission Guidelines, the EPA proposed that SEM must be terminated when the average wind speed exceeds 5 mph or the instantaneous wind speed exceeds 10 mph. However, the EPA also proposed that the Administrator may approve alternatives to this wind speed surface monitoring termination for landfills consistently having measured winds in excess of these specified limits.

Comments. The EPA received numerous comments on the Tier 4 provisions included in the 2015 Emission Guidelines proposal. The discussion below includes all comments related to changes since the 2015 proposal; more detailed comments are available in the Response to Comments document. A summary of the initial comments received in response to our request for comments for a Tier 4 provision in the 2014 ANPRM was provided in the preamble to the proposal (80 FR 52112).

Which landfills should qualify. Some commenters believe that the EPA should limit the types of landfills that qualify for Tier 4. One commenter opposed the inclusion of a Tier 4 option for new landfills, stating that it allows a subset of new landfills to delay methane capture requirements when these landfills will be required to install a GCCS in the future and should have a GCCS designed and installed during landfill construction. One commenter encouraged the EPA to ban Tier 4 for landfills with a voluntary (non-regulatory) GCCS because it is possible that GCCS design, monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements could be avoided indefinitely through the use of a non-regulatory GCCS that may not provide the same level of control as required by the EPA landfills regulations. Another commenter thinks that Tier 4 could be conducted at landfills with a GCCS installed, but that the GCCS should follow typical operational conditions during the Tier 4 test. In other words, if portions of the site are typically offline due to decreased gas flow, the commenter (0215-0197) thinks those portions must remain offline during Tier 4. Further, one commenter believes that no means of gas control whatsoever should be employed during the Tier 4 exemption.

Frequency. There were a variety of opinions on how often SEM should be conducted for Tier 4. One commenter suggested the SEM should be done annually instead of quarterly. Two other

commenters were concerned with reducing the frequency to semi-annually unless the landfill no longer accepted waste. One of these commenters noted that if a landfill has already crossed the 34 Mg/yr NMOC threshold and the facility continues to receive solid waste, then the expected gas generation will continue to increase.

Windy conditions. Many commenters, including many state agencies, opposed limiting surface monitoring during windy conditions, stating that the wind restrictions would be a significant inhibitor to completing the required monitoring in many regions of the country due to typical windy conditions. Commenters also stated that it would be difficult to schedule and reschedule dedicated sampling crews.

Commenters claimed that climate conditions across the United States are too variable, that monitoring the wind using an anemometer is not representative of wind conditions where the surface monitoring is required (5–10 cm of surface), and that it is difficult to assemble monitoring team and schedule monitoring events if they may be cancelled due to wind. One commenter supports the development of a Tier 4 SEM methodology that is functional during windy conditions. Other commenters support the removal of the wind speed criteria and replacement with a requirement that surface monitoring be performed during typical meteorological conditions. Lastly, one commenter pointed out that the Tier 4 proposal is inconsistent with the ongoing quarterly SEM requirements since Tier 4 has wind restrictions and the ongoing quarterly SEM does not.

One commenter noted that EPA recognized wind speed can skew the results of SEM. Another commenter did not submit comments specific to the wind speed limitations; however, this commenter supported the SEM approach in the CA LMR, which does include wind speed restrictions.

Reporting requirement. Commenters supported the notification requirement; however, one commenter believes landfills should not be required to reschedule monitoring events based on the availability of regulatory authorities. Furthermore, two commenters thought the notification requirement was acceptable but with the existing wind requirements, coordination with regulators could become even more challenging. Another commenter did not support the notification requirement because Tier 4 is voluntary.

Response: After considering public comments and input from small entity outreach, the EPA is finalizing Tier 4 SEM procedures for determining when

a landfill must install a GCCS. Tier 4 provides operational flexibility and allows owners or operators of landfills that have exceeded the modeled NMOC emission rate threshold to demonstrate that site-specific surface methane emissions are below a specific threshold. Commenters raised some valid points, however, and based on our consideration of that input, we are making some adjustments to the final rule.

In response to public comments concerned with implementation of Tier 4 with wind speed restrictions, the EPA is retaining a wind speed limitation with allowance of a wind barrier when onsite wind speed exceeds the limits in the regulation. The EPA is also providing additional clarifications about probe placement (as described in sections IV.A.2 and V.B of this preamble) for Tier 4 SEM. In the proposed NSPS (80 FR 52136), the EPA acknowledged concerns about the accuracy of SEM under windy conditions. The EPA is including the wind speed restriction, because air movement can affect whether the monitor is accurately reading the methane concentration during surface monitoring. Because Tier 4 is an optional emission threshold methodology, the EPA believes that wind speed restrictions and the use of wind barriers are appropriate to ensure the reliability of the results, which in turn determine the timing of GCCS installation. We also refined the wind speed criteria to account for gusts up to 10 mph. The EPA is not finalizing a variance for wind speed, but is allowing the use of a wind barrier. In the proposed NSPS (80 FR 52136), the EPA acknowledged concerns about the accuracy of SEM under windy conditions. The EPA also expressed concern about whether monitors could accurately read methane concentrations or provide representative results. The EPA has provided the Tier 4 approach as a flexible alternative to traditional modeling based approaches; but still asserts the importance of accurate measurements due to the use of the SEM approach to determine installation of controls.

In addition, Tier 4 is allowed only if the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that NMOC emissions are greater than or equal to 34 Mg/yr but less than 50 Mg/yr using Tier 1 or Tier 2 (a landfill need not model emissions under Tier 3 before using Tier 4). Tier 3 was not required because tiers 1 and 2 are more commonly used. If both Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicate NMOC emissions of 50 Mg/yr or greater, then Tier 4 cannot be used. This change avoids a

potential conflict between what is required under the Emission Guidelines and what is required by the landfills NESHAP for landfills with modeled NMOC emissions greater than 50 Mg/yr. It also ensures that landfills with modeled NMOC emissions at 50 Mg/yr or more continue to be required to install controls at an NMOC level and on a schedule that is at least as stringent as the current NSPS (40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW). To demonstrate that NMOC emissions are less than 50 Mg/yr according to Tier 1 and Tier 2, landfill owners or operators will continue to calculate the NMOC emission rate and report results annually.

Regarding frequency of monitoring, the EPA is finalizing an approach where quarterly SEM is required for Tier 4 indefinitely unless the landfill is closed. Closed landfills would be able to reduce the frequency of surface emission monitoring to annually after four quarters of no surface exceedances. Landfills that are closed are on the downside of their gas generation profile.

Regarding landfills equipped with a non-regulatory GCCS, the EPA is allowing the non-regulatory GCCS to be in operation during the Tier 4 SEM demonstration, but only if the non-regulatory GCCS has operated for at least 75 percent of the hours the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration (6,570 hours), as discussed below. The EPA recognizes that many landfills have acted early to control their emissions and installed a GCCS before surpassing the size and NMOC emission thresholds in the landfills regulations in order to recover and utilize LFG methane for beneficial use, flare for carbon credits, control odors, or meet state-specific regulations that may be more stringent than the federal NSPS standards. Thus, during the SEM demonstration, the non-regulatory GCCS must continue to operate as it normally would to collect and control as much LFG as possible. Although these landfills do not operate their GCCS under the landfills NSPS, they employ the same technology that would be applied to comply with the landfills NSPS. Many of these non-regulatory GCCSs are located at sites that are likely to eventually exceed the NSPS size and NMOC emissions thresholds and thus if no exceedances are identified during a Tier 4 SEM, the system is operating at a level consistent with the landfills NSPS collection and control requirements and operational standards at a point in time earlier than when federal regulations would require. These near-term methane reductions from non-regulatory GCCS are beneficial

to the environment and the goal of achieving short-term emission reductions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas. In addition, landfill owners or operators have incentive to operate the GCCS as efficiently as possible to collect and control LFG to avoid surface exceedances, as it would reduce paperwork requirements associated with the compliance provisions of the landfills NSPS. The non-regulatory GCCS would have to be robust to keep readings below 500 ppm methane during an SEM demonstration.

To not allow the Tier 4 demonstration while a non-regulatory GCCS is in operation under these circumstances would create a disincentive for landfill owners or operators to install control systems voluntarily before emissions reach the regulatory threshold for review. The requirement to operate the GCCS at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration (described below) will ensure that the non-regulatory GCCS is in regular use and thus represents accurate operation of the facility.

The landfill owner or operator is allowed to operate the non-regulatory GCCS during the Tier 4 demonstration, but only if the non-regulatory GCCS has operated for at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration (6,570 of 8,760 hours). To demonstrate that the non-regulatory GCCS operated at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration, landfill owners or operators must keep records of the total operating hours of the gas collection system as measured for each destruction device (*i.e.*, at the flare, engine, or other destruction device), as well as the annual operating hours where active gas flow was sent to each destruction device. If the non-regulatory GCCS has not operated at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration, then the landfill is not eligible for Tier 4. The EPA seeks to encourage use of voluntary non-regulatory GCCS systems for early gas collection before emissions reach the regulatory threshold for review, while still allowing landfill owners and operators to use Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring approach to determine if a GCCS is required. We believe that requiring the operation of the non-regulatory GCCS at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration (described below) will ensure that the non-regulatory GCCS is in regular use and thus results would be representative of the operation of the landfill.

Regarding other recordkeeping and reporting requirements associated with Tier 4, landfill owners or operators choosing Tier 4 would continue to calculate the NMOC emission rate and report results in the annual report to demonstrate that NMOC emissions are less than 50 Mg/yr. Once there is any measured concentration of methane of 500 ppm or greater from the surface of the landfill, the EPA is requiring a GCCS to be installed and operated within 30 months of the most recent NMOC emission rate report in which the calculated NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 Mg/yr according to Tier 2. Starting the 30 months from the most recent NMOC emission rate report ensures that a GCCS is installed in a timely manner. The EPA believes that if a landfill owner or operator chooses to use Tier 4 SEM, it is appropriate to require the installation and operation of a GCCS when any reading of 500 ppm or greater is detected during the quarterly SEM event. Since Tier 4 is allowed only if the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that NMOC emissions are greater than or equal to 34 Mg/yr NMOC, but less than 50 Mg/yr using Tier 1 or Tier 2, we would expect the methane emissions at the landfill to be below the 500 ppm threshold. If an exceedance of the threshold is detected, it would be indicative of higher emissions than would normally be expected at a landfill.

The EPA is also finalizing a recordkeeping requirement to take and store digital photographs of the instrument setup. The photographs must be time and date-stamped and taken at the first sampling location prior to sampling and at the last sampling location after sampling at the end of each sampling day, for the duration of the Tier 4 monitoring demonstration. The EPA believes these records will help provide credibility to the Tier 4 sampling results.

The EPA is also finalizing a requirement to notify delegated authorities 30 days prior to the Tier 4 test so that officials can be present to observe the SEM. This notification is consistent with other notification requirements for stack testing. This notification requirement will also mitigate concerns that the SEM is being conducted incorrectly and ensure transparency of results achieved during the SEM approach. In the event the Tier 4 SEM is postponed due to weather conditions or other unforeseen events, the EPA is requiring the owner or operator to notify the delegated authority to arrange a rescheduled Tier 4 SEM date.

Emerging Measurement Technologies. This rulemaking provides certain MSW landfill owners or operators the option of using either modeling or the Tier 4 SEM approach to determine whether controls are required to be installed at specific landfills. Current modeling approaches, which rely on the decomposition rate of different waste streams buried in a landfill, are prone to uncertainties due to inaccuracies in input data and often unverifiable assumptions. Current surface emission measurement methodologies can also have associated uncertainties.

New methane emissions measurement methodologies are emerging that are anticipated to provide landfill methane emission rates (mass per unit time) over time, thereby reducing significantly the uncertainty associated with current modeling and emission measurements approaches. Two promising examples of new methane measurement methodologies being used by research groups to quantify landfill methane emissions are mobile tracer correlation (TC)^{44 45 46 47} and discrete area source eddy covariance (DASEC).⁴⁸

1. *Mobile tracer correlation.* This methodology provides a “snap-shot in time” assessment of whole facility methane emissions using on-site release of atmospheric tracer gases. It provides a total mass emission rate of methane (or other gas) per unit of time. An instrumented vehicle driving 1 km to 4 km downwind of the landfill simultaneously measures the emitted landfill methane plume along with the superimposed tracer gas release. The landfill methane emission rate is determined through a simple ratio to the known tracer gas release rate. The technique has been demonstrated using

⁴⁴ Development of a mobile tracer correlation method for assessment of air emissions from landfills and other area sources, Foster-Wittig, T.A.; Thoma, E.D.; Green, R.B.; Hater, G.R.; Swan, N.D.; Chanton, J.P. *Atmos. Environ.* 2015, 102 (0), 323–330.

⁴⁵ Quantification of methane emissions from 15 Danish landfills using the mobile tracer dispersion method, Mønster, J.; Samuelsson, J.; Kjeldsen, P.; Scheutz, C. *Waste Manage.* 2015, 35 (0), 177–186.

⁴⁶ Methane Emissions Measured at Two California Landfills by OTM-10 and an Acetylene Tracer Method, Green, R.B.; Hater, G.R.; Thoma, E.D.; DeWees, J.; Rella, C.W.; Crosson, E.R.; Goldsmith, C.D.; Swan, N., Proceedings of the Global Waste Management Symposium, San Antonio, TX, October 3–6, 2010.

⁴⁷ Development of Mobile Measurement Method Series OTM 33; Thoma, E.D.; Brantley, H.L.; Squier, B.; DeWees, J.; Segall, R.; Merrill, R.; Proceedings of the Air and Waste Management Conference and Exhibition, Raleigh, NC, June 22–25, 2015.

⁴⁸ Using Eddy Covariance to Quantify Methane Emissions from a Dynamic Heterogeneous Area, Xu, L.; Lin, X.; Amen, J.; Welding, K. and McDermitt, D. Impact of changes in barometric pressure on landfill methane emission. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 2014, 28(7), pp. 679–695.

a variety of tracer gases and instruments by a number of groups to investigate emissions from landfills and other sources. The mobile tracer correlation approach is under development by the EPA as a Category C “other test method (OTM)” with potential posting in 2017 (<https://www3.epa.gov/ttnemc01/prelim.html>).

2. *Eddy covariance (EC).* This micrometeorological method estimates the source emission rate from the vertical wind speed and gas concentration above the emitting surface. This technique measures the emissions flux in mass of methane (or other gas) per unit area. The technique is well-established for measurement of emission fluxes from spatially-extended homogenous sources, such as very large, flat fields. Discrete area source eddy covariance (DASEC) is an application of EC to finite, heterogeneous area sources. This application of EC has been recently demonstrated on landfills, although method development questions on the effects of topography and variable observational foot print remain. DASEC provides the potential for long term (near continuous) measurements of discrete sections of a landfill using solar-powered on-site instrumentation. Development of this type of long term measurement capability is critical to better understand and track changes in landfill emissions overtime that may be caused by both site management and atmospheric factors.

In sum, as noted above, these techniques are still being investigated and additional work will be needed before the EPA can deem them ready for use in this application. Once additional research is completed, we believe that DASEC used in combination with mobile TC will provide a characterization of methane landfill emissions with significantly reduced uncertainty over current models or measurement techniques.

C. Changes To Address Closed or Non-Productive Areas

1. Closed Landfill Subcategory

In the 2015 Emission Guidelines proposal, the EPA proposed a separate subcategory for landfills that closed before August 27, 2015. These landfills would be subject to an NMOC emission threshold of 50 Mg/yr NMOC for determining when controls must be installed or removed, rather than the 34 Mg/yr NMOC emission threshold (or corresponding Tier 4 emission threshold) that would apply to open landfills. In addition, the EPA requested comments on extending the subcategory of closed landfills to those that close no

later than 13 months after publication of the final Emission Guidelines in the **Federal Register**.

Comment: Commenters generally favored the creation of a closed landfill subcategory and believe it was appropriate for closed landfills to be categorized separately. One commenter agreed that a separate category is appropriate, but only if EPA decides to lower the NMOC emission threshold thus ensuring that closed landfills with low emissions are not burdened with a requirement to install a GCCS. Another commenter suggested that the EPA exempt closed landfills from 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf, entirely since facilities that no longer have income from waste acceptance have financially planned for closure. The commenter believes that if these landfills were included in the new rule, it would cause financial burden.

Many commenters, including one state agency, support the expansion of the closed landfill subcategory to include those facilities that closed no later than 13 months of publication of the Emission Guidelines. Commenters believe it is critical that landfills that are planning to close are given the necessary time to meet all criteria and file required documentation to achieve closed status. Another commenter believes the EPA should provide the opportunity for landfills to be closed under the Emission Guidelines until the state or federal regulations implementing the revised Emission Guidelines are effective (*i.e.*, through a revised state or federal plan). This would allow more landfills nearing the end of their useful lifetime with little ability to change their fees or plan for longer GCCS operation the chance to close and remain under current regulations.

Response: After considering public comments, the EPA is finalizing the subcategory for closed landfills and is expanding the subcategory to include those landfills that close on or before September 27, 2017. Landfills in the closed landfill subcategory continue to be subject to a 50 Mg/yr NMOC emission rate threshold for installing a GCCS, consistent with the NMOC threshold in 40 CFR part 60, subparts Cc and WWW.

The EPA recognizes that after landfills stop accepting waste and close, LFG flows decline as well as the corresponding ability to achieve additional reductions. Many of these closed landfills are subject to the emission control requirements in the current Emission Guidelines (40 CFR part 60, subpart Cc, or corresponding state or federal plan) or the current

NSPS (40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW) and have achieved significant reductions. However, commenters report that declining gas flows make it difficult to operate a GCCS according to the landfills regulations and many closed landfills must use supplemental fuel to properly operate control devices such as flares for example. In addition, many closed landfills no longer have income from tipping fees, and have either decommissioned their GCCS or are in process of doing so. Thus, the EPA recognizes that it could be financially burdensome for landfills that are already closed to restart or expand their GCCS. For these reasons, the EPA is finalizing the subcategory of closed landfills.

To give closed landfills or landfills that are planning to close more time to complete the steps to reach closure, the EPA is expanding the closed landfill subcategory to include those landfills that close on or before September 27, 2017. Closed landfills must submit a closure report to the Administrator within 30 days of waste acceptance cessation. The Administrator may request additional information as may be necessary to verify that permanent closure has taken place in accordance with the closure requirements under RCRA (40 CFR 258.60). Closure criteria include a requirement to prepare a written closure plan and to install a final cover system that is designed to minimize infiltration and erosion.

Landfills in the closed landfill subcategory of the Emission Guidelines would be exempt from initial reporting requirements in subpart Cf, provided that the landfill already met these requirements under subparts Cc or WWW of 40 CFR part 60.

For landfills that are expected to close after September 27, 2017, the EPA understands that gas quality will remain a concern and has revised the GCCS removal criteria, as discussed in section IV.A.5 of this preamble.

2. Criteria for Removing or Decommissioning a GCCS

The proposed revisions to the Emission Guidelines in 2015 modified the criteria that allow a landfill owner or operator to cap or remove the GCCS. Specifically, the proposal refined the 15-year criterion by allowing a landfill owner or operator to demonstrate that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows. In addition, the EPA tightened the NMOC emissions criterion, requiring the controls until the NMOC emissions were below 34 Mg/yr for three consecutive quarters to be consistent with the emission threshold for

installing controls. For closed landfills, the NMOC emissions criterion remained at 50 Mg/yr to be consistent with the emission threshold for the closed landfill subcategory. Finally, the proposed Emission Guidelines added an alternative removal criterion based on site-specific SEM of methane. This alternative would allow the owner or operator to demonstrate for four consecutive quarters that there are no surface emissions of 500 ppm or greater from the closed landfill or area of an open landfill that is closed. The EPA received numerous comments on the revised set of GCCS removal criteria.

Comment: Commenters did not agree on the proposed alternative to allow an SEM demonstration as a criterion for removing a GCCS. Commenters in favor of an SEM demonstration for GCCS removal agreed with the flexibility that the approach would offer, but commenters that opposed the criterion expressed concern about emissions once the GCCS was no longer operating.

Some commenters opposed SEM procedures for determining removal or decommissioning of the GCCS. One commenter expressed concerns with relying on surface emission testing because the intervals are too far apart to detect localized high emissions and low surface emission readings during a dormant period could lead to uncontrolled emissions at a later period. The commenter (0215-0121) added that even in a closed landfill the decay process is not complete and gas collection systems should stay in place. Another commenter opposed SEM specifically at closed areas of open landfills due to gas migration concerns and difficulty in defining these areas.

Several commenters representing industry and state agency interests supported the use of SEM procedures to help determine the removal or decommissioning of existing GCCS. Commenters supported the use of SEM to allow the flexibility to confirm when a closed landfill or area of an open landfill that is closed is no longer producing gas in significant quantities could remove or decommission all or a portion of the GCCS. Several of these commenters referenced a rationale similar to the one they provided for supporting the use of Tier 4 SEM for determining GCCS installation as discussed in section VI.B of this preamble.

Commenters that supported an SEM demonstration for GCCS removal presented several options on how to implement the SEM procedure. Several commenters requested that the EPA provide a “step-down” procedure for scaling down GCCS operations in

nonproducing areas and allowing a GCCS to be removed from rule applicability. Two commenters made recommendations on SEM procedures for GCCS removal or decommissioning, which included shutting down the GCCS for 30 days following a Tier 2 test showing NMOC emissions below the threshold, then relying on subsequent SEM demonstrations and corrective action to determine whether the GCCS could remain off. Other commenters also stated that when considering SEM for removing the GCCS, quarterly SEM should be performed at steady state conditions. As LFG generation declines, one commenter suggested that some wells may be removed from service; however, such wells must not be turned on in order to pass quarterly SEM and subsequently turned back off for the remainder of the quarter. Another commenter suggested that EPA not rely solely on surface emissions when defining a closed landfill in arid areas, but instead should consider the gas quality being collected (methane, carbon dioxide, negative pressure, or nitrogen/oxygen content) when determining when a GCCS can be removed.

Regarding the 15-year criterion in the 2015 Emission Guidelines, several commenters noted that the provision to allow landfills to demonstrate the GCCS could not be operated for 15 years due to declining flow was vague, and more guidance was needed to provide instructions to landfills on how to demonstrate this to regulators.

Response: After considering public comments, the EPA is finalizing criteria for capping, removing, or decommissioning the GCCS that are similar to the criteria in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cc, but have been adjusted to reflect the NMOC emission threshold in the final rule and to provide flexibility on the requirement to operate the GCCS for 15 years. The final criteria are: (1) The landfill is a closed landfill, (2) the GCCS has been in operation for 15 years or the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows, and (3) three successive tests for NMOC emissions are below the NMOC emission threshold of 34 Mg/yr for open landfills and below 50 Mg/yr NMOC for closed landfills. The three successive tests for NMOC emissions makes the threshold for removing a GCCS consistent with the threshold for installing a GCCS. The EPA is not finalizing an alternative set of criteria for capping, removing, or decommissioning a GCCS that includes a SEM demonstration.

While a SEM approach has been allowed for installation of controls, the

EPA believes it is not appropriate to allow SEM demonstrations for capping, removing, or decommissioning a control system. The EPA recognizes the unique emissions profile for landfills including the ability of these sources to release emissions for decades. For these reasons, the EPA believes it is appropriate to ensure that controls are installed and properly maintained for the appropriate period of time. The EPA believes sufficient flexibility has been added to the control removal approach by allowing a demonstration of the system's inability to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows and a calculation of the NMOC emission rate. Further, during the comment period, concerns were raised about changes in the waste mass over time and how the SEM approach could inadvertently allow landfills whose emissions were in a period of dormancy, rather than a decline in their emissions profile, to remove controls. Agency enforcement personnel are also aware of situations where the installation of additional wells led to additional gas capture at sites asserting declining emissions. The EPA understands the importance of gas capture from landfills and believes the SEM approach for control removal may have the unintended consequence of allowing controls to be removed when significant gas capture is still possible. As a result, the EPA is not finalizing the SEM approach for removal.

Several commenters noted that the provision provided in the 2015 Emission Guidelines to allow landfills to demonstrate the GCCS could not be operated for 15 years due to declining flow was vague, and more guidance was needed to provide instructions to landfills on how to demonstrate this to regulators.

Regarding the 15-year criterion, the EPA is retaining the requirement to operate the GCCS for 15 years, but is providing flexibility to address declining gas flow in areas where the GCCS has not operated for 15 years. If the landfill is closed and the NMOC emission rate is less than 34 Mg/yr, but the GCCS has not operated for 15 years, the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows. The EPA is providing this flexibility to address areas of declining gas flows due to the age of the waste, arid climate, or low organic content. Given that there are unique situations that could cause low gas flow, or low gas quality which would cause a GCCS to be unable to operate for 15 years, the EPA is not providing prescriptive criteria for how a landfill owner or operator can

demonstrate that a GCCS could not operate for 15 years and will proceed with a site-specific approach for handling these unique cases. Some examples of data elements that could be used to demonstrate a GCCS is unable to operate may include supplemental fuel use at the flare to sustain operations or LFG quality sample measurements showing methane content lower than what is viable for combustion in the destruction device.

D. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions

In July 2014, the EPA proposed that the standards in subpart XXX apply at all times, including periods of startup or shutdown, and periods of malfunction. In addition, the proposed NSPS included recordkeeping and reporting requirements for all landfill owners or operators to estimate emissions during such periods.

Similarly, the EPA proposed standards that apply at all times in the August 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines. However, the EPA considered how the landfill emissions differ from those generated by industrial or manufacturing sources. Specifically, the EPA noted that landfill emissions are produced by a continuous biological process that cannot be stopped or restarted. Therefore, the primary concern related to SSM is with malfunction of the landfill GCCS and associated monitoring equipment, not with the startup or shutdown of the entire source. SSM periods that we have determined should be covered by the work practice standard are those periods when the landfill GCCS and associated monitoring equipment are not operating.

To address these SSM periods, the EPA proposed in the 2015 Emission Guidelines that in the event the collection or control system is not operating the gas mover system must be shut down and all valves in the GCCS contributing to venting of gas to the atmosphere must be closed within 1 hour of the collection or control system not operating. This provision is consistent with 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW. Additionally, the EPA proposed recordkeeping of combustion temperature, bypass flow, and periods when the flare flame or the flare pilot flame is out. The EPA received numerous comments on the 2014 proposed changes to the NSPS and the additional proposed edits made in the 2015 Emission Guidelines. A summary of these comments are presented below.

Sierra Club v. EPA, 551 F.3d 1019 (D.C. Cir. 2008). Many commenters stated that the *Sierra Club* decision applies only to rules with numerical

emission limits and not to rules that are specified as a work practice. One of these commenters elaborated that *Sierra Club* applies to section 111 of the Clean Air Act. Therefore, the commenter concluded that landfills subject to the NSPS are not bound by the findings of *Sierra Club* and instead they are legally allowed to develop a clear and achievable landfill rule by considering the unique circumstances that a landfill is a biological process that cannot be stopped or restarted and that the gas collection and control systems must periodically be shut down for maintenance, repair, and expansion.

Retain the 5 day/1-hour exemption for SSM events. Many commenters, including affected industry commenters and some state agencies, disagreed with removing the provisions in 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW, which allow for exemption periods of 5 days for collection systems and 1 hour for treatment or control devices. These commenters indicated that by removing this provision, state and local agencies could misconstrue the rule to require that a landfill must operate the gas collection system at all times, even during SSM, including periods of collection system construction, expansion, and repair. These commenters suggested instead of removing the exemption provision during periods of SSM, compliance can be maintained as long as the landfill owner or operator minimizes emissions of LFG by following the applicable work practices and restores the system to operation as expeditiously as practicable.

One of the state agency commenters, suggested that the 5-day and 1-hour time limitations in subpart WWW are appropriate for most situations and instead of removing these exemptions, the new subpart XXX could provide a mechanism for the facility to apply to the Administration for an extension of those timeframes. On the contrary, one state agency commenter and an NGO agreed with the standards applying at all times, including periods of SSM.

If the 5 day/1-hour exemption is not retained, the EPA should add a work practice standard for SSM events. One commenter was concerned that the preamble language for the 2014 proposed Emission Guidelines does not clarify how a landfill can demonstrate compliance with the standard during SSM events stating that "compliance with proposed 40 CFR 60.34f(e) does not constitute compliance with the applicable standards in proposed 40 CFR 60.36f" and that "by shutting down flow to the flare or other control devices a source is unlikely to be in violation of

the 98 percent emission reduction requirements since there will be no gas flowing to the control device” (see 80 FR 52134–52135). This commenter stated that EPA must clarify this confusion and specify a clear set of work practices (e.g., shut down of the gas mover system and prevention of venting) that constitute compliance during SSM periods when the collection or control system is not operated. Several other industry commenters and the U.S. Small Business Administration also asked that the rule specifically accommodate periods when the collection system is not operating during activities associated with construction, expansion, repair, replacement, testing, upgrades, or other maintenance of the system or its components.

Reporting requirement to estimate NMOC emissions whenever the collection system or control system is not operating. Two commenters representing a state agency and an NGO supported reporting NMOC emissions during SSM periods. Several industry commenters provided numerous technical arguments to explain the infeasibility of accurately estimating NMOC emissions during the short periods of SSM. For example, methods to estimate LFG emissions are based on site-specific variables that estimate LFG generation over the life of the landfill, typically on an annual basis, and cannot be used to estimate hourly or daily emissions. Accordingly, the commenters contended that it is technically and practically inappropriate to require landfill owners/operators to make this estimate for the time periods that the gas collection or control systems are not operated, given the substantial technical uncertainties involved in estimating these emissions over discrete, short-term time periods. Further, other commenters noted that emissions during SSM are expected to be very low, reporting SSM emissions is an onerous and meaningless exercise and is likely to overestimate emissions.

Two commenters asked that if the reporting requirement is retained, the EPA should limit the reporting to periods when the flare is free venting because these are the only emissions that can be estimated accurately. Several commenters asked EPA to develop guidance on how to estimate emissions during SSM if this requirement is retained in the final rule.

Several commenters stated that because there should be no deviation from the rule when the work practices of the rule are followed, there are no excess emissions, and the reported emissions are not relevant to

determining compliance. Commenters are concerned that if estimated NMOC emissions are reported, states will deem the reported emissions to be “excess emissions,” which could be treated as a serious violation. Therefore, reporting these emissions poses the risk of state or citizen suits for enforcement, even when a landfill is following all requirements of the rule.

Other Comments. Several commenters added that because SSM provisions apply to numerical emission limitations and a numerical limitation applies only to the control device (not the collection devices), commenters stated that SSM provisions should address only operation of the control devices during periods when LFG is routed from the collection system.

Several commenters indicated that EPA must retain an allowance of 5 days/1 hour for downtime events so that states do not file enforcement actions for downtime events that are shorter than the previously allowed 5 days/1-hour allowance. These commenters also asked the EPA to clarify that the 1-hour allowance for shutting vents allows for free venting for 1 hour such that venting during this time period does not constitute “excess emissions” that can be deemed a serious violation.

Response: The EPA recognizes that landfills are not typical affected sources that can be started up or shut down. Landfill emissions are produced by a continuous biological process that cannot be stopped or shut down. The EPA also recognizes that the primary concern is with malfunction of the LFG collection and control system and associated monitoring equipment, not with the startup, shutdown, or malfunction of the entire source. The EPA received extensive comments on the proposed requirements applicable to landfills during SSM events, as summarized above. Consistent with the recent Court decision that vacated the exemption in 40 CFR 63.6(f)(1) and (h)(1) for SSM (*Sierra Club v. EPA*, 551 F.3d 1019), the EPA has established standards in this rule that apply at all times.

The general provisions in 40 CFR part 60 provide that emissions in excess of the level of the applicable emissions limit during periods of SSM shall not be considered a violation of the applicable emission limit *unless otherwise specified in the applicable standard* (see 40 CFR 60.8(c)) (emphasis added). As reflected in the italicized language, an individual subpart can supersede this provision.

The EPA is finalizing a requirement in 40 CFR 60.465(e) whereby the standards apply at all times, including periods of

SSM. However, the final rule incorporates a work practice during periods of SSM. During these SSM events, owners or operators must shut down the gas mover system and close within 1 hour all valves in the GCCS contributing to venting of the gas to the atmosphere. The landfill owner or operator must also keep records and submit reports of all periods when the collection and control device is not operating. The EPA, however, is not reinstating the 5-day exemption for SSM periods because the provision provides an exemption from compliance with the standard during SSM periods, which the EPA does not have the authority to do under the reasoning of the Sierra Club decision.

E. Other Corrections and Clarifications

1. Test Methods

In the 2014 proposed NSPS, the EPA did not include EPA Method 18 or EPA Method 25A. In the 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines, the EPA proposed to include Method 25A based on public comments received on the 2014 proposed NSPS and the EPA’s recognition that the use of Method 25A is necessary for measuring outlet concentrations less than 50 ppm NMOC. However, the EPA did not propose to include Method 18 (80 FR 52112) because the EPA had determined that Method 18 was not appropriate or cost effective for testing the large number of NMOCs found in landfill samples. Specifically, 40 target analytes are listed in the current landfills section of AP–42 and 160 analytes are listed in the draft landfills section AP–42. The EPA determined that the extensive quality assurance required by the method makes the method technically and economically prohibitive for all the potential target analytes.

Comment: Commenters requested that the EPA retain both Method 18 and 25A in the final rule and cited a number of reasons that the EPA should retain them, including both technical and legal reasons. Commenters stated that landfill owners or operators have relied on these test methods to demonstrate compliance for performance testing of enclosed flares as a part of EPA policy for over a decade under 40 CFR 60.764 [60.754]. One commenter emphasized the importance of Method 25A because its use is required for many sources with an outlet concentration of less than 50 ppmv NMOC as carbon.

The commenters noted that the majority of LFG destruction devices show NMOC concentrations below 50 ppmv as carbon. Due to issues with Methods 25/25C in measuring NMOC

content under this level, commenters observed that the proposed NSPS rule change effectively removes the ability to accurately measure compliance with the 20 ppmv outlet standard for a large class of enclosed combustors. Commenter believes that Method 25A is the superior testing methodology for certain circumstances and is more commonly used in practice. Commenters cited limitations of Method 25, including sensitivity of the test method to water and carbon dioxide and the inability to measure NMOC content below 50 ppmv as carbon.

Commenters also contended that the EPA did not provide any justification for removing these methods. Commenters stated that the EPA did not provide any factual data, methodology, or any legal or policy justification for its proposed exclusion of Method 25A or Method 18; thus commenters claimed that the EPA did not satisfy the notice-and-comment requirements of the CAA.

Response: After considering public comments, the EPA is including both EPA Method 25A and Method 18 (on a limited basis, *i.e.*, compound specific) in the final landfills regulations (40 CFR part 60, subparts Cf and XXX).

After reviewing the comments received on the NSPS for new landfills proposed on July 17, 2014, the EPA recognizes that the use of Method 25A is necessary for measuring outlet concentrations less than 50 ppm NMOC. EPA Method 25A determines total gaseous organic concentration of vapor (total organic compounds). Because the rule regulates NMOC, EPA Method 18 or Method 3C are needed to determine the concentration of methane in the gas stream. Method 25A, in conjunction with Methods 18 or 3C (for methane), can be used to determine NMOC for the outlet concentrations less than 50 ppm NMOC as carbon. Note that Method 25A FIDs are insensitive to formaldehyde.

While Method 18 may be used in conjunction with Method 25A for methane or specific compounds of interest, there are limitations on the number of analytes that can be reasonably quantified in measuring the sum of all NMOCs. With the possibility of 40 target analytes listed in the current landfill section of AP-42 (160 analytes in the draft landfill AP-42), Method 18 is not an appropriate or cost effective method to test all NMOCs found in landfill samples. The extensive QA required by the method makes the method technically and economically prohibitive for all the potential target analytes.

2. Tier 2 Sampling Procedure

The EPA continues to believe that the number of samples required per hectare is appropriate for Tier 2. As described in 40 CFR 60.764, the EPA is reaffirming that the two samples are required per hectare and if additional samples are taken, all samples must be used in determining the site-specific NMOC concentration. Landfill owners or operators must also ensure that the probes are evenly distributed over the landfill surface. The EPA explored a number of methods, including a statistical approach, when establishing requirements for the number and location of Tier 2 samples for the original rule. Public commenters raised significant concerns with approaches based on equations. As such, the EPA determined that a simplified method (2 samples per hectare) was best and received no public comments to the contrary.

3. Non-degradable Waste

The EPA is reaffirming that all the waste must be included in calculating the design capacity. Non-degradable waste cannot be subtracted from the permitted landfill design capacity. However, non-degradable waste can be subtracted from the mass of solid waste when calculating the NMOC emission rate because such waste would not produce NMOC emissions. Non-degradable waste is defined as waste that does not break down through chemical or microbiological activity. Examples include concrete, municipal waste combustor ash, and metals. Petroleum contaminated soils (PCS) and paper mill sludges likely contain organics that could be emitted as MSW LFG emissions. Therefore, emissions from PCS and sludges would need to be accounted for in the emission estimate only. The EPA is also reaffirming that documentation of the nature and amount of non-degradable waste needs to be maintained when subtracting the mass of non-degradable waste from the total mass of waste for NMOC emission rate calculations.

VII. Impacts of This Final Rule

For most Emission Guidelines, the EPA analyzes the impacts in the year the standard is implemented. If the Emission Guidelines are promulgated and published in August 2016, then the implementation year would be 2017 based on the following: states have 9 months to prepare a state plan implementing the guidelines (May 2017); the EPA has 4 months to review the plan (September 2017); and if necessary, the state has an additional 2

months to revise and submit a corrected plan based on any comments from the EPA (November 2017). Concurrently, the EPA must promulgate a federal plan within 6 months after the state plan is due, consistent with 40 CFR 60.27(d), or November 2017. Thus, the EPA-approved state plan and updated federal plan implementing the Emission Guidelines are expected to become effective in November 2017. Although late 2017 is the estimated implementation year, the reporting and control timeframe allows 3 months to submit the first NMOC emission report and then 30 months after reporting the NMOC emission rate results before the GCCS is required to be installed. Therefore, the first year that affected landfills could have controls installed under the final rule will be late 2020.

Because of the necessarily lengthy implementation process, the EPA is assessing impacts in year 2025 as a representative year for the landfills Emission Guidelines. While the year 2025 differs somewhat from the expected first year of implementation for the Emission Guidelines (year 2020), the number of existing landfills required to install controls under the final rule in year 2025 is the same as those estimated to control in the estimated first year of implementation. Further, year 2025 represents a year in which several of the landfills subject to control requirements will have had to expand their GCCS according the expansion lag times set forth in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf.

The landfills dataset used for estimating the impacts of the Emission Guidelines is discussed in detail in the August 27, 2015 proposed revisions to the Emission Guidelines (80 FR 52116–52117). The EPA made several significant edits to the dataset since the August 2015 proposal, based on public comments received; new data made available from the landfills reporting 2014 emissions to 40 CFR part 98, subpart HH, of GHGRP; and consultations with EPA regional offices, and state and local authorities to identify additional landfills expected to undergo a modification within the next 5 years. After incorporating all of the updates to the inventory and removing the landfills expected to modify, the revised dataset to analyze the impacts of the final rule now has 1,851 existing landfills that accepted waste after

1987⁴⁹ and opened prior to 2014.⁵⁰ A detailed discussion of updates made to the landfill dataset is in the docketed memorandum, “Summary of Updated Landfill Dataset Used in the Cost and Emission Reduction Analysis of Landfills Regulations, 2016.”

The methodology used for estimating the impacts of the Emission Guidelines is discussed in detail in the August 27, 2015 proposed revisions to the Emission Guidelines (80 FR 52116–52117). The EPA made several significant edits to the methodology since the August 2015 proposal based on public comments and comments on a separate peer review of the EPA Landfill Gas Energy Cost (LFGcost) model.⁵¹ Notably, the EPA adjusted its assumption of gas collection efficiency to an average of 85 percent.

The impacts analysis at the proposal did not apply a collection efficiency assumption. However, in consideration of public comments received and EPA assumptions in subpart HH of the GHGRP, and analyses performed for marginal abatement cost curves, the EPA has included an 85 percent average gas collection efficiency factor to reflect a more realistic indicator of GCCS performance.⁵² In addition, Chapter 2.4 of the EPA AP-42 for MSW landfills cites a range of collection efficiencies for LFG between 60 and 85 percent. The EPA also adjusted the electricity purchase price and anticipated revenue estimates using forecasted commercial retail electricity rate data and forecasted electricity generation price data for

different Energy Information Administration (EIA) Electricity Market Module regions.^{53,54}

A detailed discussion of the methodology and equations used to estimate the impacts of the final rule are available in the docketed memorandum “Revised Methodology for Estimating Cost and Emission Impacts of MSW Landfill Regulations, 2016.” The results of applying this methodology to the population of existing landfills potentially subject to the final rule are in the docketed memorandum “Revised Cost and Emission Impacts Resulting from the Landfill EG Review, 2016.” Table 2 of this preamble summarizes the emission reductions and costs associated with the final rule.

TABLE 2—EMISSION REDUCTIONS AND COSTS FOR FINAL RULE IN YEAR 2025 AT EXISTING LANDFILLS (2012\$)

Option	Landfills affected by final rule ^a	Number of landfills affected ^b	Number of landfills controlling	Number of landfills reporting but not controlling ^c	Annual Net cost (million \$2012)	Annual NMOC reductions (Mg/yr)	Annual methane reductions (million Mg/yr)	Annual CO ₂ e reductions (million mt/yr) ^d	NMOC Cost effectiveness (\$/Mg)	Methane cost effectiveness (\$/Mg)	CO ₂ e Cost effectiveness (\$/mt) ^d
Baseline (2.5 million Mg design capacity/50 Mg/yr NMOC).	All	1014	638	177	642	58,770	9.3	231	10,900	69.3	2.8
Incremental values vs. the Baseline											
Final Option (2.5 million Mg design capacity/34 Mg/yr NMOC).	Open	0	93	–100	–54.1	1,810	0.285	7.1	29,900	190	7.6

^a The final option in this table shows the impacts of reducing the NMOC emission threshold to 34 Mg/yr on open landfills only, and retaining the NMOC threshold of 50 Mg/yr for the closed landfill subcategory.

^b Landfills are affected by the landfills Emission Guidelines based on design capacity. Once affected, they calculate and report emissions until they exceed the NMOC threshold, which triggers control requirements. Since we are not changing the size threshold, there are no incremental landfills affected.

^c Since the number of landfills affected remains the same as the baseline, the number of landfills reporting NMOC (but not controlling) decreases since more landfills will control emissions under the final rule.

^d Results do not include secondary CO₂ impacts.

^e The annualized net cost for the final Emission Guidelines is estimated to be \$54.1 million (2012\$) in 2025, when using a 7 percent discount rate. The annualized costs represent the costs compared to no changes to the current Emission Guidelines (i.e., baseline) and include \$92.6 million to install and operate a GCCS, as well as \$0.76 million to complete the corresponding testing and monitoring. These control costs are offset by \$39.3 million in revenue from electricity sales, which is incorporated into the net control costs for certain landfills that are expected to generate revenue by using the LFG to produce electricity.

A. What are the air quality impacts?

The EPA estimates that the final rule will achieve nearly an additional 3 percent reduction in NMOC from existing landfills, or 1,810 Mg/yr, when compared to the baseline, as shown in Table 2 of this preamble. The final rule would also achieve 0.285 million Mg of methane reductions (7.1 million mtCO₂e) in 2025. These reductions are achieved by reducing the NMOC threshold from 50 Mg/yr to 34 Mg/yr open landfills.

B. What are the water quality and solid waste impacts?

Leachate is the liquid that passes through the landfilled waste and strips contaminants from the waste as the leachate percolates. Precipitation generates the vast majority of leachate volume. Installation of a gas collection system will generate additional liquid, in the form of gas condensate, and it will be routed to the same leachate treatment mechanisms in place for controlling precipitation-based leachate. Collected leachate can be treated on site or transported off site to wastewater

treatment facilities. Some landfills have received permits allowing for recirculation of leachate in the landfill, which may further reduce the volume of leachate requiring treatment. Additional liquid generated from gas condensate is not expected to be significant and insufficient data are available to estimate the increases in leachate resulting from expanded gas collection and control requirements.

The additional gas collection and control components required by this final rule have finite lifetimes (approximately 15 years) and these

⁴⁹ November 8, 1987, is the date on which permit programs were established under the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of RCRA. This date was also selected as the regulatory cutoff in the Emission Guidelines for landfills no longer receiving wastes because the EPA judged states would be able to identify active facilities as of this date. The data available to EPA include an open year without the month and so the analysis uses a cutoff year of 1988 for landfill closure year.

⁵⁰ July 17, 2014, is the proposal date of the revised NSPS for MSW landfills in 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX. A landfill opening or commencing construction on its modification after this date would become subject to this new subpart and

would not be subject to the revised Emission Guidelines. The EPA cannot predict the exact month a model landfill will open so the analysis uses a cutoff year of 2014.

⁵¹ See the docketed 2016 RIA for additional discussion of changes made on the methodology for estimating impacts as a result of the LFGcost peer review.

⁵² USEPA. Global Mitigation of Non-CO₂ Greenhouse Gases: 2010–2030. EPA-430-R-13-011.

⁵³ See the docketed 2016 RIA for additional discussion of changes made to electricity pricing assumptions.

⁵⁴ To map existing landfill sites to EIA’s Electricity Market Module regions, the sites’ geospatial coordinates were overlaid on a map of the EMM regions. The AEO Electricity Market Module regions are commensurate with the eGRID2012 primary regions for which a shapefile is available at <https://www.epa.gov/energy/download-egrid2012-shapefiles>. For expected new landfills within a state the specific location is unknown, therefore the landfill is located at the state’s centroid for purposes of mapping the site to an EMM region.

pipes and wells will be capped or disposed of at the end of their useful life. There are insufficient data to quantify the solid waste resulting from disposal of this control infrastructure.

Further, the incremental costs of control for the final rule of \$54.1 million in 2025 (7% discount rate, 2012\$) are not expected to have an appreciable market effect on the waste disposal costs, tipping fees, or the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills because the costs for gas collection represent a small portion of the overall costs to design, construct, and operate a landfill. The handling of waste by the private companies in the industry was estimated to generate \$55 billion of revenue in 2011, of which landfilling contributed \$13 billion, while a more recent estimate shows the U.S. non-hazardous solid waste services industry generated about \$60 billion in annual revenues in 2015. These revenue estimates do not include activity related to publicly owned landfills. For more information, see the “Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Revisions to the Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources and the New Source Performance Standards in the Municipal Solid Waste Landfills Sector, 2016” (hereafter “2016 RIA”) included in the docket. There also is insufficient information to quantify the effect increased gas control costs might have on the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills versus other disposal mechanisms such as recycling, waste-to-energy, or composting. Note that elements of this final rule—notably lowering the NMOC threshold to 34 Mg/yr—provide additional incentives to separate waste.

C. What are the secondary air impacts?

Secondary air impacts may include grid emissions from purchasing electricity to operate the GCCS components, by-product emissions from combustion of LFG in flares or energy recovery devices, and offsets to conventional grid emissions from new LFG energy supply.

The secondary air impacts are presented as net impacts, considering both the energy demand and energy supply resulting from the final rule. The methodology used to prepare the estimated secondary impacts for this preamble is discussed in the docketed memorandum “Revised Estimates of Secondary Impacts of the Landfills Emission Guidelines Review, 2016.”

While we do expect NO_x and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emission changes as a result of these guidelines, we expect these changes to be small and these changes have not been estimated. The

net impacts were computed for CO₂e. After considering the offsets from LFG electricity, the impacts of the final rule are expected to reduce CO₂ emissions by 277,000 metric tons per year. These CO₂ emission reductions are in addition to the methane emission reductions achieved from the direct destruction of methane in flares or engines presented in Table 2 of this preamble.

D. What are the energy impacts?

The final rule is expected to have a very minimal impact on energy supply and consumption. Active gas collection systems require energy to operate the blowers and pumps and the final rule will increase the volume of LFG collected. When the least cost control is a flare, energy may be purchased from the grid to operate the blowers of the LFG collection system. However, when the least cost control option is an engine, the engine may provide this energy to the gas control system and then sell the excess to the grid. Considering the balance of energy generated and demanded from the estimated least cost controls, the final rule is estimated to supply 0.51 million megawatt hours (MWh) of additional renewable LFG energy per year, which will reduce the need for conventional fossil-based energy sources.

E. What are the cost impacts?

To meet the final rule emission thresholds, a landfill is expected to install the least cost control for combusting the LFG. The cost estimates evaluated each landfill to determine whether a gas collection and flare or a gas collection with flare and engine equipment would be least cost, after considering local power buyback rates and whether the quantity of LFG was sufficient to generate electricity. The control costs include the costs to install and operate gas collection infrastructure such as wells, header pipes, blowers, and an enclosed flare. For landfills for which the least cost control option is an engine, the costs also include the cost to install and operate one or more reciprocating internal combustion engines to convert the LFG into electricity. Revenue from electricity sales was incorporated into the net control costs using forecasted electricity generation price data from EIA Electricity Market Module regions. Testing and monitoring costs at controlled landfills include the cost to conduct initial performance tests on the enclosed flare or engine control equipment, quarterly surface monitoring, continuous combustion monitoring, and monthly wellhead monitoring. At uncontrolled landfills,

the testing and monitoring costs include calculation and reporting of NMOC emission rates.

The nationwide incremental annualized net cost for the final rule is \$54.1 million, when using a 7 percent discount rate and 2012\$. The annualized net costs of \$54.1 million represent the costs compared to no changes to the current Emission Guidelines (*i.e.*, baseline) and include \$92.6 million to install and operate a GCCS, as well as \$0.76 million to complete the corresponding testing and monitoring. These control costs are offset by \$39.3 million in revenue from electricity sales, which is incorporated into the net control costs for certain landfills that are expected to generate revenue by using the LFG to produce electricity.

F. What are the economic impacts?

Because of the relatively low net cost of the final rule compared to the overall size of the MSW industry, as well as the lack of appropriate economic parameters or model, the EPA is unable to estimate the impacts on the supply and demand for MSW landfill services. However, because of the relatively low incremental costs, the EPA does not believe the final rule would lead to substantial changes in supply and demand for landfill services or waste disposal costs, tipping fees, or the amount of waste disposed in landfills. Hence, the overall economic impact of the final rule should be minimal on the affected industries and their consumers.

G. What are the benefits?

This final action is expected to result in significant emissions reductions from existing MSW landfills. By lowering the NMOC emissions threshold to 34 Mg/yr, these final guidelines would achieve reductions of more than 1,810 Mg/yr NMOC and 285,000 metric tons of methane (7.1 million mtCO₂e). In addition, the guidelines are expected to result in the net reduction of 277,000 metric tons CO₂, due to reduced demand for electricity from the grid as landfills generate electricity from LFG.

This rule is expected to result in significant public health and welfare benefits resulting from the climate benefits due to anticipated methane and CO₂ reductions. Methane is a potent GHG that, once emitted into the atmosphere, absorbs terrestrial infrared radiation that contributes to increased global warming and continuing climate change. Methane reacts in the atmosphere to form tropospheric ozone and stratospheric water vapor, both of which also contribute to global warming. When accounting for the

impacts of changing methane, tropospheric ozone, and stratospheric water vapor concentrations, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 5th Assessment Report (2013) found that historical emissions of methane accounted for about 30 percent of the total current warming influence (radiative forcing) due to historical emissions of greenhouse gases. Methane is therefore a major contributor to the climate change impacts described in section III.B of this preamble. The remainder of this section discusses the methane reductions expected from this proposed rule and the associated monetized benefits.

As discussed in section IV of this preamble, this rulemaking includes several changes to the Emission Guidelines for MSW landfills that will decrease methane emissions from this sector. Specifically, the final emission guideline changes are expected to reduce methane emissions from all landfills in 2025 by about 285,000 metric tons of methane.

We calculated the global social benefits of these methane emission reductions using estimates of SC-CH₄, a metric that estimates the monetary value of impacts associated with marginal changes in methane emissions in a given year. The SC-CH₄ estimates applied in this analysis were developed by Marten et al. (2014) and are discussed in greater detail below.

A similar metric, the social cost of CO₂ (SC-CO₂), provides important context for understanding the Marten et al. SC-CH₄ estimates.⁵⁵ The SC-CO₂ is a metric that estimates the monetary value of impacts associated with marginal changes in CO₂ emissions in a given year. It includes a wide range of anticipated climate impacts, such as net changes in agricultural productivity and human health, property damage from increased flood risk, and changes in energy system costs, such as reduced costs for heating and increased costs for air conditioning. Estimates of the SC-CO₂ have been used by the EPA and other federal agencies to value the impacts of CO₂ emissions changes in benefit cost analysis for GHG-related rulemakings since 2008.

The SC-CO₂ estimates were developed over many years, using the best science available, and with input from the public. Specifically, an interagency working group (IWG) that

included the EPA and other executive branch agencies and offices used three integrated assessment models (IAMs) to develop the SC-CO₂ estimates and recommended four global values for use in regulatory analyses. The SC-CO₂ estimates were first released in February 2010 and updated in 2013 using new versions of each IAM.

The 2010 SC-CO₂ Technical Support Document (TSD) provides a complete discussion of the methods used to develop these estimates and the current SC-CO₂ TSD presents and discusses the 2013 update (including recent minor technical corrections to the estimates).⁵⁶

The SC-CO₂ TSDs discuss a number of limitations to the SC-CO₂ analysis, including the incomplete way in which the IAMs capture catastrophic and non-catastrophic impacts, their incomplete treatment of adaptation and technological change, uncertainty in the extrapolation of damages to high temperatures, and assumptions regarding risk aversion. Currently, IAMs do not assign value to all of the important physical, ecological, and economic impacts of climate change recognized in the climate change literature due to a lack of precise information on the nature of damages and because the science incorporated into these models understandably lags behind the most recent research. Nonetheless, these estimates and the discussion of their limitations represent the best available information about the social benefits of CO₂ reductions to inform benefit-cost analysis. The EPA and other agencies continue to engage in research on modeling and valuation of climate impacts with the goal to improve these estimates, and continue to consider feedback on the SC-CO₂ estimates from stakeholders through a range of channels, including public comments received on Agency rulemakings, a separate Office of Management and Budget (OMB) public comment solicitation, and through regular interactions with stakeholders and research analysts implementing the SC-CO₂ methodology. See the docketed 2016 RIA for additional details.

A challenge particularly relevant to this rule is that the IWG did not estimate the social costs of non-CO₂ GHG emissions at the time the SC-CO₂ estimates were developed. In addition, the directly modeled estimates of the social costs of non-CO₂ GHG emissions previously found in the published literature were few in number and varied considerably in terms of the

models and input assumptions they employed⁵⁷ (EPA 2012). In the past, the EPA has sought to understand the potential importance of monetizing non-CO₂ GHG emissions changes through sensitivity analysis using an estimate of the GWP of CH₄ to convert emission impacts to CO₂ equivalents, which can then be valued using the SC-CO₂ estimates. This approach approximates the SC-CH₄ using estimates of the SC-CO₂ and the GWP of methane.

The published literature documents a variety of reasons that directly modeled estimates of SC-CH₄ are an analytical improvement over the estimates from the GWP approximation approach. Specifically, several recent studies found that GWP-weighted benefit estimates for CH₄ are likely to be lower than the estimates derived using directly modeled social cost estimates for these gases.⁵⁸ The GWP reflects only the relative integrated radiative forcing of a gas over 100 years in comparison to CO₂. The directly modeled social cost estimates differ from the GWP-scaled SC-CO₂ because the relative differences in timing and magnitude of the warming between gases are explicitly modeled, the non-linear effects of temperature change on economic damages are included, and rather than treating all impacts over a hundred years equally, the modeled damages over the time horizon considered (300 years in this case) are discounted to present value terms. A detailed discussion of the limitations of the GWP approach can be found in the 2016 RIA.

In general, the commenters on previous rulemakings strongly encouraged the EPA to incorporate the monetized value of non-CO₂ GHG impacts into the benefit cost analysis. However, they noted the challenges associated with the GWP approach, as discussed above, and encouraged the use of directly modeled estimates of the SC-CH₄ to overcome those challenges.

Since then, a paper by Marten et al. (2014) has provided the first set of published SC-CH₄ estimates in the peer-reviewed literature that are consistent with the modeling assumptions

⁵⁵ Previous analyses have commonly referred to the social cost of carbon dioxide emissions as the social cost of carbon or SCC. To more easily facilitate the inclusion of non-CO₂ GHGs in the discussion and analysis the more specific SC-CO₂ nomenclature is used to refer to the social cost of CO₂ emissions.

⁵⁶ Both the 2010 SC-CO₂ TSD and the current TSD are available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/oira/social-cost-of-carbon>.

⁵⁷ U.S. EPA. 2012. Regulatory Impact Analysis Final New Source Performance Standards and Amendments to the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the Oil and Natural Gas Industry. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Health and Environmental Impacts Division. April. http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/oil_natural_gas_final_neshap_nsps_ria.pdf. Accessed April 7, 2016.

⁵⁸ See Walldhoff et al. (2011); Marten and Newbold (2012); and Marten et al. (2014).

underlying the SC-CO₂ estimates.^{59 60} Specifically, the estimation approach of Marten et al. used the same set of three IAMs, five socioeconomic-emissions scenarios, equilibrium climate

sensitivity distribution, three constant discount rates, and aggregation approach used by the IWG to develop the SC-CO₂ estimates.

The SC-CH₄ estimates from Marten, et al. (2014) are presented in Table 3 of

this preamble. More detailed discussion of the methodology, results, and a comparison to other published estimates can be found in the 2016 RIA and in Marten, et al.

TABLE 3—SOCIAL COST OF CH₄, 2012–2050^a
[In 2012\$ per metric ton (Source: Marten et al., 2014^b)

Year	SC-CH ₄			
	5% Average	3% Average	2.5% Average	3% 95th percentile
2012	\$430	\$1000	\$1400	\$2800
2015	490	1100	1500	3000
2020	580	1300	1700	3500
2025	700	1500	1900	4000
2030	820	1700	2200	4500
2035	970	1900	2500	5300
2040	1100	2200	2800	5900
2045	1300	2500	3000	6600
2050	1400	2700	3300	7200

^aThe values are emissions-year specific. Estimates using several discount rates are included because the literature shows that estimates of the SC-CO₂ (and SC-CH₄) are sensitive to assumptions about the discount rate, and because no consensus exists on the appropriate rate to use in an intergenerational context (where costs and benefits are incurred by different generations). The fourth value is the 95th percentile of the SC-CH₄ estimates across three models using a 3 percent discount rate. It is included to represent higher-than-expected impacts from temperature change further out in the tails of the SC-CH₄ distribution.

^bThe estimates in this table have been adjusted to reflect recent minor technical corrections to the SC-CO₂ estimates. See the Corrigendum to Marten et al. (2014), <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14693062.2015.1070550>.

The application of these directly modeled SC-CH₄ estimates from Marten et al. (2014) in a benefit-cost analysis of a regulatory action is analogous to the use of the SC-CO₂ estimates. In addition, the limitations for the SC-CO₂ estimates discussed above likewise apply to the SC-CH₄ estimates, given the consistency in the methodology.

In early 2015, the EPA conducted a peer review of the application of the Marten, et al. (2014) non-CO₂ social cost estimates in regulatory analysis and received responses that supported this application. See the 2016 RIA for a detailed discussion.

The EPA also carefully considered the full range of public comments and associated technical issues on the Marten et al. SC-CH₄ estimates received

through this rulemaking. The comments addressed the technical details of the SC-CO₂ estimates and the Marten et al. SC-CH₄ estimates as well as their application to this rulemaking analysis. One comment letter also provided constructive recommendations to improve the SC-CO₂ and SC-CH₄ estimates in the future. Based on the evaluation of the public comments on this rulemaking, the favorable peer review of the Marten et al. application, and past comments urging the EPA to value non-CO₂ GHG impacts in its rulemakings, the agency has concluded that the estimates represent the best scientific information on the impacts of climate change available in a form appropriate for incorporating the damages from incremental CH₄

emissions changes into regulatory analysis. The EPA has included those benefits in the main benefits analysis. See the EPA’s Response to Comments document for the complete response to comments received on the SC-CH₄ as part of this rulemaking.

The methane benefits based on Marten et al. (2014) are presented for the year 2025. Applying this approach to the methane reductions estimated for these guidelines, the 2025 methane benefits vary by discount rate and range from about \$200 million to approximately \$1.1 billion; the mean SC-CH₄ at the 3-percent discount rate results in an estimate of about \$430 million in 2025, as presented in Table 4 of this preamble.

TABLE 4—ESTIMATED GLOBAL BENEFITS OF CH₄ REDUCTIONS IN 2025
[In millions, 2012\$]

Million metric tons CH ₄	Discount rate and statistic			
	5% Average	3% Average	2.5% Average	3% 95th percentile
0.285	\$200	\$430	\$550	\$1,100

The vast majority of this action’s climate-related benefits are associated with methane reductions. Additional

climate-related benefits are expected from the guidelines’ secondary air impacts, specifically, a net reduction in

CO₂ emissions. Monetizing the net CO₂ reductions with the SC-CO₂ estimates described in this section yields benefits

⁵⁹ Marten et al. (2014) also provided the first set of SC-N₂O estimates that are consistent with the assumptions underlying the IWG SC-CO₂ estimates.

⁶⁰ Marten, A. L., E. A. Kopits, C. W. Griffiths, S. C. Newbold & A. Wolverton (2014). Incremental CH₄ and N₂O mitigation benefits consistent with the

U.S. Government’s SC-CO₂ estimates, Climate Policy, DOI: 10.1080/14693062.2014.912981.

of \$14 million in the year 2025 (average SC-CO₂, 3 percent discount rate, 2012\$). Monetized climate benefits associated with reductions in methane and secondary CO₂ emissions are approximately \$440 million in 2025 (2012\$), based on the average SC-CH₄ at a 3 percent discount rate and the average SC-CO₂ at a 3 percent discount rate. See the 2016 RIA for more details.

In addition to the limitation discussed above, and the referenced documents, there are additional impacts of individual GHGs that are not currently captured in the IAMS used in the directly modeled approach of Marten et al. (2014), and therefore not quantified for the rule. For example, the NMOC portion of LFG can contain a variety of air pollutants, including VOC and various organic HAP. VOC emissions are precursors to both PM_{2.5} and ozone formation, while methane is a GHG and a precursor to global ozone formation. These pollutants are associated with substantial health effects, welfare effects, and climate effects, which are discussed in section III.B of this preamble. The ozone generated by methane has important non-climate impacts on agriculture, ecosystems, and human health. The 2016 RIA describes the specific impacts of methane as an ozone precursor in more detail and discusses studies that have estimated monetized benefits of these methane generated ozone effects. The EPA continues to monitor developments in this area of research.

Finally, these final Emission Guidelines will yield benefits from reductions in VOC and HAP emissions and from reductions in methane as a precursor to global background concentrations of tropospheric ozone. With the data available, we are not able to provide quantified health benefit estimates for the reduction in exposure to HAP, ozone, and PM_{2.5} for this rule. This is not to imply that there are no benefits of the rules; rather, it is a reflection of the difficulties in modeling the direct and indirect impacts of the reductions in emissions for this sector with the data currently available.⁶¹ In

⁶¹ Previous studies have estimated the monetized benefits-per-ton of reducing VOC emissions associated with the effect that those emissions have on ambient PM_{2.5} levels and the health effects associated with PM_{2.5} exposure (Fann, Fulcher, and Hubbell, 2009). While these ranges of benefit-per-ton estimates can provide useful context, the geographic distribution of VOC emissions from the MSW landfills sector are not consistent with emissions modeled in Fann, Fulcher, and Hubbell (2009). In addition, the benefit-per-ton estimates for VOC emission reductions in that study are derived from total VOC emissions across all sectors. Coupled with the larger uncertainties about the relationship between VOC emissions and PM_{2.5} and the highly localized nature of air quality responses

associated with HAP and VOC reductions, these factors lead us to conclude that the available VOC benefit-per-ton estimates are not appropriate to calculate monetized benefits of these rules, even as a bounding exercise.

addition to health improvements, there will be improvements in visibility effects, ecosystem effects, and climate effects. Although we do not have sufficient information or modeling available to provide quantitative estimates of the health benefits associated with HAP, ozone, and PM_{2.5} reductions, we include a qualitative assessment of the public health effects associated with exposure to HAP, ozone, and PM_{2.5} in the 2016 RIA for this rule. These qualitative impact assessments are briefly summarized in section III.B of this preamble, but for more detailed information, please refer to the 2016 RIA, which is available in the docket.

Based on the monetized benefits and costs of the final emission guidelines, the annual net benefits of the rule are estimated to be \$390 million (\$2012) in 2025 based on the average SC-CH₄ at a 3 percent discount rate and costs at a 7 percent discount rate.

VIII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Additional information about these statutes and Executive Orders can be found at <http://www2.epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive-orders>.

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review

This action is an economically significant regulatory action that was submitted to OMB for review. Any changes made in response to OMB recommendations have been documented in the docket. The EPA prepared an economic analysis of the potential costs and benefits associated with the proposed Emission Guidelines. The analysis is documented in the 2016 RIA, which is available in docket EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0451 and is briefly summarized in section VII of this preamble.

B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

OMB has approved the information collection activities contained in this rule under the PRA and has assigned OMB control number 2060-NEW. The Information Collection Request (ICR) document that the EPA prepared for the final Emission Guidelines has been assigned EPA ICR number 2522.02. You can find a copy of the ICR in the docket for this rule, and it is briefly summarized here.

associated with HAP and VOC reductions, these factors lead us to conclude that the available VOC benefit-per-ton estimates are not appropriate to calculate monetized benefits of these rules, even as a bounding exercise.

The information required to be collected is necessary to identify the regulated entities subject to the final rule and to ensure their compliance with the final Emission Guidelines. The recordkeeping and reporting requirements are mandatory and are being established under authority of CAA section 114 (42 U.S.C. 7414). All information other than emissions data submitted as part of a report to the agency for which a claim of confidentiality is made will be safeguarded according to CAA section 114(c) and the EPA's implementing regulations at 40 CFR part 2, subpart B.

Respondents/affected entities: MSW landfills that accepted waste after November 8, 1987, and commenced construction, reconstruction, or modification on or before July 17, 2014.

Respondent's obligation to respond: Mandatory (40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf).

Estimated number of respondents: 1,192 MSW landfills.

Frequency of response: Initially, occasionally, and annually.

Total estimated burden: 679,668 hours (per year) for the responding facilities and 17,829 hours (per year) for the agency. These are estimates for the average annual burden for the first 3 years after the rule is final. Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.3(b).

Total estimated cost: \$45,225,362 (per year), which includes annualized capital or operation and maintenance costs, for the responding facilities and 1,161,840 (per year) for the agency. These are estimates for the average annual cost for the first 3 years after the rule is final.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for the EPA's regulations in 40 CFR are listed in 40 CFR part 9.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA. This action will not impose any requirements on small entities. Specifically, Emission Guidelines established under CAA section 111(d) do not impose any requirements on regulated entities and, thus, will not have a significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities. After Emission Guidelines are promulgated, states and U.S. territories establish standards on existing sources, and it is those state requirements that could potentially impact small entities.

Our analysis here is consistent with the analysis of the analogous situation arising when the EPA establishes National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), which do not impose any requirements on regulated entities. As here, any impact of a NAAQS on small entities would only arise when states take subsequent action to maintain and/or achieve the NAAQS through their state implementation plans. See *American Trucking Assoc. v. EPA*, 175 F.3d 1029, 1043–45 (D.C. Cir. 1999). (NAAQS do not have significant impacts upon small entities because NAAQS themselves impose no regulations upon small entities.)

Nevertheless, the EPA is aware that there is substantial interest in the rule among small entities. The EPA conducted stakeholder outreach as detailed in sections XI.C and XI.E of the preamble to the proposed Standards of Performance for MSW Landfills (79 FR 41828–41829; July 17, 2014) and in sections VIII.C and VIII.E of this preamble. The EPA convened a Small Business Advocacy Review (SBAR) Panel in 2013 for the landfills rulemaking. The EPA originally planned a review of the Emission Guidelines and NSPS in one action, but the actions were subsequently divided into separate rulemakings. The SBAR Panel evaluated the assembled materials and small-entity comments on issues related to the rule's potential effects and significant alternative regulatory approaches. A copy of the "Summary of Small Entity Outreach" is available in the rulemaking docket EPA–HQ–OAR–2014–0451. While formulating the provisions of the rule, the EPA considered the input provided over the course of the stakeholder outreach as well as the input provided in the many public comments, and we have incorporated many of the suggestions in this final rule.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)

This action does not contain any unfunded mandate of \$100 million or more as described in UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538. The final Emission Guidelines apply to landfills that were constructed, modified, or reconstructed after November 8, 1987, and that commenced construction, reconstruction, or modification on or before July 17, 2014. Impacts resulting from the final Emission Guidelines are below the applicable threshold.

We note however, that the final Emission Guidelines may significantly or uniquely affect small governments because small governments operate landfills. The EPA consulted with small

governments concerning the regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect them. In developing this rule, the EPA consulted with small governments pursuant to a plan established under section 203 of the UMRA to address impacts of regulatory requirements in the rule that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments. The EPA also held meetings as discussed in section VIII.E of this preamble under Federalism consultations.

E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

The EPA has concluded that the final Emission Guidelines may have federalism implications, because the rule imposes substantial direct compliance costs on state or local governments and the federal government will not provide the funds necessary to pay those costs.

The EPA provides the following federalism summary impact statement. The EPA consulted with state and local officials, including their representative national organizations, early in the process of developing the proposed action to permit them to have meaningful and timely input into its development. In developing the regulatory options reflected in the proposed rule as well as this final action, the EPA consulted with 8 national organizations representing state and local elected officials, including the National Governors Association, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the United States Conference of Mayors, the County Executives of America, the Council of State Governments, and the National Association of Towns and Townships. Additionally, the Environmental Council of the States, the National Association of Clean Air Agencies and the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials participated in pre-proposal briefings. Finally, in addition to these associations, over 140 officials representing state and local governments across the nation participated in at least one of three pre-proposal briefings in the Fall of 2013 (September 10, 2013, November 7, 2013, and November 14, 2013).

In the spirit of Executive Order 13132, and consistent with EPA policy to promote communications between the EPA and state and local governments, the EPA specifically solicited input prior to proposal from these intergovernmental associations, their members, and the participating state and local officials during and in follow-up to these briefings. As a result of the

first phase of pre-proposal intergovernmental outreach, the EPA received comments from [over 40] entities representing State and local governments. As the development of the rule continued, and in the interest of sharing additional information with its intergovernmental partners prior to proposing the rule, EPA conducted an additional Federalism outreach meeting on April 15, 2015.

The principal intergovernmental concerns raised during the pre-proposal consultations, as well as during the proposed rule's public comment period, include: Implementation concerns associated with shortening of gas collection system installation and/or expansion timeframes; concerns regarding significant lowering of the design capacity or emission thresholds; the need for clarifications associated with wellhead operating parameters; and, the need for consistent, clear, and rigorous surface monitoring requirements. In response to these comments and based upon the data currently available, the EPA has decided not to adjust the design capacity or significantly lower the emission threshold. The EPA has also decided not to adjust the time allotted for installation of the GCCS or expansion of the wellfield. In 80 FR 52121 (the proposed rule), the EPA highlighted specific concerns raised by commenters, which included state agencies as well as landfill owners and operators, about the interaction between shortened lag times and design plan approvals, costs and safety concerns associated with reduced lag times, and the need for flexibility for lag time adjustments. Wellhead operating parameters have been adjusted to limit corrective action requirements to negative pressure and temperature. The EPA also acknowledged concerns about wellhead operating parameters in 80 FR 52121 and reviewed public comments in favor of and against retention of the parameters during the public comment period as described in section VI.A.1 of this preamble.

As described section VI.B of this preamble, the EPA is finalizing a SEM approach for determining GCCS installation. Commenters were generally supportive of this approach and recognized the additional flexibility provided as an alternative to the traditional approach for determining GCCS installation based on a series of models. The EPA is also finalizing a subcategory for closed landfills as outlined in section VI.C of this preamble. While federalism commenters primarily supported this approach, some representatives of local

governments opposed it due to trends in ownership and size of landfills and the perception that landfills owned by these entities should not benefit from subcategorization.

A complete list of the comments from State and local governments has been provided to OMB and has been placed in the docket for this rulemaking. In addition, the detailed response to comments from these entities is contained in the EPA's Response to Comments document for this rulemaking.

As required by section 8(a) of Executive Order 13132, the EPA included a certification from its Federalism Official stating that the EPA had met the Executive Order's requirements in a meaningful and timely manner when it sent the draft of this final action to OMB for review pursuant to Executive Order 12866. A copy of this certification is included in the public version of the official record for this final action.

F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This action has tribal implications. However, it will neither impose substantial direct compliance costs on federally recognized tribal governments, nor preempt tribal law. The database used to estimate impacts of the final 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf, identified one tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, which owns three landfills potentially subject to the final Emission Guidelines. One of these landfills is open, the Salt River Landfill, and is already controlling emissions under the current NSPS/EG framework, so while subject to this subpart, the costs of this proposal are not substantial. The two other landfills are closed and anticipated to meet the definition of the closed landfill subcategory. One of the closed landfills, the Tri Cities Landfill, is already controlling emissions under the current NSPS/EG framework and will not incur substantial additional compliance costs under subpart Cf. The other landfill, North Center Street Landfill, is not estimated to install controls under the current NSPS/EG framework.

As required by section 7(a), the EPA's Tribal Consultation Official has certified that the requirements of the Executive Order have been met in a meaningful and timely manner. A copy of the certification is included in the docket for this action.

G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

This action is subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) because it is a significant regulatory action as defined by Executive Order 12866, and the EPA believes that the environmental health or safety risk addressed by this action has a disproportionate effect on children. Accordingly, the EPA has evaluated the environmental health and welfare effects of climate change on children.

Greenhouse gases including methane contribute to climate change and are emitted in significant quantities by the landfill sector. The EPA believes that the GHG emission reductions resulting from implementation of this final rule will further improve children's health.

The assessment literature cited in the EPA's 2009 Endangerment Finding concluded that certain populations and life stages, including children, the elderly, and the poor, are most vulnerable to climate-related health effects. The assessment literature since 2009 strengthens these conclusions by providing more detailed findings regarding these groups' vulnerabilities and the projected impacts they may experience.

These assessments describe how children's unique physiological and developmental factors contribute to making them particularly vulnerable to climate change. Impacts to children are expected from heat waves, air pollution, infectious and waterborne illnesses, and mental health effects resulting from extreme weather events. In addition, children are among those especially susceptible to most allergic diseases, as well as health effects associated with heat waves, storms, and floods. Additional health concerns may arise in low income households, especially those with children, if climate change reduces food availability and increases prices, leading to food insecurity within households.

More detailed information on the impacts of climate change to human health and welfare is provided in section III.B of this preamble.

H. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

This action is not a "significant energy action" because it is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. Further, we have concluded that the final Emission Guidelines are not likely to have any adverse energy effects

because the energy demanded to operate these control systems will be offset by additional energy supply from LFG energy projects.

I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) and 1 CFR Part 51

The final Emission Guidelines involve technical standards. For the final Emission Guidelines, the EPA has decided to use EPA Methods 2, 2E, 3, 3A, 3C, 18, 21, 25, 25A, and 25C of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A.

The EPA identified 15 voluntary consensus standards (VCS) as being potentially applicable (ASTM D3154-00 (2006), ASTM D3464-96 (2007), ASTM D3796-90 (2001), ANSI/ASME PTC 19-10-1981 Part 10, ASME B133.9-1994 (2001), ISO 10396:1993 (2007), ISO 12039:2001, ISO 10780:1994, ASTM D5835-95 (2013), ASTM D6522-11, ASTM D6420-99 (2010), CAN/CSA Z223.2-M86 (1999), ASTM D6060-96 (2009), ISO 14965:2000(E), EN 12619(1999)). The EPA determined that 14 of the 15 candidate VCS identified for measuring emissions of pollutants or their surrogates subject to emission standards in the rule would not be practical due to lack of equivalency, documentation, validation data, and other important technical and policy considerations. The agency identified no equivalent standards for Methods 2E, 21, and 25C. However, one voluntary consensus standard was identified as acceptable alternative to EPA test method for the purposes of this rule.

The voluntary consensus standard ASTM D6522-11, Standard Test Method for the Determination of Nitrogen Oxides, Carbon Monoxide, and Oxygen Concentrations in Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired Reciprocating Engines, Combustion Turbines, Boilers, and Process Heaters Using Portable Analyzers" is an acceptable alternative to Method 3A when used at the wellhead before combustion. It is advisable to know the flammability and check the Lower Explosive Limit of the flue gas constituents, prior to sampling, in order to avoid undesired ignition of the gas. The results of ASTM D6522-11 may be used to determine nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide emission concentrations from natural gas combustion at stationary sources. This test method may also be used to monitor emissions during short-term emission tests or periodically in order to optimize process operation for nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide control.

The EPA's review, including review of comments for these 15 methods, is documented in the memorandum, "Voluntary Consensus Standard Results

for Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, 2016” in the docket for this rulemaking (EPA–HQ–OAR–2014–0451).

In this rule, the EPA is finalizing regulatory text for 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf, that includes incorporation by reference in accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5. Specifically, the EPA is incorporating by reference ASTM D6522–11. You may obtain a copy from American Society for Testing and Materials, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, Post Office Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428–2959 or <http://www.astm.org>.

J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

The EPA believes the human health or environmental risk addressed by this action will not have potential disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority, low-income, or indigenous populations. The EPA has determined this because the rulemaking increases the level of environmental protection for all affected populations without having any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on any population, including any minority, low-income, or indigenous populations. To the extent that any minority, low-income, or indigenous subpopulation is disproportionately impacted by hazardous air emissions due to the proximity of their homes to sources of these emissions, that subpopulation also stands to see increased environmental and health benefit from the emission reductions called for by this rule.

The EPA has provided meaningful participation opportunities for minority, low-income, indigenous populations and tribes during the rulemaking process by conducting and participating in community calls and webinars. Documentation of these activities can be found in the July 13, 2016, document titled, “2016 Environmental Justice Screening Report for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills,” a copy of which is available in the docket for this action (EPA–HQ–OAR–2014–0451).

The EPA is committed to assisting states and communities to develop plans that ensure there are no disproportionate, adverse impacts on overburdened communities. To provide information fundamental to that process, the EPA has conducted a proximity analysis for this final rulemaking that summarizes demographic data on the communities

located near landfills.⁶² The EPA understands that, in order to prevent disproportionately, high and adverse human health or environmental effects on these communities, both states and communities must have information on the communities living near facilities, including demographic data, and that accessing and using census data files requires expertise that some community groups may lack. Therefore, the EPA used census data from the American Community Survey (ACS) 2008–2012 to conduct a proximity analysis that can be used by states and communities as they develop state plans and as they later assess the final plans’ impacts. The analysis and its results are presented in the EJ Screening Report for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, which is located in the docket for this rulemaking at EPA–HQ–OAR–2014–0451.

The proximity analysis provides detailed demographic information on the communities located within a 3-mile radius of each affected landfill in the U.S. Included in the analysis is the breakdown by percentage of community characteristics such as income and minority status. The analysis shows a higher percentage of communities of color and people without high school diplomas living near landfills than national averages. It is important to note that the impacts of landfill emissions are not limited to a 3-mile radius and the impacts of both potential increases and decreases in landfill emissions can be felt many miles away. Still, being aware of the characteristics of communities closest to landfills is a starting point in understanding how changes in the landfill’s air emissions may affect the air quality experienced by some of those already experiencing environmental burdens.

As stated in the Executive Order 12898 discussion located in section XIII.J of this preamble, the EPA believes that all communities will benefit from this final rulemaking because this action addresses the impacts of climate change by climate co-benefits achieved through reductions in the methane component of LFG. The EPA also believes that the information provided in the proximity analysis will promote engagement between vulnerable communities and their states and will be useful for states as they develop their plans.

Additionally, the EPA encourages states to conduct their own analyses of community considerations when developing their plans. Each state is uniquely knowledgeable about its own

communities and well-positioned to consider the possible impacts of plans on vulnerable communities within its state. Conducting state-specific analyses would not only help states assess possible impacts of plan options, but it would also enhance a state’s understanding of the means to engage these communities that would most effectively reach them and lead to valuable exchanges of information and concerns. A state analysis, together with the proximity analysis conducted by the EPA, would provide a solid foundation for engagement between a state and its communities.

Such state-specific analyses need not be exhaustive. An examination of the options a state is considering for its plan, and any projections of likely resulting increases in landfill emissions affecting low-income populations, communities of color populations, or indigenous communities, would be informative for communities. The analyses could include available air quality monitoring data and information from air quality models, and, if available, take into account information about local health vulnerabilities such as asthma rates or access to healthcare. Alternatively, a simple analysis may consider expected landfill utilization in geographic proximity to overburdened communities. The EPA will provide states with information on its publicly available environmental justice screening and mapping tool, EJ SCREEN, which they may use in conducting a state-specific analysis. Additionally, the EPA encourages states to submit a copy of their analysis if they choose to conduct one, with their initial and final plan submittals.

K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

This action is subject to the CRA, and the EPA will submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. This action is a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 60

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: July 14, 2016.

Gina McCarthy,
Administrator.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Environmental Protection Agency amends title 40, chapter I of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

⁶² The proximity analysis was conducted using the EPA’s environmental justice mapping and screening tool, EJSCREEN.

PART 60—STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 60 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

■ 2. Section 60.17 is amended:

- a. By redesignating paragraphs (h)(185) through (206) as paragraphs (h)(186) through (207), respectively; and
- b. By adding a new paragraph (h)(185).

The addition reads as follows:

§ 60.17 Incorporations by reference.

* * * * *

(h) * * *

(185) ASTM D6522–11 Standard Test Method for Determination of Nitrogen Oxides, Carbon Monoxide, and Oxygen Concentrations in Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired Reciprocating Engines, Combustion Turbines, Boilers, and Process Heaters Using Portable Analyzers (Approved December 1, 2011), IBR approved for § 60.37f(a).

* * * * *

■ 3. Part 60 is amended by adding subpart Cf to read as follows:

Subpart Cf—Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills

Sec.

- 60.30f Scope and delegated authorities.
- 60.31f Designated facilities.
- 60.32f Compliance times.
- 60.33f Emission Guidelines for municipal solid waste landfill emissions.
- 60.34f Operational standards for collection and control systems.
- 60.35f Test methods and procedures.
- 60.36f Compliance provisions.
- 60.37f Monitoring of operations.
- 60.38f Reporting guidelines.
- 60.39f Recordkeeping guidelines.
- 60.40f Specifications for active collection systems.
- 60.41f Definitions.

Subpart Cf—Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills

§ 60.30f Scope and delegated authorities.

This subpart establishes Emission Guidelines and compliance times for the control of designated pollutants from certain designated municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills in accordance with section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act and subpart B of this part.

(a) If you are the Administrator of an air quality program in a state or United States protectorate with one or more existing MSW landfills that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction on or before July 17, 2014, you must submit a state plan to

the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that implements the Emission Guidelines contained in this subpart. The requirements for state plans are specified in subpart B of this part.

(b) You must submit a state plan to EPA by May 30, 2017.

(c) The following authorities will not be delegated to state, local, or tribal agencies:

(1) Approval of alternative methods to determine the NMOC concentration or a site-specific methane generation rate constant (k).

(2) [Reserved]

§ 60.31f Designated facilities.

(a) The designated facility to which these Emission Guidelines apply is each existing MSW landfill for which construction, reconstruction, or modification was commenced on or before July 17, 2014.

(b) Physical or operational changes made to an existing MSW landfill solely to comply with an emission guideline are not considered a modification or reconstruction and would not subject an existing MSW landfill to the requirements of a standard of performance for new MSW landfills.

(c) For purposes of obtaining an operating permit under title V of the Clean Air Act, the owner or operator of an MSW landfill subject to this subpart with a design capacity less than 2.5 million megagrams or 2.5 million cubic meters is not subject to the requirement to obtain an operating permit for the landfill under part 70 or 71 of this chapter, unless the landfill is otherwise subject to either part 70 or 71. For purposes of submitting a timely application for an operating permit under part 70 or 71, the owner or operator of an MSW landfill subject to this subpart with a design capacity greater than or equal to 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters on the effective date of EPA approval of the state's program under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act, and not otherwise subject to either part 70 or 71, becomes subject to the requirements of § 70.5(a)(1)(i) or § 71.5(a)(1)(i) of this chapter 90 days after the effective date of such section 111(d) program approval, even if the design capacity report is submitted earlier.

(d) When an MSW landfill subject to this subpart is closed as defined in this subpart, the owner or operator is no longer subject to the requirement to maintain an operating permit under part 70 or 71 of this chapter for the landfill if the landfill is not otherwise subject to the requirements of either part 70 or 71

and if either of the following conditions are met:

(1) The landfill was never subject to the requirement to install and operate a gas collection and control system under § 60.33f; or

(2) The landfill meets the conditions for control system removal specified in § 60.33f(f).

(e) When an MSW landfill subject to this subpart is in the closed landfill subcategory, the owner or operator is not subject to the following reports of this subpart, provided the owner or operator submitted these reports under the provisions of subpart WWW of this part; 40 CFR part 62, subpart GGG; or a state plan implementing subpart Cc of this part on or before July 17, 2014:

(1) Initial design capacity report specified in § 60.38f(a).

(2) Initial or subsequent NMOC emission rate report specified in § 60.38f(c), provided that the most recent NMOC emission rate report indicated the NMOC emissions were below 50 Mg/yr.

(3) Collection and control system design plan specified in § 60.38f(d).

(4) Closure report specified in § 60.38f(f).

(5) Equipment removal report specified in § 60.38f(g).

(6) Initial annual report specified in § 60.38f(h).

(7) Initial performance test report in § 60.38f(i).

§ 60.32f Compliance times.

Planning, awarding of contracts, installing, and starting up MSW landfill air emission collection and control equipment that is capable of meeting the Emission Guidelines under § 60.33f must be completed within 30 months after the date an NMOC emission rate report shows NMOC emissions equal or exceed 34 megagrams per year (50 megagrams per year for the closed landfill subcategory); or within 30 months after the date of the most recent NMOC emission rate report that shows NMOC emissions equal or exceed 34 megagrams per year (50 megagrams per year for the closed landfill subcategory), if Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring shows a surface emission concentration of 500 parts per million methane or greater.

§ 60.33f Emission Guidelines for municipal solid waste landfill emissions.

(a) *Landfills.* For approval, a state plan must require each owner or operator of an MSW landfill having a design capacity greater than or equal to 2.5 million megagrams by mass and 2.5 million cubic meters by volume to collect and control MSW landfill

emissions at each MSW landfill that meets the following conditions:

(1) The landfill has accepted waste at any time since November 8, 1987, or has additional design capacity available for future waste deposition.

(2) The landfill commenced construction, reconstruction, or modification on or before July 17, 2014.

(3) The landfill has an NMOC emission rate greater than or equal to 34 megagrams per year or Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring shows a surface emission concentration of 500 parts per million methane or greater.

(4) The landfill in the closed landfill subcategory and has an NMOC emission rate greater than or equal to 50 megagrams per year or Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring shows a surface emission concentration of 500 parts per million methane or greater.

(b) *Collection system.* For approval, a state plan must include provisions for the installation of a gas collection and control system meeting the requirements in paragraphs (b)(1) through (3) and (c) of this section at each MSW landfill meeting the conditions in paragraph (a) of this section.

(1) *Collection system.* Install and start up a collection and control system that captures the gas generated within the landfill within 30 months after:

(i) The first annual report in which the NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 megagrams per year, unless Tier 2 or Tier 3 sampling demonstrates that the NMOC emission rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, as specified in § 60.38f(d)(4); or

(ii) The first annual NMOC emission rate report for a landfill in the closed landfill subcategory in which the NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 50 megagrams per year, unless Tier 2 or Tier 3 sampling demonstrates that the NMOC emission rate is less than 50 megagrams per year, as specified in § 60.38f(d)(4); or

(iii) The most recent NMOC emission rate report in which the NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 megagrams per year based on Tier 2, if the Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring shows a surface methane emission concentration of 500 parts per million methane or greater as specified in § 60.38f(d)(4)(iii).

(2) *Active.* An active collection system must:

(i) Be designed to handle the maximum expected gas flow rate from the entire area of the landfill that warrants control over the intended use period of the gas control system equipment.

(ii) Collect gas from each area, cell, or group of cells in the landfill in which the initial solid waste has been placed for a period of 5 years or more if active; or 2 years or more if closed or at final grade.

(iii) Collect gas at a sufficient extraction rate.

(iv) Be designed to minimize off-site migration of subsurface gas.

(3) *Passive.* A passive collection system must:

(i) Comply with the provisions specified in paragraphs (b)(2)(i), (ii), and (iv) of this section.

(ii) Be installed with liners on the bottom and all sides in all areas in which gas is to be collected. The liners must be installed as required under § 258.40 of this chapter.

(c) *Control system.* For approval, a state plan must include provisions for the control of the gas collected from within the landfill through the use of control devices meeting the following requirements, except as provided in § 60.24.

(1) A non-enclosed flare designed and operated in accordance with the parameters established in § 60.18 except as noted in § 60.37f(d); or

(2) A control system designed and operated to reduce NMOC by 98 weight percent; or when an enclosed combustion device is used for control, to either reduce NMOC by 98 weight percent or reduce the outlet NMOC concentration to less than 20 parts per million by volume, dry basis as hexane at 3 percent oxygen or less. The reduction efficiency or concentration in parts per million by volume must be established by an initial performance test to be completed no later than 180 days after the initial startup of the approved control system using the test methods specified in § 60.35f(d). The performance test is not required for boilers and process heaters with design heat input capacities equal to or greater than 44 megawatts that burn landfill gas for compliance with this subpart.

(i) If a boiler or process heater is used as the control device, the landfill gas stream must be introduced into the flame zone.

(ii) The control device must be operated within the parameter ranges established during the initial or most recent performance test. The operating parameters to be monitored are specified in § 60.37f.

(iii) For the closed landfill subcategory, the initial or most recent performance test conducted to comply with subpart WWW of this part; 40 CFR part 62, subpart GGG; or a state plan implementing subpart Cc of this part on

or before July 17, 2014 is sufficient for compliance with this subpart.

(3) Route the collected gas to a treatment system that processes the collected gas for subsequent sale or beneficial use such as fuel for combustion, production of vehicle fuel, production of high-Btu gas for pipeline injection, or use as a raw material in a chemical manufacturing process. Venting of treated landfill gas to the ambient air is not allowed. If the treated landfill gas cannot be routed for subsequent sale or beneficial use, then the treated landfill gas must be controlled according to either paragraph (c)(1) or (2) of this section.

(4) All emissions from any atmospheric vent from the gas treatment system are subject to the requirements of paragraph (b) or (c) of this section. For purposes of this subpart, atmospheric vents located on the condensate storage tank are not part of the treatment system and are exempt from the requirements of paragraph (b) or (c) of this section.

(d) *Design capacity.* For approval, a state plan must require each owner or operator of an MSW landfill having a design capacity less than 2.5 million megagrams by mass or 2.5 million cubic meters by volume to submit an initial design capacity report to the Administrator as provided in § 60.38f(a). The landfill may calculate design capacity in either megagrams or cubic meters for comparison with the exemption values. Any density conversions must be documented and submitted with the report. Submittal of the initial design capacity report fulfills the requirements of this subpart except as provided in paragraphs (d)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) The owner or operator must submit an amended design capacity report as provided in § 60.38f(b).

Note to paragraph (d)(1): Note that if the design capacity increase is the result of a modification, as defined in this subpart, that was commenced after July 17, 2014, then the landfill becomes subject to subpart XXX of this part instead of this subpart. If the design capacity increase is the result of a change in operating practices, density, or some other change that is not a modification as defined in this subpart, then the landfill remains subject to this subpart.

(2) When an increase in the maximum design capacity of a landfill with an initial design capacity less than 2.5 million megagrams or 2.5 million cubic meters results in a revised maximum design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters, the owner or operator

must comply with paragraph (e) of this section.

(e) *Emissions.* For approval, a state plan must require each owner or operator of an MSW landfill having a design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters to either install a collection and control system as provided in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section or calculate an initial NMOC emission rate for the landfill using the procedures specified in § 60.35f(a). The NMOC emission rate must be recalculated annually, except as provided in § 60.38f(c)(3).

(1) If the calculated NMOC emission rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, the owner or operator must:

(i) Submit an annual NMOC emission rate report according to § 60.38f(c), except as provided in § 60.38f(c)(3); and

(ii) Recalculate the NMOC emission rate annually using the procedures specified in § 60.35f(a) until such time as the calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year, or the landfill is closed.

(A) If the calculated NMOC emission rate, upon initial calculation or annual recalculation required in paragraph (e)(1)(ii) of this section, is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year, the owner or operator must either: Comply with paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section; calculate NMOC emissions using the next higher tier in § 60.35f; or conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration using the procedures specified in § 60.35f(a)(6).

(B) If the landfill is permanently closed, a closure report must be submitted to the Administrator as provided in § 60.38f(f), except for exemption allowed under § 60.31f(e)(4).

(C) For the closed landfill subcategory, if the most recently calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 50 megagrams per year, the owner or operator must either: Submit a gas collection and control system design plan as specified in § 60.38f(d), except for exemptions allowed under § 60.31f(e)(3), and install a collection and control system as provided in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section; calculate NMOC emissions using the next higher tier in § 60.35f; or conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration using the procedures specified in § 60.35f(a)(6).

(2) If the calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year using Tier 1, 2, or 3 procedures, the owner or operator must either: submit a collection and control system design plan prepared by a professional engineer to the Administrator within 1 year as specified

in § 60.38f(d), except for exemptions allowed under § 60.31f(e)(3); calculate NMOC emissions using a higher tier in § 60.35f; or conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration using the procedures specified in § 60.35f(a)(6).

(3) For the closed landfill subcategory, if the calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 50 megagrams per year using Tier 1, 2, or 3 procedures, the owner or operator must either:

Submit a collection and control system design plan as specified in § 60.38f(d), except for exemptions allowed under § 60.31f(e)(3); calculate NMOC emissions using a higher tier in § 60.35f; or conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration using the procedures specified in § 60.35f(a)(6).

(f) *Removal criteria.* The collection and control system may be capped, removed, or decommissioned if the following criteria are met:

(1) The landfill is a closed landfill (as defined in § 60.41f). A closure report must be submitted to the Administrator as provided in § 60.38f(f).

(2) The collection and control system has been in operation a minimum of 15 years or the landfill owner or operator demonstrates that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flow.

(3) Following the procedures specified in § 60.35f(b), the calculated NMOC emission rate at the landfill is less than 34 megagrams per year on three successive test dates. The test dates must be no less than 90 days apart, and no more than 180 days apart.

(4) For the closed landfill subcategory (as defined in § 60.41), following the procedures specified in § 60.35f(b), the calculated NMOC emission rate at the landfill is less than 50 megagrams per year on three successive test dates. The test dates must be no less than 90 days apart, and no more than 180 days apart.

§ 60.34f Operational standards for collection and control systems.

For approval, a state plan must include provisions for the operational standards in this section for an MSW landfill with a gas collection and control system used to comply with the provisions of § 60.33f(b) and (c). Each owner or operator of an MSW landfill with a gas collection and control system used to comply with the provisions of § 60.33f(b) and (c) must:

(a) Operate the collection system such that gas is collected from each area, cell, or group of cells in the MSW landfill in which solid waste has been in place for:

(1) Five (5) years or more if active; or

(2) Two (2) years or more if closed or at final grade.

(b) Operate the collection system with negative pressure at each wellhead except under the following conditions:

(1) A fire or increased well temperature. The owner or operator must record instances when positive pressure occurs in efforts to avoid a fire. These records must be submitted with the annual reports as provided in § 60.38f(h)(1).

(2) Use of a geomembrane or synthetic cover. The owner or operator must develop acceptable pressure limits in the design plan.

(3) A decommissioned well. A well may experience a static positive pressure after shut down to accommodate for declining flows. All design changes must be approved by the Administrator as specified in § 60.38f(d).

(c) Operate each interior wellhead in the collection system with a landfill gas temperature less than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit). The owner or operator may establish a higher operating temperature value at a particular well. A higher operating value demonstration must be submitted to the Administrator for approval and must include supporting data demonstrating that the elevated parameter neither causes fires nor significantly inhibits anaerobic decomposition by killing methanogens. The demonstration must satisfy both criteria in order to be approved (*i.e.*, neither causing fires nor killing methanogens is acceptable).

(d) Operate the collection system so that the methane concentration is less than 500 parts per million above background at the surface of the landfill. To determine if this level is exceeded, the owner or operator must conduct surface testing using an organic vapor analyzer, flame ionization detector, or other portable monitor meeting the specifications provided in § 60.36(d). The owner or operator must conduct surface testing around the perimeter of the collection area and along a pattern that traverses the landfill at no more than 30-meter intervals and where visual observations indicate elevated concentrations of landfill gas, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover and all cover penetrations. Thus, the owner or operator must monitor any openings that are within an area of the landfill where waste has been placed and a gas collection system is required. The owner or operator may establish an alternative traversing pattern that ensures equivalent coverage. A surface monitoring design plan must be developed that includes a topographical map with the monitoring route and the

rationale for any site-specific deviations from the 30-meter intervals. Areas with steep slopes or other dangerous areas may be excluded from the surface testing.

(e) Operate the system such that all collected gases are vented to a control system designed and operated in compliance with § 60.33f(c). In the event the collection or control system is not operating, the gas mover system must be shut down and all valves in the collection and control system contributing to venting of the gas to the atmosphere must be closed within 1 hour of the collection or control system not operating.

(f) Operate the control system at all times when the collected gas is routed to the system.

(g) If monitoring demonstrates that the operational requirements in paragraph

(b), (c), or (d) of this section are not met, corrective action must be taken as specified in § 60.36f(a)(3) and (5) or (c). If corrective actions are taken as specified in § 60.36f, the monitored exceedance is not a violation of the operational requirements in this section.

§ 60.35f Test methods and procedures.

For approval, a state plan must include provisions in this section to calculate the landfill NMOC emission rate or to conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration.

(a)(1) *NMOC Emission Rate.* The landfill owner or operator must calculate the NMOC emission rate using either Equation 1 provided in paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section or Equation 2 provided in paragraph (a)(1)(ii) of this section. Both Equation 1 and Equation 2 may be used if the actual year-to-year

solid waste acceptance rate is known, as specified in paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section, for part of the life of the landfill and the actual year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate is unknown, as specified in paragraph (a)(1)(ii) of this section, for part of the life of the landfill. The values to be used in both Equation 1 and Equation 2 are 0.05 per year for k , 170 cubic meters per megagram for L_o , and 4,000 parts per million by volume as hexane for the C_{NMOC} . For landfills located in geographical areas with a 30-year annual average precipitation of less than 25 inches, as measured at the nearest representative official meteorologic site, the k value to be used is 0.02 per year.

(i)(A) Equation 1 must be used if the actual year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate is known.

$$M_{NMOC} = \sum_{i=1}^n 2 k L_o M_i (e^{-kt_i}) (C_{NMOC}) (3.6 \times 10^{-9}) \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

Where:

M_{NMOC} = Total NMOC emission rate from the landfill, megagrams per year.

k = Methane generation rate constant, year⁻¹.

L_o = Methane generation potential, cubic meters per megagram solid waste.

M_i = Mass of solid waste in the i^{th} section, megagrams.

t_i = Age of the i^{th} section, years.

C_{NMOC} = Concentration of NMOC, parts per million by volume as hexane.

3.6×10^{-9} = Conversion factor.

(B) The mass of nondegradable solid waste may be subtracted from the total mass of solid waste in a particular

section of the landfill when calculating the value for M_i if documentation of the nature and amount of such wastes is maintained.

(ii)(A) Equation 2 must be used if the actual year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate is unknown.

$$M_{NMOC} = 2L_o R (e^{-kc} - e^{-kt}) C_{NMOC} (3.6 \times 10^{-9}) \quad (\text{Eq. 2})$$

Where:

M_{NMOC} = Mass emission rate of NMOC, megagrams per year.

L_o = Methane generation potential, cubic meters per megagram solid waste.

R = Average annual acceptance rate, megagrams per year.

k = Methane generation rate constant, year⁻¹.

t = Age of landfill, years.

C_{NMOC} = Concentration of NMOC, parts per million by volume as hexane.

c = Time since closure, years; for an active landfill $c = 0$ and $e^{-kc} = 1$.

3.6×10^{-9} = Conversion factor.

(B) The mass of nondegradable solid waste may be subtracted from the total mass of solid waste in a particular section of the landfill when calculating the value of R , if documentation of the nature and amount of such wastes is maintained.

(2) *Tier 1.* The owner or operator must compare the calculated NMOC mass emission rate to the standard of 34 megagrams per year.

(i) If the NMOC emission rate calculated in paragraph (a)(1) of this section is less than 34 megagrams per year, then the owner or operator must

submit an NMOC emission rate report according to § 60.38f(c), and must recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate annually as required under § 60.33f(e).

(ii) If the NMOC emission rate calculated in paragraph (a)(1) of this section is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year, then the landfill owner or operator must either:

(A) Submit a gas collection and control system design plan within 1 year as specified in § 60.38f(d) and install and operate a gas collection and control system within 30 months according to § 60.33f(b) and (c);

(B) Determine a site-specific NMOC concentration and recalculate the NMOC emission rate using the Tier 2 procedures provided in paragraph (a)(3) of this section; or

(C) Determine a site-specific methane generation rate constant and recalculate the NMOC emission rate using the Tier 3 procedures provided in paragraph (a)(4) of this section.

(3) *Tier 2.* The landfill owner or operator must determine the site-specific NMOC concentration using the

following sampling procedure. The landfill owner or operator must install at least two sample probes per hectare, evenly distributed over the landfill surface that has retained waste for at least 2 years. If the landfill is larger than 25 hectares in area, only 50 samples are required. The probes should be evenly distributed across the sample area. The sample probes should be located to avoid known areas of nondegradable solid waste. The owner or operator must collect and analyze one sample of landfill gas from each probe to determine the NMOC concentration using Method 25 or 25C of appendix A of this part. Taking composite samples from different probes into a single cylinder is allowed; however, equal sample volumes must be taken from each probe. For each composite, the sampling rate, collection times, beginning and ending cylinder vacuums, or alternative volume measurements must be recorded to verify that composite volumes are equal. Composite sample volumes should not be less than one liter unless evidence can be provided to substantiate the

accuracy of smaller volumes. Terminate compositing before the cylinder approaches ambient pressure where measurement accuracy diminishes. If more than the required number of samples is taken, all samples must be used in the analysis. The landfill owner or operator must divide the NMOC concentration from Method 25 or 25C by six to convert from C_{NMOC} as carbon to C_{NMOC} as hexane. If the landfill has an active or passive gas removal system in place, Method 25 or 25C samples may be collected from these systems instead of surface probes provided the removal system can be shown to provide sampling as representative as the two sampling probe per hectare requirement. For active collection systems, samples may be collected from the common header pipe. The sample location on the common header pipe must be before any gas moving, condensate removal, or treatment system equipment. For active collection systems, a minimum of three samples must be collected from the header pipe.

(i) Within 60 days after the date of determining the NMOC concentration and corresponding NMOC emission rate, the owner or operator must submit the results according to § 60.38f(j)(2).

(ii) The landfill owner or operator must recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate using Equation 1 or Equation 2 provided in paragraph (a)(1)(i) or (ii) of this section using the average site-specific NMOC concentration from the collected samples instead of the default value provided in paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

(iii) If the resulting NMOC mass emission rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, then the owner or operator must submit a periodic estimate of NMOC emissions in an NMOC emission rate report according to § 60.38f(c), and must recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate annually as required under § 60.33f(e). The site-specific NMOC concentration must be retested every 5 years using the methods specified in this section.

(iv) If the NMOC mass emission rate as calculated using the Tier 2 site-specific NMOC concentration is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year, the owner or operator must either:

(A) Submit a gas collection and control system design plan within 1 year as specified in § 60.38f(d) and install and operate a gas collection and control system within 30 months according to § 60.33f(b) and (c);

(B) Determine a site-specific methane generation rate constant and recalculate the NMOC emission rate using the site-specific methane generation rate using

the Tier 3 procedures specified in paragraph (a)(4) of this section; or

(C) Conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration using the Tier 4 procedures specified in paragraph (a)(6) of this section.

(4) *Tier 3.* The site-specific methane generation rate constant must be determined using the procedures provided in Method 2E of appendix A of this part. The landfill owner or operator must estimate the NMOC mass emission rate using Equation 1 or Equation 2 in paragraph (a)(1)(i) or (ii) of this section and using a site-specific methane generation rate constant, and the site-specific NMOC concentration as determined in paragraph (a)(3) of this section instead of the default values provided in paragraph (a)(1) of this section. The landfill owner or operator must compare the resulting NMOC mass emission rate to the standard of 34 megagrams per year.

(i) If the NMOC mass emission rate as calculated using the Tier 2 site-specific NMOC concentration and Tier 3 site-specific methane generation rate is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year, the owner or operator must either:

(A) Submit a gas collection and control system design plan within 1 year as specified in § 60.38f(d) and install and operate a gas collection and control system within 30 months according to § 60.33f(b) and (c); or

(B) Conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration using the Tier 4 procedures specified in paragraph (a)(6) of this section.

(ii) If the NMOC mass emission rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, then the owner or operator must recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate annually using Equation 1 or Equation 2 in paragraph (a)(1) of this section and using the site-specific Tier 2 NMOC concentration and Tier 3 methane generation rate constant and submit a periodic NMOC emission rate report as provided in § 60.38f(c). The calculation of the methane generation rate constant is performed only once, and the value obtained from this test must be used in all subsequent annual NMOC emission rate calculations.

(5) *Other methods.* The owner or operator may use other methods to determine the NMOC concentration or a site-specific methane generation rate constant as an alternative to the methods required in paragraphs (a)(3) and (4) of this section if the method has been approved by the Administrator.

(6) *Tier 4.* The landfill owner or operator must demonstrate that surface methane emissions are below 500 parts per million. Surface emission

monitoring must be conducted on a quarterly basis using the following procedures. Tier 4 is allowed only if the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that NMOC emissions are greater than or equal to 34 Mg/yr but less than 50 Mg/yr using Tier 1 or Tier 2. If both Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicate NMOC emissions are 50 Mg/yr or greater, then Tier 4 cannot be used. In addition, the landfill must meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(6)(viii) of this section.

(i) The owner or operator must measure surface concentrations of methane along the entire perimeter of the landfill and along a pattern that traverses the landfill at no more than 30-meter intervals using an organic vapor analyzer, flame ionization detector, or other portable monitor meeting the specifications provided in § 60.36f(d).

(ii) The background concentration must be determined by moving the probe inlet upwind and downwind at least 30 meters from the waste mass boundary of the landfill.

(iii) Surface emission monitoring must be performed in accordance with section 8.3.1 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, except that the probe inlet must be placed no more than 5 centimeters above the landfill surface; the constant measurement of distance above the surface should be based on a mechanical device such as with a wheel on a pole.

(A) The owner or operator must use a wind barrier, similar to a funnel, when onsite average wind speed exceeds 4 miles per hour or 2 meters per second or gust exceeding 10 miles per hour. Average on-site wind speed must also be determined in an open area at 5-minute intervals using an on-site anemometer with a continuous recorder and data logger for the entire duration of the monitoring event. The wind barrier must surround the SEM monitor, and must be placed on the ground, to ensure wind turbulence is blocked. SEM cannot be conducted if average wind speed exceeds 25 miles per hour.

(B) Landfill surface areas where visual observations indicate elevated concentrations of landfill gas, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover, and all cover penetrations must also be monitored using a device meeting the specifications provided in § 60.36f(d).

(iv) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with the Tier 4 provisions in paragraph (a)(6) of this section must maintain records of surface emission monitoring as provided in § 60.39f(g) and submit a Tier 4 surface emissions report as provided in § 60.38f(d)(4)(iii).

(v) If there is any measured concentration of methane of 500 parts per million or greater from the surface of the landfill, the owner or operator must submit a gas collection and control system design plan within 1 year of the first measured concentration of methane of 500 parts per million or greater from the surface of the landfill according to § 60.38f(d) and install and operate a gas collection and control system according to § 60.33f(b) and (c) within 30 months of the most recent NMOC emission rate report in which the NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 megagrams per year based on Tier 2.

(vi) If after four consecutive quarterly monitoring periods at a landfill, other than a closed landfill, there is no measured concentration of methane of

500 parts per million or greater from the surface of the landfill, the owner or operator must continue quarterly surface emission monitoring using the methods specified in this section.

(vii) If after four consecutive quarterly monitoring periods at a closed landfill there is no measured concentration of methane of 500 parts per million or greater from the surface of the landfill, the owner or operator must conduct annual surface emission monitoring using the methods specified in this section.

(viii) If a landfill has installed and operates a collection and control system that is not required by this subpart, then the collection and control system must meet the following criteria:

(A) The gas collection and control system must have operated for at least 6,570 out of 8,760 hours preceding the Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring demonstration.

(B) During the Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring demonstration, the gas collection and control system must operate as it normally would to collect and control as much landfill gas as possible.

(b) After the installation and startup of a collection and control system in compliance with this subpart, the owner or operator must calculate the NMOC emission rate for purposes of determining when the system can be capped, removed, or decommissioned as provided in § 60.33f(f), using Equation 3:

$$M_{\text{NMOC}} = 1.89 \times 10^{-3} Q_{\text{LFG}} C_{\text{NMOC}} \quad (\text{Eq. 3})$$

Where:

M_{NMOC} = Mass emission rate of NMOC, megagrams per year.

Q_{LFG} = Flow rate of landfill gas, cubic meters per minute.

C_{NMOC} = NMOC concentration, parts per million by volume as hexane.

(1) The flow rate of landfill gas, Q_{LFG} , must be determined by measuring the total landfill gas flow rate at the common header pipe that leads to the control system using a gas flow measuring device calibrated according to the provisions of section 10 of Method 2E of appendix A of this part.

(2) The average NMOC concentration, C_{NMOC} , must be determined by collecting and analyzing landfill gas sampled from the common header pipe before the gas moving or condensate removal equipment using the procedures in Method 25 or Method 25C of appendix A of this part. The sample location on the common header pipe must be before any condensate removal or other gas refining units. The landfill owner or operator must divide the NMOC concentration from Method 25 or Method 25C by six to convert from C_{NMOC} as carbon to C_{NMOC} as hexane.

(3) The owner or operator may use another method to determine landfill gas flow rate and NMOC concentration if the method has been approved by the Administrator.

(i) Within 60 days after the date of calculating the NMOC emission rate for

purposes of determining when the system can be capped or removed, the owner or operator must submit the results according to § 60.38f(j)(2).

(ii) [Reserved]

(c) When calculating emissions for Prevention of Significant Deterioration purposes, the owner or operator of each MSW landfill subject to the provisions of this subpart must estimate the NMOC emission rate for comparison to the Prevention of Significant Deterioration major source and significance levels in § 51.166 or § 52.21 of this chapter using Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources (AP-42) or other approved measurement procedures.

(d) For the performance test required in § 60.33f(c)(1), the net heating value of the combusted landfill gas as determined in § 60.18(f)(3) is calculated from the concentration of methane in the landfill gas as measured by Method 3C. A minimum of three 30-minute Method 3C samples are determined. The measurement of other organic components, hydrogen, and carbon monoxide is not applicable. Method 3C may be used to determine the landfill gas molecular weight for calculating the flare gas exit velocity under § 60.18(f)(4).

(1) Within 60 days after the date of completing each performance test (as defined in § 60.8), the owner or operator must submit the results of the

performance tests required by paragraph (b) or (d) of this section, including any associated fuel analyses, according to § 60.38f(j)(1).

(2) [Reserved]

(e) For the performance test required in § 60.33f(c)(2), Method 25 or 25C (Method 25C may be used at the inlet only) of appendix A of this part must be used to determine compliance with the 98 weight-percent efficiency or the 20 parts per million by volume outlet NMOC concentration level, unless another method to demonstrate compliance has been approved by the Administrator as provided by § 60.38f(d)(2). Method 3, 3A, or 3C must be used to determine oxygen for correcting the NMOC concentration as hexane to 3 percent. In cases where the outlet concentration is less than 50 ppm NMOC as carbon (8 ppm NMOC as hexane), Method 25A should be used in place of Method 25. Method 18 may be used in conjunction with Method 25A on a limited basis (compound specific, e.g., methane) or Method 3C may be used to determine methane. The methane as carbon should be subtracted from the Method 25A total hydrocarbon value as carbon to give NMOC concentration as carbon. The landfill owner or operator must divide the NMOC concentration as carbon by 6 to convert the C_{NMOC} as carbon to C_{NMOC} as hexane. Equation 4 must be used to calculate efficiency:

$$\text{Control Efficiency} = (\text{NMOC}_{\text{in}} - \text{NMOC}_{\text{out}}) / (\text{NMOC}_{\text{in}}) \quad (\text{Eq. 4})$$

Where:

$NMOC_{in}$ = Mass of NMOC entering control device.

$NMOC_{out}$ = Mass of NMOC exiting control device.

(1) Within 60 days after the date of completing each performance test (as defined in § 60.8), the owner or operator must submit the results of the performance tests, including any associated fuel analyses, according to § 60.38f(j)(1).

(2) [Reserved]

§ 60.36f Compliance provisions.

For approval, a state plan must include the compliance provisions in this section.

(a) Except as provided in § 60.38f(d)(2), the specified methods in paragraphs (a)(1) through (6) of this section must be used to determine whether the gas collection system is in compliance with § 60.33f(b)(2).

(1) For the purposes of calculating the maximum expected gas generation flow rate from the landfill to determine compliance with § 60.33f(b)(2)(i), either Equation 5 or Equation 6 in paragraph (a)(1)(i) or (ii) of this section must be used. The methane generation rate

constant (k) and methane generation potential (L_o) kinetic factors should be those published in the most recent AP-42 or other site-specific values demonstrated to be appropriate and approved by the Administrator. If k has been determined as specified in § 60.35f(a)(4), the value of k determined from the test must be used. A value of no more than 15 years must be used for the intended use period of the gas mover equipment. The active life of the landfill is the age of the landfill plus the estimated number of years until closure.

(i) For sites with unknown year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate:

$$Q_m = 2L_oR (e^{-kc} - e^{-kt}) \quad (\text{Eq. 5})$$

Where:

Q_m = Maximum expected gas generation flow rate, cubic meters per year.

L_o = Methane generation potential, cubic meters per megagram solid waste.

R = Average annual acceptance rate, megagrams per year.

k = Methane generation rate constant, year⁻¹.

t = Age of the landfill at equipment installation plus the time the owner or operator intends to use the gas mover equipment or active life of the landfill, whichever is less. If the equipment is

installed after closure, t is the age of the landfill at installation, years.

c = Time since closure, years (for an active landfill c = 0 and $e^{-kc} = 1$).

(ii) For sites with known year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate:

$$Q_M = \sum_{i=1}^n 2kL_oM_i(e^{-kt_i}) \quad (\text{Eq. 6})$$

Where:

Q_M = Maximum expected gas generation flow rate, cubic meters per year.

k = Methane generation rate constant, year⁻¹.

L_o = Methane generation potential, cubic meters per megagram solid waste.

M_i = Mass of solid waste in the ith section, megagrams.

t_i = Age of the ith section, years.

(iii) If a collection and control system has been installed, actual flow data may be used to project the maximum expected gas generation flow rate instead of, or in conjunction with, Equation 5 or Equation 6 in paragraph (a)(1)(i) or (ii) of this section. If the landfill is still accepting waste, the actual measured flow data will not equal the maximum expected gas generation rate, so calculations using Equation 5 or Equation 6 or other methods must be used to predict the maximum expected gas generation rate over the intended period of use of the gas control system equipment.

(2) For the purposes of determining sufficient density of gas collectors for compliance with § 60.33f(b)(2)(ii), the owner or operator must design a system of vertical wells, horizontal collectors, or other collection devices, satisfactory to the Administrator, capable of controlling and extracting gas from all portions of the landfill sufficient to meet

all operational and performance standards.

(3) For the purpose of demonstrating whether the gas collection system flow rate is sufficient to determine compliance with § 60.33f(b)(2)(iii), the owner or operator must measure gauge pressure in the gas collection header applied to each individual well monthly. If a positive pressure exists, action must be initiated to correct the exceedance within 5 calendar days, except for the three conditions allowed under § 60.34f(b). Any attempted corrective measure must not cause exceedances of other operational or performance standards.

(i) If negative pressure cannot be achieved without excess air infiltration within 15 calendar days of the first measurement of positive pressure, the owner or operator must conduct a root cause analysis and correct the exceedance as soon as practicable, but not later than 60 days after positive pressure was first measured. The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.39f(e)(3).

(ii) If corrective actions cannot be fully implemented within 60 days following the positive pressure measurement for which the root cause analysis was required, the owner or

operator must also conduct a corrective action analysis and develop an implementation schedule to complete the corrective action(s) as soon as practicable, but no more than 120 days following the positive pressure measurement. The owner or operator must submit the items listed in § 60.38f(h)(7) as part of the next annual report. The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.39f(e)(4).

(iii) If corrective action is expected to take longer than 120 days to complete after the initial exceedance, the owner or operator must submit the root cause analysis, corrective action analysis, and corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator, according to § 60.38f(h)(7) and (k). The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.39f(e)(5).

(4) [Reserved]

(5) For the purpose of identifying whether excess air infiltration into the landfill is occurring, the owner or operator must monitor each well monthly for temperature as provided in § 60.34f(c). If a well exceeds the operating parameter for temperature, action must be initiated to correct the exceedance within 5 calendar days. Any attempted corrective measure must not

cause exceedances of other operational or performance standards.

(i) If a landfill gas temperature less than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) cannot be achieved within 15 calendar days of the first measurement of landfill gas temperature greater than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit), the owner or operator must conduct a root cause analysis and correct the exceedance as soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days after a landfill gas temperature greater than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) was first measured. The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.39f(e)(3).

(ii) If corrective actions cannot be fully implemented within 60 days following the positive pressure measurement for which the root cause analysis was required, the owner or operator must also conduct a corrective action analysis and develop an implementation schedule to complete the corrective action(s) as soon as practicable, but no more than 120 days following the measurement of landfill gas temperature greater than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit). The owner or operator must submit the items listed in § 60.38f(h)(7) as part of the next annual report. The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.39f(e)(4).

(iii) If corrective action is expected to take longer than 120 days to complete after the initial exceedance, the owner or operator must submit the root cause analysis, corrective action analysis, and corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator, according to § 60.38f(h)(7) and (k). The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.39f(e)(5).

(6) An owner or operator seeking to demonstrate compliance with § 60.33f(b)(2)(iv) through the use of a collection system not conforming to the specifications provided in § 60.40f must provide information satisfactory to the Administrator as specified in § 60.38f(d)(3) demonstrating that off-site migration is being controlled.

(b) For purposes of compliance with § 60.34f(a), each owner or operator of a controlled landfill must place each well or design component as specified in the approved design plan as provided in § 60.38f(d). Each well must be installed no later than 60 days after the date on which the initial solid waste has been in place for a period of:

(1) Five (5) years or more if active; or
(2) Two (2) years or more if closed or at final grade.

(c) The following procedures must be used for compliance with the surface

methane operational standard as provided in § 60.34f(d):

(1) After installation and startup of the gas collection system, the owner or operator must monitor surface concentrations of methane along the entire perimeter of the collection area and along a pattern that traverses the landfill at no more than 30-meter intervals (or a site-specific established spacing) for each collection area on a quarterly basis using an organic vapor analyzer, flame ionization detector, or other portable monitor meeting the specifications provided in paragraph (d) of this section.

(2) The background concentration must be determined by moving the probe inlet upwind and downwind outside the boundary of the landfill at a distance of at least 30 meters from the perimeter wells.

(3) Surface emission monitoring must be performed in accordance with section 8.3.1 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, except that the probe inlet must be placed within 5 to 10 centimeters of the ground. Monitoring must be performed during typical meteorological conditions.

(4) Any reading of 500 parts per million or more above background at any location must be recorded as a monitored exceedance and the actions specified in paragraphs (c)(4)(i) through (v) of this section must be taken. As long as the specified actions are taken, the exceedance is not a violation of the operational requirements of § 60.34f(d).

(i) The location of each monitored exceedance must be marked and the location and concentration recorded. For location, you must determine the latitude and longitude coordinates using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 4 meters. The coordinates must be in decimal degrees with at least five decimal places.

(ii) Cover maintenance or adjustments to the vacuum of the adjacent wells to increase the gas collection in the vicinity of each exceedance must be made and the location must be re-monitored within 10 calendar days of detecting the exceedance.

(iii) If the re-monitoring of the location shows a second exceedance, additional corrective action must be taken and the location must be monitored again within 10 days of the second exceedance. If the re-monitoring shows a third exceedance for the same location, the action specified in paragraph (c)(4)(v) of this section must be taken, and no further monitoring of that location is required until the action specified in paragraph (c)(4)(v) of this section has been taken.

(iv) Any location that initially showed an exceedance but has a methane concentration less than 500 parts per million methane above background at the 10-day re-monitoring specified in paragraph (c)(4)(ii) or (iii) of this section must be re-monitored 1 month from the initial exceedance. If the 1-month re-monitoring shows a concentration less than 500 parts per million above background, no further monitoring of that location is required until the next quarterly monitoring period. If the 1-month re-monitoring shows an exceedance, the actions specified in paragraph (c)(4)(iii) or (v) of this section must be taken.

(v) For any location where monitored methane concentration equals or exceeds 500 parts per million above background three times within a quarterly period, a new well or other collection device must be installed within 120 calendar days of the initial exceedance. An alternative remedy to the exceedance, such as upgrading the blower, header pipes or control device, and a corresponding timeline for installation may be submitted to the Administrator for approval.

(5) The owner or operator must implement a program to monitor for cover integrity and implement cover repairs as necessary on a monthly basis.

(d) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with the provisions in paragraph (c) of this section or § 60.35f(a)(6) must comply with the following instrumentation specifications and procedures for surface emission monitoring devices:

(1) The portable analyzer must meet the instrument specifications provided in section 6 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, except that “methane” replaces all references to “VOC”.

(2) The calibration gas must be methane, diluted to a nominal concentration of 500 parts per million in air.

(3) To meet the performance evaluation requirements in section 8.1 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, the instrument evaluation procedures of section 8.1 of Method 21 must be used.

(4) The calibration procedures provided in sections 8 and 10 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part must be followed immediately before commencing a surface monitoring survey.

(e) The provisions of this subpart apply at all times, including periods of startup, shutdown, or malfunction. During periods of startup, shutdown, and malfunction, you must comply with the work practice specified in § 60.34f(e) in lieu of the compliance provisions in § 60.36f.

§ 60.37f Monitoring of operations.

For approval, a state plan must include the monitoring provisions in this section, except as provided in § 60.38f(d)(2).

(a) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.33f(b)(2) for an active gas collection system must install a sampling port and a thermometer, other temperature measuring device, or an access port for temperature measurements at each wellhead and:

(1) Measure the gauge pressure in the gas collection header on a monthly basis as provided in § 60.36f(a)(3); and

(2) Monitor nitrogen or oxygen concentration in the landfill gas on a monthly basis as follows:

(i) The nitrogen level must be determined using Method 3C, unless an alternative test method is established as allowed by § 60.38f(d)(2).

(ii) Unless an alternative test method is established as allowed by § 60.38f(d)(2), the oxygen level must be determined by an oxygen meter using Method 3A, 3C, or ASTM D6522–11 (incorporated by reference, see § 60.17). Determine the oxygen level by an oxygen meter using Method 3A, 3C, or ASTM D6522–11 (if sample location is prior to combustion) except that:

(A) The span must be set between 10 and 12 percent oxygen;

(B) A data recorder is not required;

(C) Only two calibration gases are required, a zero and span;

(D) A calibration error check is not required; and

(E) The allowable sample bias, zero drift, and calibration drift are ± 10 percent.

(iii) A portable gas composition analyzer may be used to monitor the oxygen levels provided:

(A) The analyzer is calibrated; and

(B) The analyzer meets all quality assurance and quality control requirements for Method 3A or ASTM D6522–11 (incorporated by reference, see § 60.17).

(3) Monitor temperature of the landfill gas on a monthly basis as provided in § 60.36f(a)(5). The temperature measuring device must be calibrated annually using the procedure in this part 60, appendix A–1, Method 2, Section 10.3.

(b) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.33f(c) using an enclosed combustor must calibrate, maintain, and operate according to the manufacturer's specifications, the following equipment:

(1) A temperature monitoring device equipped with a continuous recorder and having a minimum accuracy of ± 1 percent of the temperature being measured expressed in degrees Celsius

or ± 0.5 degrees Celsius, whichever is greater. A temperature monitoring device is not required for boilers or process heaters with design heat input capacity equal to or greater than 44 megawatts.

(2) A device that records flow to the control device and bypass of the control device (if applicable). The owner or operator must:

(i) Install, calibrate, and maintain a gas flow rate measuring device that must record the flow to the control device at least every 15 minutes; and

(ii) Secure the bypass line valve in the closed position with a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration. A visual inspection of the seal or closure mechanism must be performed at least once every month to ensure that the valve is maintained in the closed position and that the gas flow is not diverted through the bypass line.

(c) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.33f(c) using a non-enclosed flare must install, calibrate, maintain, and operate according to the manufacturer's specifications the following equipment:

(1) A heat sensing device, such as an ultraviolet beam sensor or thermocouple, at the pilot light or the flame itself to indicate the continuous presence of a flame.

(2) A device that records flow to the flare and bypass of the flare (if applicable). The owner or operator must:

(i) Install, calibrate, and maintain a gas flow rate measuring device that records the flow to the control device at least every 15 minutes; and

(ii) Secure the bypass line valve in the closed position with a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration. A visual inspection of the seal or closure mechanism must be performed at least once every month to ensure that the valve is maintained in the closed position and that the gas flow is not diverted through the bypass line.

(d) Each owner or operator seeking to demonstrate compliance with § 60.33f(c) using a device other than a non-enclosed flare or an enclosed combustor or a treatment system must provide information satisfactory to the Administrator as provided in § 60.38f(d)(2) describing the operation of the control device, the operating parameters that would indicate proper performance, and appropriate monitoring procedures. The Administrator must review the information and either approve it, or request that additional information be submitted. The Administrator may specify additional appropriate monitoring procedures.

(e) Each owner or operator seeking to install a collection system that does not meet the specifications in § 60.40f or seeking to monitor alternative parameters to those required by §§ 60.34f through 60.37f must provide information satisfactory to the Administrator as provided in § 60.38f(d)(2) and (3) describing the design and operation of the collection system, the operating parameters that would indicate proper performance, and appropriate monitoring procedures. The Administrator may specify additional appropriate monitoring procedures.

(f) Each owner or operator seeking to demonstrate compliance with the 500 parts per million surface methane operational standard in § 60.34f(d) must monitor surface concentrations of methane according to the procedures provided in § 60.36f(c) and the instrument specifications in § 60.36f(d). Any closed landfill that has no monitored exceedances of the operational standard in three consecutive quarterly monitoring periods may skip to annual monitoring. Any methane reading of 500 parts per million or more above background detected during the annual monitoring returns the frequency for that landfill to quarterly monitoring.

(g) Each owner or operator seeking to demonstrate compliance with the control system requirements in § 60.33f(c) using a landfill gas treatment system must maintain and operate all monitoring systems associated with the treatment system in accordance with the site-specific treatment system monitoring plan required in § 60.39f(b)(5)(ii) and must calibrate, maintain, and operate according to the manufacturer's specifications a device that records flow to the treatment system and bypass of the treatment system (if applicable). The owner or operator must:

(1) Install, calibrate, and maintain a gas flow rate measuring device that records the flow to the treatment system at least every 15 minutes; and

(2) Secure the bypass line valve in the closed position with a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration. A visual inspection of the seal or closure mechanism must be performed at least once every month to ensure that the valve is maintained in the closed position and that the gas flow is not diverted through the bypass line.

(h) The monitoring requirements of paragraphs (b), (c) (d) and (g) of this section apply at all times the affected source is operating, except for periods of monitoring system malfunctions, repairs associated with monitoring system malfunctions, and required monitoring

system quality assurance or quality control activities. A monitoring system malfunction is any sudden, infrequent, not reasonably preventable failure of the monitoring system to provide valid data. Monitoring system failures that are caused in part by poor maintenance or careless operation are not malfunctions. You are required to complete monitoring system repairs in response to monitoring system malfunctions and to return the monitoring system to operation as expeditiously as practicable.

§ 60.38f Reporting guidelines.

For approval, a state plan must include the reporting provisions listed in this section, as applicable, except as provided under §§ 60.24 and 60.38f(d)(2).

(a) *Design capacity report.* For existing MSW landfills subject to this subpart, the initial design capacity report must be submitted no later than 90 days after the effective date of EPA approval of the state's plan under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act. The initial design capacity report must contain the following information:

(1) A map or plot of the landfill, providing the size and location of the landfill, and identifying all areas where solid waste may be landfilled according to the permit issued by the state, local, or tribal agency responsible for regulating the landfill.

(2) The maximum design capacity of the landfill. Where the maximum design capacity is specified in the permit issued by the state, local, or tribal agency responsible for regulating the landfill, a copy of the permit specifying the maximum design capacity may be submitted as part of the report. If the maximum design capacity of the landfill is not specified in the permit, the maximum design capacity must be calculated using good engineering practices. The calculations must be provided, along with the relevant parameters as part of the report. The landfill may calculate design capacity in either megagrams or cubic meters for comparison with the exemption values. If the owner or operator chooses to convert the design capacity from volume to mass or from mass to volume to demonstrate its design capacity is less than 2.5 million megagrams or 2.5 million cubic meters, the calculation must include a site-specific density, which must be recalculated annually. Any density conversions must be documented and submitted with the design capacity report. The state, local, or tribal agency or the Administrator may request other reasonable information as may be necessary to

verify the maximum design capacity of the landfill.

(b) *Amended design capacity report.* An amended design capacity report must be submitted providing notification of an increase in the design capacity of the landfill, within 90 days of an increase in the maximum design capacity of the landfill to meet or exceed 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters. This increase in design capacity may result from an increase in the permitted volume of the landfill or an increase in the density as documented in the annual recalculation required in § 60.39f(f).

(c) *NMOC emission rate report.* For existing MSW landfills covered by this subpart with a design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters, the NMOC emission rate report must be submitted following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section no later than 90 days after the effective date of EPA approval of the state's plan under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act. The NMOC emission rate report must be submitted to the Administrator annually following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section, except as provided for in paragraph (c)(3) of this section. The Administrator may request such additional information as may be necessary to verify the reported NMOC emission rate.

(1) The NMOC emission rate report must contain an annual or 5-year estimate of the NMOC emission rate calculated using the formula and procedures provided in § 60.35f(a) or (b), as applicable.

(2) The NMOC emission rate report must include all the data, calculations, sample reports and measurements used to estimate the annual or 5-year emissions.

(3) If the estimated NMOC emission rate as reported in the annual report to the Administrator is less than 34 megagrams per year in each of the next 5 consecutive years, the owner or operator may elect to submit, following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section, an estimate of the NMOC emission rate for the next 5-year period in lieu of the annual report. This estimate must include the current amount of solid waste-in-place and the estimated waste acceptance rate for each year of the 5 years for which an NMOC emission rate is estimated. All data and calculations upon which this estimate is based must be provided to the Administrator. This estimate must be revised at least once every 5 years. If the actual waste acceptance rate exceeds the estimated waste acceptance rate in any year reported in the 5-year estimate, a

revised 5-year estimate must be submitted to the Administrator. The revised estimate must cover the 5-year period beginning with the year in which the actual waste acceptance rate exceeded the estimated waste acceptance rate.

(4) Each owner or operator subject to the requirements of this subpart is exempted from the requirements to submit an NMOC emission rate report, after installing a collection and control system that complies with § 60.33f(b) and (c), during such time as the collection and control system is in operation and in compliance with §§ 60.34f and 60.36f.

(d) *Collection and control system design plan.* The state plan must include a process for state review and approval of the site-specific design plan for each gas collection and control system. The collection and control system design plan must be prepared and approved by a professional engineer and must meet the following requirements:

(1) The collection and control system as described in the design plan must meet the design requirements in § 60.33f(b) and (c).

(2) The collection and control system design plan must include any alternatives to the operational standards, test methods, procedures, compliance measures, monitoring, recordkeeping, or reporting provisions of §§ 60.34f through 60.39f proposed by the owner or operator.

(3) The collection and control system design plan must either conform to specifications for active collection systems in § 60.40f or include a demonstration to the Administrator's satisfaction of the sufficiency of the alternative provisions to § 60.40f.

(4) Each owner or operator of an MSW landfill having a design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters must submit a copy of the collection and control system design plan cover page that contains the engineer's seal to the Administrator within 1 year of the first NMOC emission rate report in which the NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 megagrams per year, except as follows:

(i) If the owner or operator elects to recalculate the NMOC emission rate after Tier 2 NMOC sampling and analysis as provided in § 60.35f(a)(3) and the resulting rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, annual periodic reporting must be resumed, using the Tier 2 determined site-specific NMOC concentration, until the calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year or

the landfill is closed. The revised NMOC emission rate report, with the recalculated NMOC emission rate based on NMOC sampling and analysis, must be submitted, following the procedures in paragraph (j)(2) of this section, within 180 days of the first calculated exceedance of 34 megagrams per year.

(ii) If the owner or operator elects to recalculate the NMOC emission rate after determining a site-specific methane generation rate constant k , as provided in Tier 3 in § 60.35f(a)(4), and the resulting NMOC emission rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, annual periodic reporting must be resumed. The resulting site-specific methane generation rate constant k must be used in the NMOC emission rate calculation until such time as the emissions rate calculation results in an exceedance. The revised NMOC emission rate report based on the provisions of § 60.35f(a)(4) and the resulting site-specific methane generation rate constant k must be submitted, following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section, to the Administrator within 1 year of the first calculated NMOC emission rate equaling or exceeding 34 megagrams per year.

(iii) If the owner or operator elects to demonstrate that site-specific surface methane emissions are below 500 parts per million methane, based on the provisions of § 60.35f(a)(6), then the owner or operator must submit annually a Tier 4 surface emissions report as specified in this paragraph (d)(4)(iii) following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section until a surface emissions readings of 500 parts per million methane or greater is found. If the Tier 4 surface emissions report shows no surface emissions readings of 500 parts per million methane or greater for four consecutive quarters at a closed landfill, then the landfill owner or operator may reduce Tier 4 monitoring from a quarterly to an annual frequency. The Administrator may request such additional information as may be necessary to verify the reported instantaneous surface emission readings. The Tier 4 surface emissions report must clearly identify the location, date and time (to the nearest second), average wind speeds including wind gusts, and reading (in parts per million) of any value 500 parts per million methane or greater, other than non-repeatable, momentary readings. For location, you must determine the latitude and longitude coordinates using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 4 meters. The coordinates must be in decimal degrees with at least five decimal places. The Tier 4 surface emission report should also include the

results of the most recent Tier 1 and Tier 2 results in order to verify that the landfill does not exceed 50 Mg/yr of NMOC.

(A) The initial Tier 4 surface emissions report must be submitted annually, starting within 30 days of completing the fourth quarter of Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring that demonstrates that site-specific surface methane emissions are below 500 parts per million methane, and following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section.

(B) The Tier 4 surface emissions rate report must be submitted within 1 year of the first measured surface exceedance of 500 parts per million methane, following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section.

(iv) If the landfill is in the closed landfill subcategory, the owner or operator must submit a collection and control system design plan to the Administrator within 1 year of the first NMOC emission rate report in which the NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 50 megagrams per year, except as follows:

(A) If the owner or operator elects to recalculate the NMOC emission rate after Tier 2 NMOC sampling and analysis as provided in § 60.35f(a)(3) and the resulting rate is less than 50 megagrams per year, annual periodic reporting must be resumed, using the Tier 2 determined site-specific NMOC concentration, until the calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 50 megagrams per year or the landfill is closed. The revised NMOC emission rate report, with the recalculated NMOC emission rate based on NMOC sampling and analysis, must be submitted, following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section, within 180 days of the first calculated exceedance of 50 megagrams per year.

(B) If the owner or operator elects to recalculate the NMOC emission rate after determining a site-specific methane generation rate constant k , as provided in Tier 3 in § 60.35f(a)(4), and the resulting NMOC emission rate is less than 50 megagrams per year, annual periodic reporting must be resumed. The resulting site-specific methane generation rate constant k must be used in the NMOC emission rate calculation until such time as the emissions rate calculation results in an exceedance. The revised NMOC emission rate report based on the provisions of § 60.35f(a)(4) and the resulting site-specific methane generation rate constant k must be submitted, following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section, to the Administrator within 1

year of the first calculated NMOC emission rate equaling or exceeding 50 megagrams per year.

(C) The landfill owner or operator elects to demonstrate surface emissions are low, consistent with the provisions in paragraph (d)(4)(iii) of this section.

(D) The landfill has already submitted a gas collection and control system design plan consistent with the provisions of subpart WWW of this part; 40 CFR part 62, subpart GGG; or a state plan implementing subpart Cc of this part.

(5) The landfill owner or operator must notify the Administrator that the design plan is completed and submit a copy of the plan's signature page. The Administrator has 90 days to decide whether the design plan should be submitted for review. If the Administrator chooses to review the plan, the approval process continues as described in paragraph (c)(6) of this section. However, if the Administrator indicates that submission is not required or does not respond within 90 days, the landfill owner or operator can continue to implement the plan with the recognition that the owner or operator is proceeding at their own risk. In the event that the design plan is required to be modified to obtain approval, the owner or operator must take any steps necessary to conform any prior actions to the approved design plan and any failure to do so could result in an enforcement action.

(6) Upon receipt of an initial or revised design plan, the Administrator must review the information submitted under paragraphs (d)(1) through (3) of this section and either approve it, disapprove it, or request that additional information be submitted. Because of the many site-specific factors involved with landfill gas system design, alternative systems may be necessary. A wide variety of system designs are possible, such as vertical wells, combination horizontal and vertical collection systems, or horizontal trenches only, leachate collection components, and passive systems. If the Administrator does not approve or disapprove the design plan, or does not request that additional information be submitted within 90 days of receipt, then the owner or operator may continue with implementation of the design plan, recognizing they would be proceeding at their own risk.

(7) If the owner or operator chooses to demonstrate compliance with the emission control requirements of this subpart using a treatment system as defined in this subpart, then the owner or operator must prepare a site-specific

treatment system monitoring plan as specified in § 60.39f(b)(5).

(e) *Revised design plan.* The owner or operator who has already been required to submit a design plan under paragraph (d) of this section, or under subpart WWW of this part; 40 CFR part 62, subpart GGG; or a state plan implementing subpart Cc of this part, must submit a revised design plan to the Administrator for approval as follows:

(1) At least 90 days before expanding operations to an area not covered by the previously approved design plan.

(2) Prior to installing or expanding the gas collection system in a way that is not consistent with the design plan that was submitted to the Administrator according to paragraph (d) of this section.

(f) *Closure report.* Each owner or operator of a controlled landfill must submit a closure report to the Administrator within 30 days of ceasing waste acceptance. The Administrator may request additional information as may be necessary to verify that permanent closure has taken place in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 258.60. If a closure report has been submitted to the Administrator, no additional wastes may be placed into the landfill without filing a notification of modification as described under § 60.7(a)(4).

(g) *Equipment removal report.* Each owner or operator of a controlled landfill must submit an equipment removal report to the Administrator 30 days prior to removal or cessation of operation of the control equipment.

(1) The equipment removal report must contain the following items:

(i) A copy of the closure report submitted in accordance with paragraph (f) of this section; and

(ii) A copy of the initial performance test report demonstrating that the 15-year minimum control period has expired, unless the report of the results of the performance test has been submitted to the EPA via the EPA's CDX, or information that demonstrates that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows. In the equipment removal report, the process unit(s) tested, the pollutant(s) tested, and the date that such performance test was conducted may be submitted in lieu of the performance test report if the report has been previously submitted to the EPA's CDX; and

(iii) Dated copies of three successive NMOC emission rate reports demonstrating that the landfill is no longer producing 34 megagrams or greater of NMOC per year, unless the NMOC emission rate reports have been

submitted to the EPA via the EPA's CDX. If the NMOC emission rate reports have been previously submitted to the EPA's CDX, a statement that the NMOC emission rate reports have been submitted electronically and the dates that the reports were submitted to the EPA's CDX may be submitted in the equipment removal report in lieu of the NMOC emission rate reports; or

(iv) For the closed landfill subcategory, dated copies of three successive NMOC emission rate reports demonstrating that the landfill is no longer producing 50 megagrams or greater of NMOC per year, unless the NMOC emission rate reports have been submitted to the EPA via the EPA's CDX. If the NMOC emission rate reports have been previously submitted to the EPA's CDX, a statement that the NMOC emission rate reports have been submitted electronically and the dates that the reports were submitted to the EPA's CDX may be submitted in the equipment removal report in lieu of the NMOC emission rate reports.

(2) The Administrator may request such additional information as may be necessary to verify that all of the conditions for removal in § 60.33f(f) have been met.

(h) *Annual report.* The owner or operator of a landfill seeking to comply with § 60.33f(e)(2) using an active collection system designed in accordance with § 60.33f(b) must submit to the Administrator, following the procedures specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section, an annual report of the recorded information in paragraphs (h)(1) through (7) of this section. The initial annual report must be submitted within 180 days of installation and startup of the collection and control system. The initial annual report must include the initial performance test report required under § 60.8, as applicable, unless the report of the results of the performance test has been submitted to the EPA via the EPA's CDX. In the initial annual report, the process unit(s) tested, the pollutant(s) tested and the date that such performance test was conducted may be submitted in lieu of the performance test report if the report has been previously submitted to the EPA's CDX. The initial performance test report must be submitted, following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(1) of this section, no later than the date that the initial annual report is submitted. For enclosed combustion devices and flares, reportable exceedances are defined under § 60.39f(c)(1).

(1) Value and length of time for exceedance of applicable parameters

monitored under § 60.37f(a)(1), (b), (c), (d), and (g).

(2) Description and duration of all periods when the gas stream was diverted from the control device or treatment system through a bypass line or the indication of bypass flow as specified under § 60.37f.

(3) Description and duration of all periods when the control device or treatment system was not operating and length of time the control device or treatment system was not operating.

(4) All periods when the collection system was not operating.

(5) The location of each exceedance of the 500 parts per million methane concentration as provided in § 60.34f(d) and the concentration recorded at each location for which an exceedance was recorded in the previous month. For location, you must determine the latitude and longitude coordinates using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 4 meters. The coordinates must be in decimal degrees with at least five decimal places.

(6) The date of installation and the location of each well or collection system expansion added pursuant to § 60.36f(a)(3), (a)(5), (b), and (c)(4).

(7) For any corrective action analysis for which corrective actions are required in § 60.36f(a)(3) or (5) and that take more than 60 days to correct the exceedance, the root cause analysis conducted, including a description of the recommended corrective action(s), the date for corrective action(s) already completed following the positive pressure reading, and, for action(s) not already completed, a schedule for implementation, including proposed commencement and completion dates.

(i) *Initial performance test report.* Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.33f(c) must include the following information with the initial performance test report required under § 60.8:

(1) A diagram of the collection system showing collection system positioning including all wells, horizontal collectors, surface collectors, or other gas extraction devices, including the locations of any areas excluded from collection and the proposed sites for the future collection system expansion;

(2) The data upon which the sufficient density of wells, horizontal collectors, surface collectors, or other gas extraction devices and the gas mover equipment sizing are based;

(3) The documentation of the presence of asbestos or nondegradable material for each area from which collection wells have been excluded based on the presence of asbestos or nondegradable material;

(4) The sum of the gas generation flow rates for all areas from which collection wells have been excluded based on nonproductivity and the calculations of gas generation flow rate for each excluded area;

(5) The provisions for increasing gas mover equipment capacity with increased gas generation flow rate, if the present gas mover equipment is inadequate to move the maximum flow rate expected over the life of the landfill; and

(6) The provisions for the control of off-site migration.

(j) *Electronic reporting.* The owner or operator must submit reports electronically according to paragraphs (j)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) Within 60 days after the date of completing each performance test (as defined in § 60.8), the owner or operator must submit the results of each performance test according to the following procedures:

(i) For data collected using test methods supported by the EPA's Electronic Reporting Tool (ERT) as listed on the EPA's ERT Web site (https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ert/ert_info.html) at the time of the test, you must submit the results of the performance test to the EPA via the Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface (CEDRI). CEDRI can be accessed through the EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) (<https://cdx.epa.gov/>). Performance test data must be submitted in a file format generated through the use of the EPA's ERT or an alternative file format consistent with the extensible markup language (XML) schema listed on the EPA's ERT Web site, once the XML schema is available. If you claim that some of the performance test information being submitted is confidential business information (CBI), you must submit a complete file generated through the use of the EPA's ERT or an alternate electronic file consistent with the XML schema listed on the EPA's ERT Web site, including information claimed to be CBI, on a compact disc, flash drive or other commonly used electronic storage media to the EPA. The electronic media must be clearly marked as CBI and mailed to U.S. EPA/OAQPS/CORE CBI Office, Attention: Group Leader, Measurement Policy Group, MD C404-02, 4930 Old Page Rd., Durham, NC 27703. The same ERT or alternate file with the CBI omitted must be submitted to the EPA via the EPA's CDX as described earlier in this paragraph (j)(1)(i).

(ii) For data collected using test methods that are not supported by the

EPA's ERT as listed on the EPA's ERT Web site at the time of the test, you must submit the results of the performance test to the Administrator at the appropriate address listed in § 60.4.

(2) Each owner or operator required to submit reports following the procedure specified in this paragraph must submit reports to the EPA via the CEDRI. (CEDRI can be accessed through the EPA's CDX.) The owner or operator must use the appropriate electronic report in CEDRI for this subpart or an alternate electronic file format consistent with the XML schema listed on the CEDRI Web site (<https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/cedri/index.html>). If the reporting form specific to this subpart is not available in CEDRI at the time that the report is due, the owner or operator must submit the report to the Administrator at the appropriate address listed in § 60.4. Once the form has been available in CEDRI for 90 calendar days, the owner or operator must begin submitting all subsequent reports via CEDRI. The reports must be submitted by the deadlines specified in this subpart, regardless of the method in which the reports are submitted.

(k) *Corrective action and the corresponding timeline.* The owner or operator must submit according to paragraphs (k)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) For corrective action that is required according to § 60.36f(a)(3)(iii) or (a)(5)(iii) and is expected to take longer than 120 days after the initial exceedance to complete, you must submit the root cause analysis, corrective action analysis, and corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator as soon as practicable but no later than 75 days after the first measurement of positive pressure or temperature monitoring value of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) or above. The Administrator must approve the plan for corrective action and the corresponding timeline.

(2) For corrective action that is required according to § 60.36f(a)(3)(iii) or (a)(5)(iii) and is not completed within 60 days after the initial exceedance, you must submit a notification to the Administrator as soon as practicable but no later than 75 days after the first measurement of positive pressure or temperature exceedance.

(l) *Liquids addition.* The owner or operator of an affected landfill with a design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters that has employed leachate recirculation or added liquids based on a Research, Development, and Demonstration permit (issued through Resource Conservation and Recovery

Act, subtitle D, part 258) within the last 10 years must submit to the Administrator, annually, following the procedure specified in paragraph (j)(2) of this section, the following information:

(1) Volume of leachate recirculated (gallons per year) and the reported basis of those estimates (records or engineering estimates).

(2) Total volume of all other liquids added (gallons per year) and the reported basis of those estimates (records or engineering estimates).

(3) Surface area (acres) over which the leachate is recirculated (or otherwise applied).

(4) Surface area (acres) over which any other liquids are applied.

(5) The total waste disposed (megagrams) in the areas with recirculated leachate and/or added liquids based on on-site records to the extent data are available, or engineering estimates and the reported basis of those estimates.

(6) The annual waste acceptance rates (megagrams per year) in the areas with recirculated leachate and/or added liquids, based on on-site records to the extent data are available, or engineering estimates.

(7) The initial report must contain items in paragraph (l)(1) through (6) of this section per year for the most recent 365 days as well as for each of the previous 10 years, to the extent historical data are available in on-site records, and the report must be submitted no later than:

(i) September 27, 2017, for landfills that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction after July 17, 2014 but before August 29, 2016; or

(ii) 365 days after the date of commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction for landfills that commence construction, modification, or reconstruction after August 29, 2016.

(8) Subsequent annual reports must contain items in paragraph (l)(1) through (6) of this section for the 365-day period following the 365-day period included in the previous annual report, and the report must be submitted no later than 365 days after the date the previous report was submitted.

(9) Landfills in the closed landfill subcategory are exempt from reporting requirements contained in paragraphs (l)(1) through (7) of this section.

(10) Landfills may cease annual reporting of items in paragraphs (l)(1) through (6) of this section once they have submitted the closure report in § 60.38f(f).

(m) *Tier 4 notification.* (1) The owner or operator of an affected landfill with

a design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters must provide a notification of the date(s) upon which it intends to demonstrate site-specific surface methane emissions are below 500 parts per million methane, based on the Tier 4 provisions of § 60.35f(a)(6). The landfill must also include a description of the wind barrier to be used during the SEM in the notification. Notification must be postmarked not less than 30 days prior to such date.

(2) If there is a delay to the scheduled Tier 4 SEM date due to weather conditions, including not meeting the wind requirements in § 60.35f(a)(6)(iii)(A), the owner or operator of a landfill shall notify the Administrator by email or telephone no later than 48 hours before any known delay in the original test date, and arrange an updated date with the Administrator by mutual agreement.

§ 60.39f Recordkeeping guidelines.

For approval, a state plan must include the recordkeeping provisions in this section.

(a) Except as provided in § 60.38f(d)(2), each owner or operator of an MSW landfill subject to the provisions of § 60.33f(e) must keep for at least 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible, on-site records of the design capacity report that triggered § 60.33f(e), the current amount of solid waste in-place, and the year-by-year waste acceptance rate. Off-site records may be maintained if they are retrievable within 4 hours. Either paper copy or electronic formats are acceptable.

(b) Except as provided in § 60.38f(d)(2), each owner or operator of a controlled landfill must keep up-to-date, readily accessible records for the life of the control system equipment of the data listed in paragraphs (b)(1) through (5) of this section as measured during the initial performance test or compliance determination. Records of subsequent tests or monitoring must be maintained for a minimum of 5 years. Records of the control device vendor specifications must be maintained until removal.

(1) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.33f(b):

(i) The maximum expected gas generation flow rate as calculated in § 60.36f(a)(1). The owner or operator may use another method to determine the maximum gas generation flow rate, if the method has been approved by the Administrator.

(ii) The density of wells, horizontal collectors, surface collectors, or other

gas extraction devices determined using the procedures specified in § 60.40f(a)(1).

(2) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.33f(c) through use of an enclosed combustion device other than a boiler or process heater with a design heat input capacity equal to or greater than 44 megawatts:

(i) The average temperature measured at least every 15 minutes and averaged over the same time period of the performance test.

(ii) The percent reduction of NMOC determined as specified in § 60.33f(c)(2) achieved by the control device.

(3) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.33f(c)(2)(i) through use of a boiler or process heater of any size: A description of the location at which the collected gas vent stream is introduced into the boiler or process heater over the same time period of the performance testing.

(4) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.33f(c)(1) through use of a non-enclosed flare, the flare type (*i.e.*, steam-assisted, air-assisted, or non-assisted), all visible emission readings, heat content determination, flow rate or bypass flow rate measurements, and exit velocity determinations made during the performance test as specified in § 60.18; and continuous records of the flare pilot flame or flare flame monitoring and records of all periods of operations during which the pilot flame or the flare flame is absent.

(5) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.33f(c)(3) through use of a landfill gas treatment system:

(i) *Bypass records.* Records of the flow of landfill gas to, and bypass of, the treatment system.

(ii) *Site-specific treatment monitoring plan,* to include:

(A) Monitoring records of parameters that are identified in the treatment system monitoring plan and that ensure the treatment system is operating properly for each intended end use of the treated landfill gas. At a minimum, records should include records of filtration, de-watering, and compression parameters that ensure the treatment system is operating properly for each intended end use of the treated landfill gas.

(B) Monitoring methods, frequencies, and operating ranges for each monitored operating parameter based on

manufacturer's recommendations or engineering analysis for each intended end use of the treated landfill gas.

(C) Documentation of the monitoring methods and ranges, along with justification for their use.

(D) Identify who is responsible (by job title) for data collection.

(E) Processes and methods used to collect the necessary data.

(F) Description of the procedures and methods that are used for quality assurance, maintenance, and repair of all continuous monitoring systems.

(c) Except as provided in § 60.38f(d)(2), each owner or operator of a controlled landfill subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep for 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible continuous records of the equipment operating parameters specified to be monitored in § 60.37f as well as up-to-date, readily accessible records for periods of operation during which the parameter boundaries established during the most recent performance test are exceeded.

(1) The following constitute exceedances that must be recorded and reported under § 60.38f:

(i) For enclosed combustors except for boilers and process heaters with design heat input capacity of 44 megawatts (150 million British thermal unit per hour) or greater, all 3-hour periods of operation during which the average temperature was more than 28 degrees Celsius (82 degrees Fahrenheit) below the average combustion temperature during the most recent performance test at which compliance with § 60.33f(c) was determined.

(ii) For boilers or process heaters, whenever there is a change in the location at which the vent stream is introduced into the flame zone as required under paragraph (b)(3) of this section.

(2) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep up-to-date, readily accessible continuous records of the indication of flow to the control system and the indication of bypass flow or records of monthly inspections of car-seals or lock-and-key configurations used to seal bypass lines, specified under § 60.37f.

(3) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart who uses a boiler or process heater with a design heat input capacity of 44 megawatts or greater to comply with § 60.33f(c) must keep an up-to-date, readily accessible record of all periods of operation of the boiler or process heater. (Examples of such records could include records of steam use, fuel use, or monitoring data collected pursuant to other state, local,

tribal, or federal regulatory requirements.)

(4) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with the provisions of this subpart by use of a non-enclosed flare must keep up-to-date, readily accessible continuous records of the flame or flare pilot flame monitoring specified under § 60.37f(c), and up-to-date, readily accessible records of all periods of operation in which the flame or flare pilot flame is absent.

(5) Each owner or operator of a landfill seeking to comply with § 60.33f(e) using an active collection system designed in accordance with § 60.33f(b) must keep records of periods when the collection system or control device is not operating.

(d) Except as provided in § 60.38f(d)(2), each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep for the life of the collection system an up-to-date, readily accessible plot map showing each existing and planned collector in the system and providing a unique identification location label on each collector that matches the labeling on the plot map.

(1) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep up-to-date, readily accessible records of the installation date and location of all newly installed collectors as specified under § 60.36f(b).

(2) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep readily accessible documentation of the nature, date of deposition, amount, and location of asbestos-containing or nondegradable waste excluded from collection as provided in § 60.40f(a)(3)(i) as well as any nonproductive areas excluded from collection as provided in § 60.40f(a)(3)(ii).

(e) Except as provided in § 60.38f(d)(2), each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep for at least 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible records of the following:

(1) All collection and control system exceedances of the operational standards in § 60.34f, the reading in the subsequent month whether or not the second reading is an exceedance, and the location of each exceedance.

(2) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must also keep records of each wellhead temperature monitoring value of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) or above, each wellhead nitrogen level at or above 20 percent, and each wellhead oxygen level at or above 5 percent.

(3) For any root cause analysis for which corrective actions are required in § 60.36f(a)(3) or (5), keep a record of the

root cause analysis conducted, including a description of the recommended corrective action(s) taken, and the date(s) the corrective action(s) were completed.

(4) For any root cause analysis for which corrective actions are required in § 60.36f(a)(3)(ii) or (a)(5)(ii), keep a record of the root cause analysis conducted, the corrective action analysis, the date for corrective action(s) already completed following the positive pressure reading or high temperature reading, and, for action(s) not already completed, a schedule for implementation, including proposed commencement and completion dates.

(5) For any root cause analysis for which corrective actions are required in § 60.36f(a)(3)(iii) or (a)(5)(iii), keep a record of the root cause analysis conducted, the corrective action analysis, the date for corrective action(s) already completed following the positive pressure reading or high temperature reading, for action(s) not already completed, a schedule for implementation, including proposed commencement and completion dates, and a copy of any comments or final approval on the corrective action analysis or schedule from the regulatory agency.

(f) Landfill owners or operators who convert design capacity from volume to mass or mass to volume to demonstrate that landfill design capacity is less than 2.5 million megagrams or 2.5 million cubic meters, as provided in the definition of "design capacity", must keep readily accessible, on-site records of the annual recalculation of site-specific density, design capacity, and the supporting documentation. Off-site records may be maintained if they are retrievable within 4 hours. Either paper copy or electronic formats are acceptable.

(g) Landfill owners or operators seeking to demonstrate that site-specific surface methane emissions are below 500 parts per million by conducting surface emission monitoring under the Tier 4 procedures specified in § 60.35f(a)(6) must keep for at least 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible records of all surface emissions monitoring and information related to monitoring instrument calibrations conducted according to sections 8 and 10 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, including all of the following items:

(1) Calibration records:

(i) Date of calibration and initials of operator performing the calibration.

(ii) Calibration gas cylinder identification, certification date, and certified concentration.

(iii) Instrument scale(s) used.

(iv) A description of any corrective action taken if the meter readout could not be adjusted to correspond to the calibration gas value.

(v) If an owner or operator makes their own calibration gas, a description of the procedure used.

(2) Digital photographs of the instrument setup. The photographs must be time and date-stamped and taken at the first sampling location prior to sampling and at the last sampling location after sampling at the end of each sampling day, for the duration of the Tier 4 monitoring demonstration.

(3) Timestamp of each surface scan reading:

(i) Timestamp should be detailed to the nearest second, based on when the sample collection begins.

(ii) A log for the length of time each sample was taken using a stopwatch (e.g., the time the probe was held over the area).

(4) Location of each surface scan reading. The owner or operator must determine the coordinates using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 4 meters. Coordinates must be in decimal degrees with at least five decimal places.

(5) Monitored methane concentration (parts per million) of each reading.

(6) Background methane concentration (parts per million) after each instrument calibration test.

(7) Adjusted methane concentration using most recent calibration (parts per million).

(8) For readings taken at each surface penetration, the unique identification location label matching the label specified in paragraph (d) of this section.

(9) Records of the operating hours of the gas collection system for each destruction device.

(h) Except as provided in § 60.38f(d)(2), each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep for at least 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible records of all collection and control system monitoring data for parameters measured in § 60.37f(a)(1), (2), and (3).

(i) Any records required to be maintained by this subpart that are submitted electronically via the EPA's CDX may be maintained in electronic format.

(j) For each owner or operator reporting leachate or other liquids addition under § 60.38f(l), keep records of any engineering calculations or company records used to estimate the quantities of leachate or liquids added, the surface areas for which the leachate or liquids were applied, and the

estimates of annual waste acceptance or total waste in place in the areas where leachate or liquids were applied.

§ 60.40f Specifications for active collection systems.

For approval, a state plan must include the specifications for active collection systems in this section.

(a) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.33f(b) must site active collection wells, horizontal collectors, surface collectors, or other extraction devices at a sufficient density throughout all gas producing areas using the following procedures unless alternative procedures have been approved by the Administrator.

(1) The collection devices within the interior must be certified to achieve comprehensive control of surface gas emissions by a professional engineer. The following issues must be addressed in the design: depths of refuse, refuse gas generation rates and flow characteristics, cover properties, gas system expandability, leachate and

condensate management, accessibility, compatibility with filling operations, integration with closure end use, air intrusion control, corrosion resistance, fill settlement, resistance to the refuse decomposition heat, and ability to isolate individual components or sections for repair or troubleshooting without shutting down entire collection system.

(2) The sufficient density of gas collection devices determined in paragraph (a)(1) of this section must address landfill gas migration issues and augmentation of the collection system through the use of active or passive systems at the landfill perimeter or exterior.

(3) The placement of gas collection devices determined in paragraph (a)(1) of this section must control all gas producing areas, except as provided by paragraphs (a)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) Any segregated area of asbestos or nondegradable material may be

excluded from collection if documented as provided under § 60.39f(d). The documentation must provide the nature, date of deposition, location and amount of asbestos or nondegradable material deposited in the area, and must be provided to the Administrator upon request.

(ii) Any nonproductive area of the landfill may be excluded from control, provided that the total of all excluded areas can be shown to contribute less than 1 percent of the total amount of NMOC emissions from the landfill. The amount, location, and age of the material must be documented and provided to the Administrator upon request. A separate NMOC emissions estimate must be made for each section proposed for exclusion, and the sum of all such sections must be compared to the NMOC emissions estimate for the entire landfill.

(A) The NMOC emissions from each section proposed for exclusion must be computed using Equation 7:

$$Q_i = 2kL_oM_i(e^{-kt_i})(C_{NMOC})(3.6 \times 10^{-9}) \quad (\text{Eq. 7})$$

Where:

Q_i = NMOC emission rate from the i^{th} section, megagrams per year.
 k = Methane generation rate constant, year⁻¹.
 L_o = Methane generation potential, cubic meters per megagram solid waste.
 M_i = Mass of the degradable solid waste in the i^{th} section, megagram.
 t_i = Age of the solid waste in the i^{th} section, years.
 C_{NMOC} = Concentration of NMOC, parts per million by volume.
 3.6×10^{-9} = Conversion factor.

(B) If the owner or operator is proposing to exclude, or cease gas collection and control from, nonproductive physically separated (e.g., separately lined) closed areas that already have gas collection systems, NMOC emissions from each physically separated closed area must be computed using either Equation 3 in § 60.35f or Equation 7 in paragraph (a)(3)(ii)(A) of this section.

(iii) The values for k and C_{NMOC} determined in field testing must be used if field testing has been performed in determining the NMOC emission rate or the radii of influence (the distance from the well center to a point in the landfill where the pressure gradient applied by the blower or compressor approaches zero). If field testing has not been performed, the default values for k , L_o , and C_{NMOC} provided in § 60.35f or the alternative values from § 60.35f must be used. The mass of nondegradable solid waste contained within the given

section may be subtracted from the total mass of the section when estimating emissions provided the nature, location, age, and amount of the nondegradable material is documented as provided in paragraph (a)(3)(i) of this section.

(b) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.33f(b) must construct the gas collection devices using the following equipment or procedures:

(1) The landfill gas extraction components must be constructed of polyvinyl chloride (PVC), high density polyethylene (HDPE) pipe, fiberglass, stainless steel, or other nonporous corrosion resistant material of suitable dimensions to: Convey projected amounts of gases; withstand installation, static, and settlement forces; and withstand planned overburden or traffic loads. The collection system must extend as necessary to comply with emission and migration standards. Collection devices such as wells and horizontal collectors must be perforated to allow gas entry without head loss sufficient to impair performance across the intended extent of control. Perforations must be situated with regard to the need to prevent excessive air infiltration.

(2) Vertical wells must be placed so as not to endanger underlying liners and must address the occurrence of water within the landfill. Holes and trenches constructed for piped wells and horizontal collectors must be of

sufficient cross-section so as to allow for their proper construction and completion including, for example, centering of pipes and placement of gravel backfill. Collection devices must be designed so as not to allow indirect short circuiting of air into the cover or refuse into the collection system or gas into the air. Any gravel used around pipe perforations should be of a dimension so as not to penetrate or block perforations.

(3) Collection devices may be connected to the collection header pipes below or above the landfill surface. The connector assembly must include a positive closing throttle valve, any necessary seals and couplings, access couplings and at least one sampling port. The collection devices must be constructed of PVC, HDPE, fiberglass, stainless steel, or other nonporous material of suitable thickness.

(c) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.33f(c) must convey the landfill gas to a control system in compliance with § 60.33f(c) through the collection header pipe(s). The gas mover equipment must be sized to handle the maximum gas generation flow rate expected over the intended use period of the gas moving equipment using the following procedures:

(1) For existing collection systems, the flow data must be used to project the maximum flow rate. If no flow data

exist, the procedures in paragraph (c)(2) of this section must be used.

(2) For new collection systems, the maximum flow rate must be in accordance with § 60.36f(a)(1).

§ 60.41f Definitions.

Terms used but not defined in this subpart have the meaning given them in the Clean Air Act and in subparts A and B of this part.

Active collection system means a gas collection system that uses gas mover equipment.

Active landfill means a landfill in which solid waste is being placed or a landfill that is planned to accept waste in the future.

Administrator means the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or his/her authorized representative or the Administrator of a state air pollution control agency.

Closed area means a separately lined area of an MSW landfill in which solid waste is no longer being placed. If additional solid waste is placed in that area of the landfill, that landfill area is no longer closed. The area must be separately lined to ensure that the landfill gas does not migrate between open and closed areas.

Closed landfill means a landfill in which solid waste is no longer being placed, and in which no additional solid wastes will be placed without first filing a notification of modification as prescribed under § 60.7(a)(4). Once a notification of modification has been filed, and additional solid waste is placed in the landfill, the landfill is no longer closed.

Closed landfill subcategory means a closed landfill that has submitted a closure report as specified in § 60.38f(f) on or before September 27, 2017.

Closure means that point in time when a landfill becomes a closed landfill.

Commercial solid waste means all types of solid waste generated by stores, offices, restaurants, warehouses, and other nonmanufacturing activities, excluding residential and industrial wastes.

Controlled landfill means any landfill at which collection and control systems are required under this subpart as a result of the NMOC emission rate. The landfill is considered controlled at the time a collection and control system design plan is prepared in compliance with § 60.33f(e)(2).

Corrective action analysis means a description of all reasonable interim and long-term measures, if any, that are available, and an explanation of why the selected corrective action(s) is/are the

best alternative(s), including, but not limited to, considerations of cost effectiveness, technical feasibility, safety, and secondary impacts.

Design capacity means the maximum amount of solid waste a landfill can accept, as indicated in terms of volume or mass in the most recent permit issued by the state, local, or tribal agency responsible for regulating the landfill, plus any in-place waste not accounted for in the most recent permit. If the owner or operator chooses to convert the design capacity from volume to mass or from mass to volume to demonstrate its design capacity is less than 2.5 million megagrams or 2.5 million cubic meters, the calculation must include a site-specific density, which must be recalculated annually.

Disposal facility means all contiguous land and structures, other appurtenances, and improvements on the land used for the disposal of solid waste.

Emission rate cutoff means the threshold annual emission rate to which a landfill compares its estimated emission rate to determine if control under the regulation is required.

Enclosed combustor means an enclosed firebox which maintains a relatively constant limited peak temperature generally using a limited supply of combustion air. An enclosed flare is considered an enclosed combustor.

Flare means an open combustor without enclosure or shroud.

Gas mover equipment means the equipment (*i.e.*, fan, blower, compressor) used to transport landfill gas through the header system.

Gust means the highest instantaneous wind speed that occurs over a 3-second running average.

Household waste means any solid waste (including garbage, trash, and sanitary waste in septic tanks) derived from households (including, but not limited to, single and multiple residences, hotels and motels, bunkhouses, ranger stations, crew quarters, campgrounds, picnic grounds, and day-use recreation areas). Household waste does not include fully segregated yard waste. Segregated yard waste means vegetative matter resulting exclusively from the cutting of grass, the pruning and/or removal of bushes, shrubs, and trees, the weeding of gardens, and other landscaping maintenance activities. Household waste does not include construction, renovation, or demolition wastes, even if originating from a household.

Industrial solid waste means solid waste generated by manufacturing or industrial processes that is not a

hazardous waste regulated under Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, parts 264 and 265 of this chapter. Such waste may include, but is not limited to, waste resulting from the following manufacturing processes: electric power generation; fertilizer/agricultural chemicals; food and related products/by-products; inorganic chemicals; iron and steel manufacturing; leather and leather products; nonferrous metals manufacturing/foundries; organic chemicals; plastics and resins manufacturing; pulp and paper industry; rubber and miscellaneous plastic products; stone, glass, clay, and concrete products; textile manufacturing; transportation equipment; and water treatment. This term does not include mining waste or oil and gas waste.

Interior well means any well or similar collection component located inside the perimeter of the landfill waste. A perimeter well located outside the landfilled waste is not an interior well.

Landfill means an area of land or an excavation in which wastes are placed for permanent disposal, and that is not a land application unit, surface impoundment, injection well, or waste pile as those terms are defined under § 257.2 of this title.

Lateral expansion means a horizontal expansion of the waste boundaries of an existing MSW landfill. A lateral expansion is not a modification unless it results in an increase in the design capacity of the landfill.

Leachate recirculation means the practice of taking the leachate collected from the landfill and reapplying it to the landfill by any of one of a variety of methods, including pre-wetting of the waste, direct discharge into the working face, spraying, infiltration ponds, vertical injection wells, horizontal gravity distribution systems, and pressure distribution systems.

Modification means an increase in the permitted volume design capacity of the landfill by either lateral or vertical expansion based on its permitted design capacity as of July 17, 2014. Modification does not occur until the owner or operator commences construction on the lateral or vertical expansion.

Municipal solid waste landfill or *MSW landfill* means an entire disposal facility in a contiguous geographical space where household waste is placed in or on land. An MSW landfill may also receive other types of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle D wastes (§ 257.2 of this title) such as commercial solid waste,

nonhazardous sludge, conditionally exempt small quantity generator waste, and industrial solid waste. Portions of an MSW landfill may be separated by access roads. An MSW landfill may be publicly or privately owned. An MSW landfill may be a new MSW landfill, an existing MSW landfill, or a lateral expansion.

Municipal solid waste landfill emissions or *MSW landfill emissions* means gas generated by the decomposition of organic waste deposited in an MSW landfill or derived from the evolution of organic compounds in the waste.

NMOC means nonmethane organic compounds, as measured according to the provisions of § 60.35f.

Nondegradable waste means any waste that does not decompose through chemical breakdown or microbiological activity. Examples are, but are not limited to, concrete, municipal waste combustor ash, and metals.

Passive collection system means a gas collection system that solely uses

positive pressure within the landfill to move the gas rather than using gas mover equipment.

Protectorate means American Samoa, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

Root cause analysis means an assessment conducted through a process of investigation to determine the primary cause, and any other contributing causes, of positive pressure at a wellhead.

Sludge means the term sludge as defined in 40 CFR 258.2.

Solid waste means the term solid waste as defined in 40 CFR 258.2.

State means any of the 50 United States and the protectorates of the United States.

State plan means a plan submitted pursuant to section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act and subpart B of this part that implements and enforces this subpart.

Sufficient density means any number, spacing, and combination of collection

system components, including vertical wells, horizontal collectors, and surface collectors, necessary to maintain emission and migration control as determined by measures of performance set forth in this part.

Sufficient extraction rate means a rate sufficient to maintain a negative pressure at all wellheads in the collection system without causing air infiltration, including any wellheads connected to the system as a result of expansion or excess surface emissions, for the life of the blower.

Treated landfill gas means landfill gas processed in a treatment system as defined in this subpart.

Treatment system means a system that filters, de-waters, and compresses landfill gas for sale or beneficial use.

Untreated landfill gas means any landfill gas that is not treated landfill gas.

[FR Doc. 2016-17700 Filed 8-26-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P



FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 81

Monday,

No. 167

August 29, 2016

Part III

Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR Part 60

Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills; Final Rule

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 60**

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0215; FRL-9949-51-OAR]

RIN 2060-AM08

Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is finalizing a new subpart that updates the Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills. Under section 111 of the Clean Air Act, the EPA must review, and, if appropriate, revise standards of performance at least every 8 years. The EPA's review of the standards for municipal solid waste landfills considered landfills that commence construction, reconstruction, or modification after July 17, 2014. The final standards also reflect changes to the population of landfills and an analysis of the timing and methods for reducing emissions. This action will achieve additional reductions in emissions of landfill gas and its components, including methane, by lowering the emissions threshold at which a landfill must install controls. This action also incorporates new data and information received in response to the proposed rulemaking and addresses other regulatory issues including surface emissions monitoring, wellhead monitoring, and the definition of landfill gas treatment system.

The new subpart will reduce emissions of landfill gas, which contains both nonmethane organic compounds and methane. Landfills are a significant source of methane, which is a potent greenhouse gas pollutant. These avoided emissions will improve air quality and reduce the potential for public health and welfare effects associated with exposure to landfill gas emissions.

DATES: This final rule is effective on October 28, 2016.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of October 28, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0215. All documents in the docket are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index. Although listed in the index, some

information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information concerning this final rule, contact Ms. Hillary Ward, Fuels and Incineration Group, Sector Policies and Programs Division, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (E143-05), Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711; telephone number: (919) 541-3154; fax number: (919) 541-0246; email address: ward.hillary@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Acronyms and Abbreviations. The following acronyms and abbreviations are used in this document.

ANPRM Advance notice of proposed rulemaking
ANSI American National Standards Institute
BMP Best management practice
BSEB Best system of emission reduction
Btu British thermal unit
CAA Clean Air Act
CA LMR California Landfill Methane Rule
CBI Confidential business information
CDX Central Data Exchange
CEDRI Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface
CFR Code of Federal Regulations
CO₂ Carbon dioxide
CO_{2e} Carbon dioxide equivalent
EIA Energy Information Administration
EPA Environmental Protection Agency
ERT Electronic Reporting Tool
FID Flame ionization detector
GCCS Gas collection and control system
GHG Greenhouse gas
GHGRP Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program
GWP Global warming potential
HAP Hazardous air pollutant
HOV Higher operating value
IAMS Integrated assessment models
ICR Information collection request
IPCC Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IWG Interagency working group
lb/MMBtu Pounds per million British thermal unit
LFG Landfill gas
LFGCost Landfill Gas Energy Cost Model
m³ Cubic meters
Mg Megagram
Mg/yr Megagram per year
mph Miles per hour
MSW Municipal solid waste
mtCO_{2e} Metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent
MW Megawatt
MWh Megawatt hour
NAICS North American Industry Classification System

NESHAP National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NMOC Nonmethane organic compound
NRC National Research Council
NSPS New source performance standards
NTTAA National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
OAQPS Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
OMB Office of Management & Budget
PM Particulate matter
PM_{2.5} Fine particulate matter
ppm Parts per million
RCRA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RD&D Research, development, and demonstration
RFA Regulatory Flexibility Act
RIA Regulatory Impact Analysis
SBAR Small Business Advocacy Review
SC-CH₄ Social cost of methane
SC-CO₂ Social cost of carbon dioxide
SEM Surface emissions monitoring
SER Small entity representative
SO₂ Sulfur dioxide
SSM Startup, shutdown, and malfunction
Tg Teragram
TTN Technology Transfer Network
U.S. United States
USGCRP U.S. Global Change Research Program
VCS Voluntary consensus standard
VOC Volatile organic compound
WWW World Wide Web

Organization of This Document. The following outline is provided to aid in locating information in this preamble.

- I. Executive Summary
 - A. Purpose of Regulatory Action
 - B. Summary of Major Provisions
 - C. Costs and Benefits
- II. General Information
 - A. Does this action apply to me?
 - B. Where can I get a copy of this document and other related information?
- III. Background
 - A. Landfill Gas Emissions and Climate Change
 - B. What are the public health and welfare effects of landfill gas emissions?
 - C. What is the EPA's authority for reviewing the NSPS?
 - D. What is the purpose and scope of this action?
 - E. How would the changes in applicability affect sources currently subject to subparts Cc and WWW?
- IV. Summary of the Final NSPS
 - A. What are the control requirements?
 - B. What are the monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements?
 - C. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions
 - D. Other Corrections and Clarifications
- V. Summary of Significant Changes Since Proposal
 - A. Changes to Monitoring, Recordkeeping, and Reporting
 - B. Tier 4
 - C. Changes To Address Closed or Non-Productive Areas
 - D. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions
 - E. Definitions for Treated Landfill Gas and Treatment System and Treatment System Monitoring

- F. Other Corrections and Clarifications
- VI. Rationale for Significant Changes Since Proposal
 - A. Changes To Monitoring, Recordkeeping, and Reporting
 - B. Tier 4
 - C. Changes To Address Closed or Non-Productive Areas
 - D. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions
 - E. Definitions of Treated Landfill Gas and Treatment System
 - F. Other Corrections and Clarifications
- VII. Impacts of This Final Rule
 - A. What are the air quality impacts?
 - B. What are the water quality and solid waste impacts?
 - C. What are the secondary air impacts?
 - D. What are the energy impacts?
 - E. What are the cost impacts?
 - F. What are the economic impacts?
 - G. What are the benefits?
- VIII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
 - A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review
 - B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
 - C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)
 - D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)
 - E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
 - F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
 - G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks
 - H. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use
 - I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) and 1 CFR Part 51
 - J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
 - K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

I. Executive Summary

A. Purpose of Regulatory Action

This action finalizes changes to the Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Landfills (landfills new source performance standards or landfills NSPS) resulting from the EPA's review of the landfills NSPS under Clean Air Act (CAA) section 111. The EPA's review identified a number of advances in technology and operating practices for reducing emissions of landfill gas (LFG) and the final changes are based on our evaluation of those advances and our understanding of LFG emissions. In order to avoid possible confusion regarding which MSW landfills would actually be subject to these requirements, the EPA is establishing a new subpart XXX (40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX) rather than merely updating the existing subpart WWW (40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW).

The requirements in new subpart XXX apply to MSW landfills for which construction, reconstruction, or modification commenced after July 17, 2014, the date of the proposed rule. The requirements in subpart WWW continue to apply to MSW landfills for which construction, reconstruction, or modification was commenced on or after May 30, 1991 and on or before July 17, 2014. For a discussion of how changes in applicability affect sources currently subject to subparts Cc and WWW, see the proposed Emission Guidelines (80 FR 52110, August 27, 2016).

The resulting changes to the NSPS found in subpart XXX will achieve additional reductions in emissions of LFG and its components, including methane. This final rule is consistent with the President's 2013 Climate Action Plan,¹ which directs federal agencies to focus on "assessing current emissions data, addressing data gaps, identifying technologies and best practices for reducing emissions, and identifying existing authorities and incentive-based opportunities to reduce methane emissions." The final rule is also consistent with the President's Methane Strategy,² which directs the EPA's regulatory and voluntary programs to continue to pursue emission reductions through regulatory updates and to encourage LFG energy recovery through voluntary programs. These directives are discussed in detail in section III.A of this preamble. This regulatory action also resolves and clarifies several implementation issues that were previously addressed in amendments proposed on May 23, 2002 (67 FR 36475) and September 8, 2006 (71 FR 53271).

1. Need for Regulatory Action

Several factors led to today's final action. First, section 111 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) (42 U.S.C. 7411) requires the EPA to review standards of performance at least every 8 years and, if appropriate, revise the standards to reflect improvements in methods for reducing emissions. Second, a mandatory duty lawsuit was filed against the EPA for failure to review the NSPS by the statutorily required deadline. Under a consent decree resolving that lawsuit, the EPA agreed to

¹ Executive Office of the President, "The President's Climate Action Plan" June 2013. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/image/president27scimateactionplan.pdf>.

² Executive Office of the President, "Climate Action Plan Strategy to Reduce Methane, March 2014. https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/strategy_to_reduce_methane_emissions_2014-03-28_final.pdf.

propose a review and take final action on the proposal. Third, the EPA has concluded that landfill owners or operators, as well as regulators, need clarification regarding issues that have arisen during implementation of the existing standards. Implementation issues include the definition of LFG treatment, among other topics. Fourth, landfills are a significant source of methane, a very potent greenhouse gas, for which there are cost-effective means of reduction, so this rule is an important element of the United States' work to reduce emissions that are contributing to climate change.

2. Legal Authority

CAA section 111(b)(1)(B) (42 U.S.C. 7411(b)(1)(B)) requires the EPA to "at least every 8 years review and, if appropriate, revise" new source performance standards. CAA section 111(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 7411(a)(1)) provides that performance standards are to "reflect the degree of emission limitation achievable through the application of the best system of emission reduction which (taking into account the cost of achieving such reduction and any nonair quality health and environmental impact and energy requirements) the Administrator determines has been adequately demonstrated." We refer to this level of control as the best system of emission reduction or "BSER."

As indicated above, the EPA has decided to finalize its review of the landfill NSPS in a new subpart rather than update existing requirements in 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW. The EPA believes that either approach is legally permissible.³ The final subpart XXX will appear in 40 CFR part 60 and will apply to landfills that commence construction, reconstruction, or modification after July 17, 2014.

B. Summary of Major Provisions

The final NSPS apply to landfills that commenced construction, reconstruction, or modification after July 17, 2014 (the date of publication of the proposed NSPS). The final rule provisions are described below.

Thresholds for Installing Controls. The final NSPS retain the current design capacity threshold of 2.5 million megagrams (Mg) and 2.5 million cubic meters (m³), but reduce the nonmethane

³ The EPA believes that it has the legal authority in updating an NSPS to either propose and make changes to the existing subpart or to promulgate a new subpart and has previously done both. In either case, any substantive changes to the NSPS apply only to sources for which construction, reconstruction, or modification commenced on or after the date on which the proposed changes were published in the **Federal Register** (July 17, 2014).

organic compounds (NMOC) emission threshold for the installation and removal of a gas collection and control system (GCCS) from 50 megagrams per year (Mg/yr) to 34 Mg/yr. An MSW landfill that exceeds the design capacity threshold must install and start up a GCCS within 30 months after LFG emissions reach or exceed an NMOC level of 34 Mg/yr. (A megagram is also known as a metric ton, which is equal to 1.1 United States (U.S.) short tons or about 2,205 pounds.) Consistent with the existing NSPS (40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW), the owner or operator of a landfill may control the gas by routing it to a non-enclosed flare, an enclosed combustion device, or a treatment system that processes the collected gas for subsequent sale or beneficial use.

Emission Threshold Determination. The EPA is finalizing an alternative site-specific emission threshold methodology for when a landfill must install and operate a GCCS. This alternative methodology, referred to as "Tier 4," is based on surface emission monitoring (SEM) and demonstrates whether or not surface emissions are below a specific threshold. The Tier 4 SEM demonstration allows landfills that exceed the threshold using modeled NMOC emission rates using Tier 1 or 2 to demonstrate that actual site-specific surface methane emissions are below the threshold. A landfill that can demonstrate that surface emissions are below 500 parts per million (ppm) for four consecutive quarters does not trigger the requirement to install a GCCS even if Tier 1, 2, or 3 calculations indicate that the 34 Mg/yr threshold has been exceeded. Landfills that have calculated NMOC emissions of 50 Mg/yr or greater are not eligible for the Tier 4 emission threshold determination in order to prevent conflicting requirements between subpart XXX and the landfills NESHAP (40 CFR part 63, subpart AAAA). Many landfills that are subject to subpart XXX will also be subject to the landfills NESHAP. The landfills NESHAP requires landfills that exceed the size threshold (2.5 million Mg and 2.5 million m³) and exceed the NMOC emissions threshold (50 Mg/yr) to install and operate a GCCS.

Low LFG Producing Areas. The EPA is also finalizing criteria for determining when it is appropriate to cap or remove all or a portion of the GCCS. The final criteria for capping or removing all or a portion of the GCCS are: (1) The landfill is closed, (2) the GCCS has operated for at least 15 years or the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows, and (3) the

calculated NMOC emission rate at the landfill is less than 34 Mg/yr on three successive test dates.

Landfill Gas Treatment. In the final NSPS, the EPA has addressed two issues related to LFG treatment. First, the EPA is clarifying that the use of treated LFG is not limited to use as a fuel for a stationary combustion device but may be used for other beneficial uses such as vehicle fuel, production of high-British thermal unit (Btu) gas for pipeline injection, or use as a raw material in a chemical manufacturing process. Second, the EPA is finalizing the definition of *treated landfill gas* that applies to LFG processed in a treatment system meeting the requirements in 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX and defining *treatment system* as a system that filters, de-waters, and compresses LFG for sale or beneficial use. The definition of treatment system allows the level of treatment to be tailored to the type and design of the specific combustion equipment or the other beneficial uses such as vehicle fuel, production of high-Btu gas for pipeline injection, or use as a raw material in a chemical manufacturing process in which the LFG is used. Owners or operators must develop a site-specific treatment system monitoring plan that includes monitoring parameters addressing all three elements of treatment (filtration, de-watering, and compression) to ensure the treatment system is operating properly for the intended end use of the treated LFG. They also must keep records that demonstrate that such parameters effectively monitor filtration, de-watering, and compression system performance necessary for the end use of the treated LFG.

Wellhead Operational Standards. The EPA is finalizing changes to certain operational standards (*i.e.*, the requirement to meet specific operating limits) for nitrogen/oxygen level at the wellheads. Landfill owners or operators are not required to take corrective action based on exceedances of specified operational standards for nitrogen/oxygen levels at wellheads, but they must continue to monitor and maintain records of nitrogen/oxygen levels on a monthly basis in order to inform any necessary adjustments to the GCCS and must maintain records of monthly readings. The operational standard, corrective action, and corresponding recordkeeping and reporting remain for temperature and maintaining negative pressure at the wellhead.

Surface Monitoring. The EPA is finalizing the requirement to monitor all surface penetrations at landfills. In final 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX, landfills must conduct SEM at all cover

penetrations and openings within the area of the landfill where waste has been placed and a gas collection system is required to be in place and operating according to the operational standards in final 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX. Specifically, landfill owners or operators must conduct surface monitoring on a quarterly basis at the specified intervals and where visual observations indicate elevated concentrations of LFG, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover and all cover penetrations.

Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction. The EPA is finalizing a requirement that standards of performance in the NSPS apply at all times, including periods of startup, shutdown, and malfunction (SSM). The EPA is also finalizing an alternative standard during SSM events: In the event the collection or control system is not operating, the gas mover system must be shut down and all valves in the collection and control system that could contribute to venting of the gas to the atmosphere must be closed within 1 hour of the collection or control system not operating.

Other Clarifications. The EPA is finalizing a number of clarifications to address several issues that have been raised by landfill owners or operators during implementation of the current NSPS and Emission Guidelines. These clarifications include adding criteria for when an affected source must update its design plan and clarifying when landfill owners or operators must submit requests to extend the timeline for taking corrective action. The EPA is also updating several definitions in the NSPS. In addition, while the EPA is not mandating organics diversion, we are finalizing two specific compliance flexibilities in the NSPS to encourage wider adoption of organics diversion and GCCS Best Management Practices (BMPs) for emission reductions at landfills. These compliance flexibilities are discussed in sections VI.A.1 and VI.A.2 (wellhead monitoring) and section V.B and VI.B (Tier 4 emission threshold determination) of this preamble.

C. Costs and Benefits

The final NSPS are expected to significantly reduce emissions of LFG and its components, which include methane, volatile organic compounds (VOC), and hazardous air pollutants (HAP). Landfills are a significant source of methane emissions, and in 2014 landfills represented the third largest source of human-related methane emissions in the U.S. This rulemaking applies to landfills that commence

construction, modification, or reconstruction after July 17, 2014. In the 5 years following July 17, 2014, the EPA estimates that 14 landfills will commence construction and 123 landfills will modify. Note that landfills are not expected to reconstruct (63 FR 32745, June 16, 1998).

To comply with the emissions limits in the final rule, owners or operators of new or modified MSW landfills are expected to install the least-cost control for collecting and treating or combusting LFG. The annualized net cost for the final NSPS is estimated to be \$6.0 million (2012\$) in 2025, when using a 7 percent discount rate. The annualized costs represent the costs compared to no changes to the current NSPS (*i.e.*, baseline) and include \$11 million to install and operate a GCCS, as well as \$0.08 million to complete the corresponding testing and monitoring. These control costs are offset by \$5.1 million in revenue from electricity sales, which is incorporated into the net control costs for certain landfills that are expected to generate revenue by using the LFG to produce electricity.

Installation of a GCCS to comply with the 34 Mg/yr NMOC emissions threshold at new or modified landfills would achieve reductions of 281 Mg/yr NMOC and 44,300 Mg/yr methane (about 1.1 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year (mtCO₂e/yr)) beyond the baseline in year 2025. In

addition, the final rule is expected to result in the net reduction of 26,000 Mg-CO₂, due to reduced demand by landfills for electricity from the grid as landfills generate electricity from LFG. The NMOC portion of LFG can contain a variety of air pollutants, including VOC and various organic HAP. VOC emissions are precursors to both fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and ozone formation. These pollutants, along with methane, are associated with substantial health effects, welfare effects, and climate effects. The EPA expects that the reduced emissions will result in improvements in air quality and lessen the potential for health effects associated with exposure to air pollution related emissions, and result in climate benefits due to reductions of the methane component of LFG.

The EPA estimates that the final rule's estimated methane emission reductions and secondary CO₂ emission reductions in the year 2025 would yield global monetized climate benefits of \$31 million to approximately \$180 million, depending on the discount rate. Using the mean social cost of methane (SC-CH₄) and social cost of CO₂ (SC-CO₂), at a 3-percent discount rate, results in an estimate of about \$68 million in 2025 (2012\$).

The SC-CH₄ and SC-CO₂ are the monetary values of impacts associated with marginal changes in methane and CO₂ emissions, respectively, in a given

year. Each metric includes a wide range of anticipated climate impacts, such as net changes in agricultural productivity, property damage from increased flood risk, and changes in energy system costs, such as reduced costs for heating and increased costs for air conditioning.

With the data available, we are not able to provide quantified health benefit estimates for the reduction in exposure to HAP, ozone, and PM_{2.5} for this rule. This is not to imply that there are no such benefits of the rule; rather, it is a reflection of the difficulties in modeling the direct and indirect impacts of the reductions in emissions for this sector with the data currently available.

Based on the monetized benefits and costs, the annual net benefits of the standards are estimated to be \$62 million (\$2012) in 2025, based on the average SC-CH₄ at a 3 percent discount rate, average SC-CO₂ at a 3 percent discount rate, and costs at a 7 percent discount rate.

II. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

This final rule addresses MSW landfills that are new, reconstructed, or modified after July 17, 2014, and associated solid waste management programs. Potentially affected categories include those listed in Table 1 of this preamble.

TABLE 1—REGULATED ENTITIES

Category	NAICS ^a	Examples of affected facilities
Industry: Air and water resource and solid waste management.	924110	Solid waste landfills
Industry: Refuse systems—solid waste landfills	562212	Solid waste landfills
State, local, and tribal government agencies	924110	Administration of air and water resource and solid waste management programs

^a North American Industry Classification System.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be regulated by the new subpart. To determine whether your facility would be regulated by this action, you should carefully examine the applicability criteria in final 40 CFR 60.760 of subpart XXX. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of the final subpart to a particular entity, contact the person listed in the preceding **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

B. Where can I get a copy of this document and other related information?

In addition to being available in the docket, an electronic copy of this action

is available through EPA's Technology Transfer Network (TTN) Web site, a forum for information and technology exchange in various areas of air pollution control. Following signature by the EPA Administrator, the EPA will post a copy of this action at <http://www.epa.gov/ttnatw01/landfill/landflpg.html>. Following publication in the **Federal Register**, the EPA will post the **Federal Register** version of the final rule and key technical documents at this same Web site.

III. Background

On July 17, 2014, the EPA proposed a new NSPS subpart (40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX) based on its ongoing review of the MSW Landfills NSPS (40

CFR part 60, subpart WWW) (79 FR 41796). On August 27, 2015 (80 FR 52162), the EPA issued a supplemental proposal to achieve additional reductions of LFG and its components, including methane, through a lower emission threshold at which MSW landfills must install and operate a GCCS. On August 27, 2015, the EPA issued a concurrent proposal for revised Emission Guidelines for existing MSW Landfills (80 FR 52100). The EPA considered information it received in response to an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) for the MSW landfills Emission Guidelines (79 FR 41772) and a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for existing landfills (80 FR 52100), in addition to the Notice of

Proposed Rulemaking for new landfills (79 FR 41796), in evaluating these final provisions for new sources.

A. Landfill Gas Emissions and Climate Change

In June 2013, President Obama issued a Climate Action Plan that directed federal agencies to focus on “assessing current emissions data, addressing data gaps, identifying technologies and best practices for reducing emissions, and identifying existing authorities and incentive-based opportunities to reduce methane emissions.”⁴ Methane is a potent greenhouse gas (GHG) that is 28–36 times greater than carbon dioxide (CO₂) and has an atmospheric life of about 12 years.⁵ Because of methane’s potency as a GHG and its atmospheric life, reducing methane emissions is one of the best ways to achieve near-term beneficial impacts in mitigating global climate change.

The “Climate Action Plan: Strategy to Reduce Methane Emissions”⁶ (the Methane Strategy) was released in March 2014. The strategy recognized the methane reductions achieved through the EPA’s regulatory and voluntary programs to date. It also directed the EPA to continue to pursue emission reductions through regulatory updates and to encourage LFG energy recovery through voluntary programs.

The EPA recognized the climate benefits associated with reducing methane emissions from landfills nearly 25 years ago. The 1991 NSPS Background Information Document⁷ asserted that the reduction of methane emissions from MSW landfills was one of many options available to reduce global warming. The NSPS for MSW landfills, promulgated in 1996, also recognized the climate co-benefits of controlling methane (61 FR 9917, March 12, 1996).

⁴ Executive Office of the President, “The President’s Climate Action Plan” June 2013. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/image/president27sclimateactionplan.pdf>.

⁵ The IPCC updates GWP estimates with each new assessment report, and in the latest assessment report, AR5, the latest estimate of the methane GWP ranged from 28–36, compared to a GWP of 25 in AR4. The impacts analysis in this final rule is based on AR4 instead of AR5 (*i.e.*, a GWP of 25) to be consistent with and comparable to key Agency emission quantification programs such as the Inventory of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks (GHG Inventory), and the GHGRP.

⁶ Executive Office of the President, “Climate Action Plan Strategy to Reduce Methane”, March 2014. https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/strategy_to_reduce_methane_emissions_2014-03-28_final.pdf.

⁷ Air Emissions from Municipal Solid Waste Landfills-Background Information for Proposed Standards and Guidelines, U.S. EPA (EPA-450/3-90-011a) (NTIS PB 91-197061) page 2-15.

A recent study assessed EPA regulations and voluntary programs over the period 1993–2013 and found that they were responsible for the reduction of about 130 million metric tons of methane emissions (equal to about 18 percent of the total U.S. methane emissions over that time period), leading to a reduction in atmospheric concentrations of methane of about 28 parts per billion in 2013⁸ (compared to an observed increase in methane concentrations of about 80 ppb over those 20 years).

The review and final revision of the MSW landfills NSPS capitalizes on additional opportunities to achieve methane reductions while acknowledging historical agency perspectives and research on climate, a charge from the President’s Climate Action Plan, the Methane Strategy, and improvements in the science surrounding GHG emissions.

LFG is a collection of air pollutants, including methane and NMOC. LFG is typically composed of 50-percent methane, 50-percent CO₂, and less than 1-percent NMOC by volume. The NMOC portion of LFG can contain various organic HAP and VOC. When the Emission Guidelines and NSPS were promulgated in 1996, NMOC was selected as a surrogate for MSW LFG emissions because NMOC contains the air pollutants that at that time were of most concern due to their adverse effects on health and welfare. Today, methane’s effects on climate change are also considered important. In 2014, methane emissions from MSW landfills represented 18.2 percent of total U.S. methane emissions and 1.9 percent of total U.S. GHG emissions (in carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e)).⁹ In 2014, MSW landfills continued to be the third largest source of human-related methane emissions in the U.S., releasing an estimated 133.1 million metric tons of CO₂e.¹⁰ For these reasons and because additional emissions reductions can be achieved at a reasonable cost, the EPA is finalizing changes to the NSPS that

⁸ Melvin, A.M.; Sarofim, M.C.; Crimmins, A.R., “Climate benefits of U.S. EPA programs and policies that reduced methane emissions 1993–2013”, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2016, in press. <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/acs.est.6b00367>. DOI 10.1021/acs.est.6b00367.

⁹ Total U.S. methane emissions were 731 Teragram (Tg) CO₂e and total U.S. GHG emissions were 6,870.5 Tg in 2014. A teragram is equal to 1 million Mg. (A megagram is also known as a metric ton, which is equal to 1.1 U.S. short tons or about 2,205 pounds.) U.S. EPA “Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2014.” Table ES-2. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/usinventoryreport.html>.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, Section 7. Waste, Table 7-3.

are based on reducing the NMOC and methane components of LFG.

B. What are the public health and welfare effects of landfill gas emissions?

1. Health Effects of VOC and Various Organic HAP

VOC emissions are precursors to both PM_{2.5} and ozone formation. As documented in previous analyses (U.S. EPA, 2006,¹¹ 2010,¹² and 2014¹³), exposure to PM_{2.5} and ozone is associated with significant public health effects. PM_{2.5} is associated with health effects, including premature mortality for adults and infants, cardiovascular morbidity such as heart attacks, and respiratory morbidity such as asthma attacks, acute bronchitis, hospital admissions and emergency room visits, work loss days, restricted activity days and respiratory symptoms, as well as welfare impacts such as visibility impairment.¹⁴ Ozone is associated with health effects, including hospital and emergency department visits, school loss days and premature mortality, as well as ecological effects (*e.g.*, injury to vegetation and climate change).¹⁵ Nearly 30 organic HAP have been identified in uncontrolled LFG, including benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene, and vinyl chloride.¹⁶ Benzene is a known human carcinogen.

¹¹ U.S. EPA. *RIA. National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter*, Chapter 5. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC. October 2006. Available on the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/Chapter%205--Benefits.pdf>.

¹² U.S. EPA. *RIA. National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone*. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC. January 2010. Available on the Internet at http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/s1-supplemental_analysis_full.pdf.

¹³ U.S. EPA. *RIA. National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone*. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC. December 2014. Available on the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/ttnecas1/regdata/RIAs/20141125ria.pdf>.

¹⁴ U.S. EPA. *Integrated Science Assessment for Particulate Matter (Final Report)*. EPA-600-R-08-139F. National Center for Environmental Assessment—RTP Division. December 2009. Available at <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=216546>.

¹⁵ U.S. EPA. *Air Quality Criteria for Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants (Final)*. EPA/600/R-05/004aF-cF. Washington, DC: U.S. EPA. February 2006. Available on the Internet at <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/GFM/recordisplay.cfm?deid=149923>.

¹⁶ U.S. EPA. 1998. *Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. “Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Fifth Edition, Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources, Chapter 2: Solid Waste Disposal, Section 2.4: Municipal Solid Waste Landfills”*. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch02/final/c02s04.pdf>.

2. Climate Impacts of Methane Emissions

In addition to the improvements in air quality and resulting benefits to human health and the non-climate welfare effects discussed above, reducing emissions from landfills is expected to result in climate co-benefits due to reductions of the methane component of LFG. Methane is a potent GHG with a global warming potential (GWP) 28–36 times greater than CO₂, which accounts for methane's stronger absorption of infrared radiation per ton in the atmosphere, but also its shorter lifetime (on the order of 12 years compared to centuries or millennia for CO₂).^{17 18} According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 5th Assessment Report, methane is the second leading long-lived climate forcer after CO₂ globally.¹⁹

In 2009, based on a large body of robust and compelling scientific evidence, the EPA Administrator issued an Endangerment Finding under CAA section 202(a)(1).²⁰ In the Endangerment Finding, the Administrator found that the current, elevated concentrations of GHGs in the atmosphere—already at levels unprecedented in human history—may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare of current and future generations in the U.S. We summarize these adverse effects on public health and welfare briefly here.

3. Public Health Impacts Detailed in the 2009 Endangerment Finding

The 2009 Endangerment Finding documented that climate change caused by human emissions of GHGs threatens the health of Americans. By raising average temperatures, climate change increases the likelihood of heat waves,

which are associated with increased deaths and illnesses. While climate change also increases the likelihood of reductions in cold-related mortality, evidence indicates that the increases in heat mortality will be larger than the decreases in cold mortality in the United States. Compared to a future without climate change, climate change is expected to increase ozone pollution over broad areas of the U.S., including in the largest metropolitan areas with the worst ozone problems, and thereby increase the risk of morbidity and mortality. Climate change is also expected to cause more intense hurricanes and more frequent and intense storms of other types and heavy precipitation, with impacts on other areas of public health, such as the potential for increased deaths, injuries, infectious and waterborne diseases, and stress-related disorders. Children, the elderly, and the poor are among the most vulnerable to these climate-related health effects.

4. Public Welfare Impacts Detailed in the 2009 Endangerment Finding

The 2009 Endangerment Finding documented that climate change impacts touch nearly every aspect of public welfare. Among the multiple threats caused by human emissions of GHGs, climate changes are expected to place large areas of the country at serious risk of reduced water supplies, increased water pollution, and increased occurrence of extreme events such as floods and droughts. Coastal areas are expected to face a multitude of increased risks, particularly from rising sea level and increases in the severity of storms. These communities face storm and flooding damage to property, or even loss of land due to inundation, erosion, wetland submergence and habitat loss.

Impacts of climate change on public welfare also include threats to social and ecosystem services. Climate change is expected to result in an increase in peak electricity demand. Extreme weather from climate change threatens energy, transportation, and water resource infrastructure. Climate change may also exacerbate ongoing environmental pressures in certain settlements, particularly in Alaskan indigenous communities, and is very likely to fundamentally rearrange U.S. ecosystems over the 21st century. Though some benefits may balance adverse effects on agriculture and forestry in the next few decades, the body of evidence points towards increasing risks of net adverse impacts on U.S. food production, agriculture and forest productivity as temperature

continues to rise. These impacts are global and may exacerbate problems outside the U.S. that raise humanitarian, trade, and national security issues for the U.S.

5. New Scientific Assessments

In 2009, based on a large body of robust and compelling scientific evidence, the EPA Administrator issued the Endangerment Finding under CAA section 202(a)(1).²¹ In the Endangerment Finding, the Administrator found that the current, elevated concentrations of GHGs in the atmosphere—already at levels unprecedented in human history—may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare of current and future generations in the U.S. The D.C. Circuit later upheld the Endangerment Finding from all challenges. *Coalition for Responsible Regulation v. EPA*, 684 F. 3d 102, 116–26 (D.C. Cir. 2012).

Since the administrative record concerning the Endangerment Finding closed following the EPA's 2010 Reconsideration Denial, the climate has continued to change, with new records being set for a number of climate indicators such as global average surface temperatures, Arctic sea ice retreat, CO₂ concentrations, and sea level rise. Additionally, a number of major scientific assessments have been released that improve understanding of the climate system and strengthen the case that GHGs endanger public health and welfare both for current and future generations. These assessments, from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), and the National Research Council (NRC), include: IPCC's 2012 Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (SREX) and the 2013–2014 Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), the USGCRP's 2014 National Climate Assessment, Climate Change Impacts in the United States (NCA3), and the NRC's 2010 Ocean Acidification: A National Strategy to Meet the Challenges of a Changing Ocean (Ocean Acidification), 2011 Report on Climate Stabilization Targets: Emissions, Concentrations, and Impacts over Decades to Millennia (Climate Stabilization Targets), 2011 National Security Implications for U.S. Naval Forces (National Security Implications), 2011 Understanding Earth's Deep Past: Lessons for Our Climate Future

¹⁷ IPCC, 2013: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

¹⁸ Note that this final uses a GWP value for methane of 25 for CO₂ equivalency calculations, consistent with the GHG emissions inventories and the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report.

¹⁹ IPCC, 2013: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

²⁰ "Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act," 74 FR 66496 (Dec. 15, 2009) ("Endangerment Finding").

²¹ "Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act," 74 FR 66496 (Dec. 15, 2009) ("Endangerment Finding").

(Understanding Earth's Deep Past), 2012 Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future, 2012 Climate and Social Stress: Implications for Security Analysis (Climate and Social Stress), and 2013 Abrupt Impacts of Climate Change (Abrupt Impacts) assessments.

The conclusions of the recent scientific assessments confirm and strengthen the science that supported the 2009 Endangerment Finding. The NCA3 indicates that climate change "threatens human health and well-being in many ways, including impacts from increased extreme weather events, wildfire, decreased air quality, threats to mental health, and illnesses transmitted by food, water, and disease-carriers such as mosquitoes and ticks."²² Most recently, the USGCRP released a new assessment, "The Impacts of Climate Change on Human Health in the United States: A Scientific Assessment" (also known as the USGCRP Climate and Health Assessment). This assessment finds that "climate change impacts endanger our health" and that in the United States we have "observed climate-related increases in our exposure to elevated temperatures; more frequent, severe, or longer lasting extreme events; diseases transmitted through food, water, or disease vectors such as ticks and mosquitoes; and stresses to mental health and well-being." The assessment determines that "[e]very American is vulnerable to the health impacts associated with climate change." Climate warming will also likely "make it harder for any given regulatory approach to reduce ground-level ozone pollution", and, unless offset by reductions of ozone precursors, it is likely that "climate-driven increases in ozone will cause premature deaths, hospital visits, lost school days, and acute respiratory symptoms."²³

Assessments state that certain populations are particularly vulnerable to climate change. The USGCRP Climate and Health Assessment assesses several disproportionately vulnerable populations, including those with low income, some communities of color, immigrant groups, indigenous peoples, pregnant women, vulnerable occupational groups, persons with disabilities, and persons with preexisting or chronic medical conditions. The Climate and Health

Assessment also concludes that children's unique physiology and developing bodies contribute to making them particularly vulnerable to climate change. Children also have unique behaviors and exposure pathways that could increase their exposure to environmental stressors, like contaminants in dust or extreme heat events. Impacts from climate change on children are likely from heat waves, air pollution, infectious and waterborne illnesses, disruptions in food safety and security, and mental health effects resulting from extreme weather events. For example, climate change can disrupt food safety and security by significantly reducing food quality, availability and access. Children are more susceptible to this disruption because nutrition is important during critical windows of development and growth. Older people are at much higher risk of mortality during extreme heat events and pre-existing health conditions also make older adults susceptible to cardiac and respiratory impacts of air pollution and to more severe consequences from infectious and waterborne diseases. Limited mobility among older adults can also increase health risks associated with extreme weather and floods.

The new assessments also confirm and strengthen the science that supported the 2009 Endangerment Finding. The NRC assessment Understanding Earth's Deep Past stated that "[b]y the end of this century, without a reduction in emissions, atmospheric CO₂ is projected to increase to levels that Earth has not experienced for more than 30 million years." In fact, that assessment stated that "the magnitude and rate of the present GHG increase place the climate system in what could be one of the most severe increases in radiative forcing of the global climate system in Earth history."²⁴ Because of these unprecedented changes in atmospheric concentrations, several assessments state that we may be approaching critical, poorly understood thresholds. The NRC Abrupt Impacts report analyzed the potential for abrupt climate change in the physical climate system and abrupt impacts of ongoing changes that, when thresholds are crossed, could cause abrupt impacts for society and ecosystems. The report considered destabilization of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet (which could cause 3–4 m of potential sea level rise) as an abrupt climate impact with unknown but probably low probability of occurring this century. The report

categorized a decrease in ocean oxygen content (with attendant threats to aerobic marine life); increase in intensity, frequency, and duration of heat waves; and increase in frequency and intensity of extreme precipitation events (droughts, floods, hurricanes, and major storms) as climate impacts with moderate risk of an abrupt change within this century. The NRC Abrupt Impacts report also analyzed the threat of rapid state changes in ecosystems and species extinctions as examples of an irreversible impact that is expected to be exacerbated by climate change. Species at most risk include those whose migration potential is limited, whether because they live on mountaintops or fragmented habitats with barriers to movement, or because climatic conditions are changing more rapidly than the species can move or adapt. While some of these abrupt impacts may be of low or moderate probability in this century, the probability for a significant change in many of these processes after 2100 was judged to be higher, with severe impacts likely should the abrupt change occur. Future temperature changes will be influenced by what emissions path the world follows. In its high emission scenario, the IPCC AR5 projects that global temperatures by the end of the century will likely be 2.6 °C to 4.8 °C (4.7 to 8.6 °F) warmer than today. There is very high confidence that temperatures on land and in the Arctic will warm even faster than the global average. However, according to the NCA3, significant reductions in emissions would lead to noticeably less future warming beyond mid-century, and therefore less impact to public health and welfare. According to the NCA3, regions closer to the poles are projected to receive more precipitation, while the dry subtropics expand (colloquially, this has been summarized as wet areas getting wet and dry regions getting drier), while "[t]he widespread trend of increasing heavy downpours is expected to continue, with precipitation becoming less frequent but more intense." Meanwhile, the NRC Climate Stabilization Targets assessment found that the area burned by wildfire in parts of western North America is expected to grow by 2 to 4 times for 1 °C (1.8 °F) of warming. The NCA also found that "[e]xtrapolation of the present observed trend suggests an essentially ice-free Arctic in summer before mid-century." Retreating snow and ice, and emissions of carbon dioxide and methane released from thawing permafrost, are very likely to amplify future warming.

Since the 2009 Endangerment Finding, the IPCC AR5, the USGCRP

²² USGCRP, Third National Climate Assessment, p. 221.

²³ See also Kleeman, M.J., S.-H. Chen, and R.A. Harley. 2010. Climate change impact on air quality in California: Report to the California Air Resources Board. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/qpr/past/04-349.pdf>.

²⁴ National Research Council, Understanding Earth's Deep Past, p. 138.

NCA3, and three of the new NRC assessments provide estimates of projected global average sea level rise. These estimates, while not always directly comparable as they assume different emissions scenarios and baselines, are at least 40 percent larger than, and in some cases more than twice as large as, the projected rise estimated in the IPCC AR4 assessment, which was referred to in the 2009 Endangerment Finding. The NRC Sea Level Rise assessment projects a global average sea level rise of 0.5 to 1.4 meters by 2100. The NRC National Security Implications assessment suggests that “the Department of the Navy should expect roughly 0.4 to 2 meters global average sea-level rise by 2100.” The NRC Climate Stabilization Targets assessment states that a global average temperature increase of 3 °C will lead to a global average sea level rise of 0.5 to 1 meter by 2100. These NRC and IPCC assessments continue to recognize and characterize the uncertainty inherent in accounting for melting ice sheets in sea level rise projections.

In addition to future impacts, the NCA3 emphasizes that climate change driven by human emissions of GHGs is already happening now and it is happening in the U.S. According to the IPCC AR5 and the NCA3, there are a number of climate-related changes that have been observed recently, and these changes are projected to accelerate in the future:

- The planet warmed about 0.85 °C (1.5 °F) from 1880 to 2012. It is extremely likely (>95 percent probability) that human influence was the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century, and likely (>66 percent probability) that human influence has more than doubled the probability of occurrence of heat waves in some locations. In the Northern Hemisphere, the last 30 years were likely the warmest 30 year period of the last 1400 years.

- Global sea levels rose 0.19 m (7.5 inches) from 1901 to 2010. Contributing to this rise was the warming of the oceans and melting of land ice. It is likely that 275 gigatons per year of ice melted from land glaciers (not including ice sheets) since 1993, and that the rate of loss of ice from the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets increased substantially in recent years, to 215 gigatons per year and 147 gigatons per year respectively since 2002. For context, 360 gigatons of ice melt is sufficient to cause global sea levels to rise 1 mm.

- Annual mean Arctic sea ice has been declining at 3.5 to 4.1 percent per decade, and Northern Hemisphere snow cover extent has decreased at about 1.6 percent per decade for March and 11.7 percent per decade for June.

- Permafrost temperatures have increased in most regions since the 1980s, by up to 3 °C (5.4 °F) in parts of Northern Alaska.

- Winter storm frequency and intensity have both increased in the Northern Hemisphere. The NCA3 states that the increases in the severity or frequency of some types of extreme weather and climate events in recent decades can affect energy production and delivery, causing supply disruptions, and compromise other essential infrastructure such as water and transportation systems.

In addition to the changes documented in the assessment literature, there have been other climate milestones of note. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), methane concentrations in 2014 were about 1,823 parts per billion, 150 percent higher than concentrations were in 1750. After a few years of nearly stable concentrations from 1999 to 2006, methane concentrations have resumed increasing at about 5 parts per billion per year.²⁵ Concentrations today are likely higher than they have been for at least the past 800,000 years.²⁶ Arctic sea ice has continued to decline, with September of 2012 marking the record low in terms of Arctic sea ice extent, 40 percent below the 1979–2000 median. Sea level has continued to rise at a rate of 3.2 mm per year (1.3 inches/decade) since satellite observations started in 1993, more than twice the average rate of rise in the 20th century prior to 1993.²⁷ And 2015 was the warmest year globally in the modern global surface temperature record, going back to 1880, breaking the record previously held by 2014; this now means that the last 15 years have been 15 of the 16 warmest years on record.²⁸

These assessments and observed changes raise concerns that reducing emissions of GHGs across the globe is necessary in order to avoid the worst impacts of climate change, and underscore the urgency of reducing emissions now. In 2011 the NRC Committee on America’s Climate Choices listed a number of reasons “why it is imprudent to delay actions that at least begin the process of substantially reducing emissions.”²⁹ For example, they stated:

- The faster emissions are reduced, the lower the risks posed by climate change. Delays in reducing emissions could commit

²⁵ Ed Dlugokencky, NOAA/ESRL (www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends_ch4/).

²⁶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2014. Climate change indicators in the United States, 2014. Third edition. EPA 430-R-14-004. www.epa.gov/climatechange/indicators.

²⁷ Blunden, J., and D.S. Arndt, Eds., 2015: State of the Climate in 2014. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 96 (7), S1–S267.

²⁸ <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/sotc/global/201513>.

²⁹ NRC, 2011: America’s Climate Choices, The National Academies Press, p. 2.

the planet to a wide range of adverse impacts, especially if the sensitivity of the climate to GHGs is on the higher end of the estimated range.

- Waiting for unacceptable impacts to occur before taking action is imprudent because the effects of GHG emissions do not fully manifest themselves for decades and, once manifested, many of these changes will persist for hundreds or even thousands of years.

- In the committee’s judgment, the risks associated with doing business as usual are a much greater concern than the risks associated with engaging in strong response efforts.

Overview of Climate Change Impacts in the United States

The NCA3 assessed the climate impacts in eight regions of the U.S., noting that changes in physical climate parameters such as temperatures, precipitation, and sea ice retreat were already having impacts on forests, water supplies, ecosystems, flooding, heat waves, and air quality. The U.S. average temperatures have similarly increased by 1.3 to 1.9 degrees F since 1895, with most of that increase occurring since 1970, and the most recent decade was the U.S.’s hottest as well as the world’s hottest. Moreover, the NCA3 found that future warming is projected to be much larger than recent observed variations in temperature, with 2 to 4 degrees F warming expected in most areas of the U.S. over the next few decades, and up to 10 degrees F possible by the end of the century assuming continued increases in emissions. Extreme heat events will continue to become more common, and extreme cold less common. Additionally, precipitation is considered likely to increase in the northern states, decrease in the southern states, and with the heaviest precipitation events projected to increase everywhere.

In the Northeast, temperatures increased almost 2 °F from 1895 to 2011, precipitation increased by about 5 inches (10 percent), and sea level rise of about a foot has led to an increase in coastal flooding. In the future, if emissions continue to increase, the Northeast is projected to experience 4.5 to 10 °F of warming by the 2080s. This is expected to lead to more heat waves, coastal and river flooding, and intense precipitation events. Sea levels in the Northeast are expected to increase faster than the global average because of subsidence, and models suggest changing ocean currents may further increase the rate of sea level rise.

In the Southeast, average annual temperature during the last century cycled between warm and cool periods. A warm peak occurred during the 1930s

and 1940s followed by a cool period and temperatures then increased again from 1970 to the present by an average of 2 °F. Louisiana has already lost 1,880 square miles of land in the last 80 years due to sea level rise and other contributing factors. The Southeast is exceptionally vulnerable to sea level rise, extreme heat events, hurricanes, and decreased water availability. Major risks of further warming include significant increases in the number of hot days (95 °F or above) and decreases in freezing events, as well as exacerbated ground level ozone in urban areas. Projections suggest that there may be fewer hurricanes in the Atlantic in the future, but they will be more intense, with more Category 4 and 5 storms. The NCA identified New Orleans, Miami, Tampa, Charleston, and Virginia Beach as cities at particular risk of flooding.

In the Northwest, temperatures increased by about 1.3 °F between 1895 and 2011. Snowpack in the Northwest is an important freshwater source for the region. More precipitation falling as rain instead of snow has reduced the snowpack, and warmer springs have corresponded to earlier snowpack melting and reduced stream flows during summer months. Drier conditions have increased the extent of wildfires in the region. Average annual temperatures are projected to increase by 3.3 °F to 9.7 °F by the end of the century (depending on future global GHG emissions), with the greatest warming is expected during the summer. Continued increases in global GHG emissions are projected to result in up to a 30 percent decrease in summer precipitation. Warmer waters are expected to increase disease and mortality in important fish species, including Chinook and sockeye salmon.

In Alaska, temperatures have changed faster than anywhere else in the U.S. Annual temperatures increased by about 3 °F in the past 60 years. Warming in the winter has been even greater, rising by an average of 6 °F. Glaciers in Alaska are melting at some of the fastest rates on Earth. Permafrost soils are also warming and beginning to thaw. Drier conditions had already contributed to more large wildfires in the 10 years prior to the NCA3 than in any previous decade since the 1940s, when recordkeeping began, and subsequent years have seen even more wildfires. By the end of this century, continued increases in GHG emissions are expected to increase temperatures by 10 to 12 °F in the northernmost parts of Alaska, by 8 to 10 °F in the interior, and by 6 to 8 °F across the rest of the state. These increases will exacerbate ongoing

arctic sea ice loss, glacial melt, permafrost thaw and increased wildfire, and threaten humans, ecosystems, and infrastructure.

In the Southwest, temperatures are now about 2 °F higher than the past century, and are already the warmest that region has experienced in at least 600 years. The NCA notes that there is evidence that climate-change induced warming on top of recent drought has influenced tree mortality, wildfire frequency and area, and forest insect outbreaks. At the time of publication of the NCA, even before the last 2 years of extreme drought in California, tree ring data was already indicating that the region might be experiencing its driest period in 800 years. The Southwest is projected to warm an additional 5.5 to 9.5 °F over the next century if emissions continue to increase. Winter snowpack in the Southwest is projected to decline (consistent with recent record lows), reducing the reliability of surface water supplies for cities, agriculture, cooling for power plants, and ecosystems. Sea level rise along the California coast is projected to worsen coastal erosion, increase flooding risk for coastal highways, bridges, and low-lying airports, and pose a threat to groundwater supplies in coastal cities. Also, “[t]he combination of a longer frost-free season, less frequent cold air outbreaks, and more frequent heat waves accelerates crop ripening and maturity, reduces yields of corn, tree fruit, and wine grapes, stresses livestock, and increases agricultural water consumption.” Increased drought, higher temperatures, and bark beetle outbreaks are likely to contribute to continued increases in wildfires.

The rate of warming in the Midwest has markedly accelerated over the past few decades. Temperatures rose by more than 1.5 °F from 1900 to 2010, but between 1980 and 2010 the rate of warming was three times faster than from 1900 through 2010. Precipitation generally increased over the last century, with much of the increase driven by intensification of the heaviest rainfalls. Several types of extreme weather events in the Midwest (*e.g.*, heat waves and flooding) have already increased in frequency and/or intensity due to climate change. In the future, if emissions continue increasing, the Midwest is expected to experience 5.6 to 8.5 °F of warming by the 2080s, leading to more heat waves. Specific vulnerabilities highlighted by the NCA include long-term decreases in agricultural productivity, changes in the composition of the region’s forests, increased public health threats from heat waves and degraded air and water

quality, negative impacts on transportation and other infrastructure associated with extreme rainfall events and flooding, and risks to the Great Lakes including shifts in invasive species, increases in harmful algal blooms, and declining beach health.

High temperatures (more than 100 °F in the Southern Plains and more than 95 °F in the Northern Plains) are projected to occur much more frequently by mid-century. Increases in extreme heat will increase heat stress for residents, energy demand for air conditioning, and water losses. In Hawaii, other Pacific islands, and the Caribbean, rising air and ocean temperatures, shifting rainfall patterns, changing frequencies and intensities of storms and drought, decreasing base flow in streams, rising sea levels, and changing ocean chemistry will affect ecosystems on land and in the oceans, as well as local communities, livelihoods, and cultures. Low islands are particularly at risk.

In Hawaii and the Pacific islands, “[w]armer oceans are leading to increased coral bleaching events and disease outbreaks in coral reefs, as well as changed distribution patterns of tuna fisheries. Ocean acidification will reduce coral growth and health. Warming and acidification, combined with existing stresses, will strongly affect coral reef fish communities.” For Hawaii and the Pacific islands, future sea surface temperatures are projected to increase 2.3 °F by 2055 and 4.7 °F by 2090 under a scenario that assumes continued increases in emissions.

Methane Specific Impacts. Methane is also a precursor to ground-level ozone, which can cause a number of harmful effects on public health and the environment. Additionally, ozone is a short-lived climate forcer that contributes to global warming. In remote areas, methane is an important precursor to tropospheric ozone formation.³⁰ Almost half of the global annual mean ozone increase since preindustrial times is believed to be due to anthropogenic methane.³¹ Projections of future emissions also indicate that methane is likely to be a key contributor to ozone concentrations in the future.³² Unlike nitrogen oxide (NO_x) and VOC, which affect ozone concentrations regionally and at hourly time scales, methane emissions affect ozone concentrations globally and on decadal

³⁰ U.S. EPA. 2013. “Integrated Science Assessment for Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants (Final Report).” EPA-600-R-10-076F. National Center for Environmental Assessment—RTP Division. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/ncea/isa/>.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*

time scales given methane's relatively long atmospheric lifetime compared to these other ozone precursors.³³ Reducing methane emissions, therefore, may contribute to efforts to reduce global background ozone concentrations that contribute to the incidence of ozone-related health effects.^{34 35 36} These benefits are global and occur in both urban and rural areas.

C. What is the EPA's authority for reviewing the NSPS?

Section 111 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the EPA Administrator to list categories of stationary sources that in the Administrator's judgment cause or contribute significantly to air pollution that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. 42 U.S.C. 7411(b)(1)(A). The EPA must then issue performance standards for new (and modified or reconstructed) sources in each source category. 42 U.S.C. 7411(b)(1)(B). These standards are referred to as new source performance standards or NSPS. The EPA has the authority to define the scope of the source categories, determine the pollutants for which standards should be developed, set the emission level of the standards, and distinguish among classes, type and sizes within categories in establishing the standards. 42 U.S.C. 7411(b).

On March 12, 1996 (61 FR 9905), under the authority of CAA section 111(b)(1)(A), the EPA added the MSW landfills source category to the priority list in 40 CFR 60.16 because, in the judgment of the Administrator, the source category contributes significantly to air pollution that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare. In that same notice, the EPA promulgated new source performance standards, which apply to new (and modified or reconstructed) landfills under the authority of CAA section 111(b)(1)(B), and emission guidelines, which apply to existing landfills, under the authority of CAA section 111(d). In the March 12, 1996 notice, the EPA defined the MSW landfills source category, identified municipal solid waste landfill emissions (commonly referred to as landfill gas) as the pollutant for which standards should be developed, identified which

landfills would be covered, and determined the applicability threshold and emission level of the standards.

CAA section 111(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 7411(a)(1)) provides that standards of performance are to "reflect the degree of emission limitation achievable through the application of the best system of emission limitation achievable through the application of the best system of emission reduction which (taking into account the cost of achieving such reduction and any nonair quality health environmental impact and energy requirements) the Administrator determines has been adequately demonstrated." We refer to this level of control as the best system of emission reduction or BSER. When promulgated in 1996, BSER for MSW landfills was determined to be a well-designed and well-operated LFG collection and control system with a control device capable of reducing NMOC by 98 percent by weight. NMOC was established as a surrogate for LFG in the final rule.

The CAA also requires the EPA to review the NSPS at least every 8 years to determine if the level of control that was previously established remains appropriate. Specifically, CAA section 111(b)(1)(B) (42 U.S.C. 7411(b)(1)(B)) requires the EPA to "at least every 8 years review and, if appropriate, revise" standards of performance. The Administrator need not review a standard, however, if the "Administrator determines that such review is not appropriate in light of readily available information on the efficacy" of the standard. While not required to do so, the EPA has authority to revise an NSPS to add emission limits for pollutants or emission sources not currently concurrent with its review of the NSPS (77 FR 49494, August 16, 2012).

In determining BSER, we typically conduct a review that identifies what emission reduction systems exist and how much they reduce air pollution in practice. Next, for each control system identified, we evaluate its costs, energy requirements, and any nonair quality health and environmental impacts. Based on our evaluation, we determine BSER for each pollutant to be regulated and establish an appropriate standard of performance based on the identified BSER. The resultant standard is usually expressed either as a numerical emissions limit, e.g., ppm or pounds per million British thermal unit (lb/MMBtu), or a percent reduction requirement. Although the standards are based on the identified BSER, the EPA may not require the use of a particular technology to comply with a

performance standard unless the Administrator determines that it is not feasible to prescribe or enforce a standard of performance. (CAA 111(b)(5), 42 U.S.C. 7411(b)(5).) Thus, except in rare circumstances, sources remain free to select any control measures that will meet the requirements of the standard(s). Upon promulgation, an NSPS becomes a national standard with which all new, reconstructed, and modified sources must comply. (CAA 111(e), 42 U.S.C. 7411(e).)

D. What is the purpose and scope of this action?

The purpose of this action is to (1) Present the results of the EPA's review of the MSW landfills NSPS, (2) finalize revisions to the NSPS based on that review, and (3) resolve or clarify several implementation issues that were addressed in prior proposed amendments published on May 23, 2002 (67 FR 36475) and September 8, 2006 (71 FR 53271) as they apply to new, modified, or reconstructed sources. The final revisions appear in 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX.³⁷ Although the EPA is not required to respond to comments received on the July 17, 2014, ANPRM (79 FR 41772) for the MSW landfills Emission Guidelines or comments it received on the concurrent proposal for revised Emission Guidelines for existing MSW landfills, in this document, the EPA is summarizing several comments it received to provide a framework and support the rationale for the final revisions to the NSPS.

E. How would the changes in applicability affect sources currently subject to subparts Cc and WWW?

Landfills currently subject to 40 CFR part 60, subparts Cc and WWW are considered "existing" with the promulgation of this new NSPS subpart XXX and are not affected by any changes to the NSPS resulting from this review. Each MSW landfill for which construction, modification, or reconstruction commenced on or before July 17, 2014, the date of proposal of the standard for new landfill under subpart XXX, is an existing source. Under section 111, a source is either new, i.e., construction, modification, or reconstruction commenced after a proposed NSPS is published in the **Federal Register** (CAA section 111(a)(1))

³⁷ Rather than merely updating 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW, the existing NSPS, the EPA has determined that the most appropriate way to proceed is to establish a new subpart that includes both the verbatim restatement of certain provisions in the existing NSPS and revisions to, or the addition of, other provisions.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ West, J.J., Fiore, A.M. 2005. "Management of tropospheric ozone by reducing methane emissions." *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 39:4685-4691.

³⁵ Anenberg, S.C., et al. 2009. "Intercontinental impacts of ozone pollution on human mortality," *Environ. Sci. & Technol.* 43: 6482-6487.

³⁶ Sarofim, M.C., Waldhoff, S.T., Anenberg, S.C. 2015. "Valuing the Ozone-Related Health Benefits of Methane Emission Controls," *Environ. Resource Econ.* DOI 10.1007/s10640-015-9937-6.

or existing, *i.e.*, any source other than a new source (CAA section 111(a)(6)). Since the revised NSPS apply to new (and modified or reconstructed) sources, any source that is not subject to subpart XXX will be subject to the revised Emission Guidelines found in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cf. Any existing MSW landfill that modifies or reconstructs after July 17, 2014 would become a new source subject to the NSPS subpart XXX.

IV. Summary of the Final NSPS

A. What are the control requirements?

1. Design Capacity and Emissions Thresholds

The revised NSPS retain the current design capacity threshold of 2.5 million Mg and 2.5 million m³, but reduce the NMOC emission threshold for the installation and removal of a GCCS from 50 Mg/yr to 34 Mg/yr for landfills that commence construction, reconstruction, or modification after July 17, 2014. An MSW landfill that exceeds the design capacity threshold must install and start up a GCCS within 30 months after LFG emissions reach or exceed an NMOC level of 34 Mg/yr NMOC. The owner or operator of a landfill may control the gas by routing it to a non-enclosed flare, an enclosed combustion device, or a treatment system that processes the collected gas for subsequent sale or beneficial use.

2. Tier 4

The current NSPS (40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW) provides that owners or operators determine whether the landfill has exceeded the NMOC emissions threshold using one of three available modeling approaches, known as Tiers 1, 2 and 3. The EPA is finalizing in subpart XXX an additional optional methodology based on site-specific surface methane emissions to determine when a landfill must install and operate a GCCS. This alternative emission threshold methodology, referred to as "Tier 4," is based on SEM and demonstrates that surface methane emissions are below a specific threshold. The Tier 4 SEM demonstration allows certain landfills that exceed modeled NMOC emission rate thresholds using Tier 1 or 2 to demonstrate that site-specific surface methane emissions are below a surface concentration threshold. A landfill that can demonstrate that surface emissions are below 500 ppm for four consecutive quarters does not trigger the requirement to install a GCCS even if Tier 1, 2, or 3 calculations indicate that the 34 Mg/yr threshold has been exceeded. Owners or operators continue

to keep detailed records of each quarterly monitoring demonstration and must submit a Tier 4 surface emissions report annually. Upon a surface emissions reading of greater than 500 ppm methane, the landfill must submit a GCCS design plan and install and operate a GCCS.

Tier 4 is based on the results of quarterly site-specific methane emissions monitoring of the perimeter of the landfill and entire surface of the landfill along a pattern that traverses the landfill at 30-meter (98-ft) intervals, in addition to monitoring areas where visual observations may indicate elevated concentrations of LFG, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover and all cover penetrations. If the landfill opts to use Tier 4 and there is any measured concentration of methane of 500 ppm or greater from the surface of the landfill, the owner or operator must install a GCCS, and the landfill cannot return to Tier 1, 2, or 3 modeling to demonstrate that emissions are below the NMOC threshold.

Tier 4 is allowed only if the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that NMOC emissions are greater than or equal to 34 Mg/yr, but less than 50 Mg/yr using Tier 1 or Tier 2. If both Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicate NMOC emissions of 50 Mg/yr or greater, Tier 4 cannot be used (a landfill need not model emissions under Tier 3 before using Tier 4). In order to verify that the landfill is eligible for Tier 4, the EPA is finalizing a provision to require landfill owners or operators that choose to use Tier 4 to continue to conduct Tier 1 and Tier 2 NMOC emission rate calculations and report results in the annual report.

In addition, the EPA is finalizing specific requirements for the use of Tier 4 for emission threshold determinations related to wind speed. Since accurate measurements can be compromised in even moderately windy conditions, the EPA is requiring the owner or operator to use a wind barrier, similar to a funnel or other device, to minimize surface air turbulence when onsite wind speed exceeds the limits in the rule. Thus, when a wind barrier is used, the final rule allows the Tier 4 surface emissions demonstration to proceed when the average on-site wind speed exceeds 4 mph, or gusts exceed 10 mph. Tier 4 measurements cannot be conducted if the average wind speed exceeds 25 mph. Although we are aware of the use of wind barriers in the field, the EPA intends to provide additional guidance on their use. In addition, the owner or operator must take digital photographs of the instrument setup, including the wind barrier. The photographs must be

time and date-stamped and taken at the first sampling location prior to sampling and at the last sampling location after sampling at the end of each sampling day, for the duration of the Tier 4 monitoring demonstration. The owner or operator must maintain those photographs per the recordkeeping requirements. Wind speed must be measured with an on-site anemometer with a continuous recorder and data logger for the entire duration of the monitoring event. The average wind speed must be determined at 5-minute intervals. The gust must be determined at 3-second intervals. Further, when taking surface measurements, the sampling probe must be held no more than 5 centimeters above the landfill surface (*e.g.*, using a mechanical device such as a wheel on a pole).

The EPA is also limiting the use of Tier 4 at landfills with a GCCS installed. In order for a landfill with an operational GCCS to qualify for Tier 4, the GCCS must have operated for at least 75 percent of the 12 months prior to initiating Tier 4 testing. The EPA is finalizing reporting and recordkeeping requirements for the annual operating hours of destruction devices in order to verify that a landfill with a GCCS installed and opting for Tier 4 meets the GCCS criteria for having operated the system.

The EPA is also finalizing reporting and recordkeeping requirements to improve the transparency of SEM testing. To ensure that a GCCS is installed in a timely manner, the EPA is requiring a GCCS to be installed and operated within 30 months of the most recent NMOC emission rate report in which the calculated NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 Mg/yr according to Tier 2, once there is any measured concentration of methane of 500 ppm or greater from the surface of the landfill. To improve the transparency of SEM testing, landfill owners or operators must notify the delegated authority 30 days prior to conducting Tier 4 tests and maintain records of all SEM monitoring data and calibrations.

3. Criteria for Removing GCCS

Landfill emissions increase as waste is added to a landfill, but decline over time; as waste decays, a landfill produces less and less methane and other pollutants. In the proposed revisions to the NSPS (79 FR 41811), the EPA requested comment on whether the three criteria for control device removal in 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW were appropriate for proposed 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX, and whether alternative criteria such as consecutive

quarterly measurements below a surface emission threshold should also be considered. Additionally, in the proposed revisions to the Emission Guidelines (80 FR 52112), the EPA recognized that many open landfills subject to control requirements contain inactive areas that have experienced declining LFG flows. The EPA is finalizing criteria for determining when it is appropriate to cap, remove, or decommission a portion of the GCCS. The criteria for capping, removing, or decommissioning the GCCS are: (1) The landfill is closed, (2) the calculated NMOC emission rate at the landfill is less than 34 Mg/yr on three successive test dates, and (3) the GCCS has operated for at least 15 years or the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows.

4. Excluding Non-Productive Areas From Control

In the proposed revisions to the NSPS (79 FR 41817), the EPA recognized that there are situations in which the quantity of gas production has greatly declined in separate closed areas of some landfills, and the methane content has fallen such that the area is producing insufficient gas to properly operate a GCCS and control device. Thus, the EPA is finalizing a provision that allows the use of actual flow data when estimating NMOC emissions for the purposes of excluding low- or non-productive areas of the landfill from control. To determine whether NMOC emissions from non-productive areas of the landfill are less than 1 percent of the total landfill NMOC emissions (and hence controls are not required), subpart WWW relies on modeled (calculated) NMOC rates (see 40 CFR 60.759(a)(3)(ii)). To refine the measurements of these non-productive areas, subpart XXX (40 CFR 60.769(a)(3)(ii)) allows owners or operators of landfills with physically separated, closed areas to either model NMOC emission rates, or determine the flow rate of LFG using actual measurements, to determine NMOC emissions. Using actual flow measurements yields a more precise measurement of NMOC emissions for purposes of demonstrating the closed area represents less than 1 percent of the landfill's total NMOC emissions. The NSPS has historically allowed owners or operators to exclude from control areas that are non-productive. In the final rule, the retained the 1 percent criteria level, rather than raising it, to prevent landfills from excluding areas from control unless emissions were very

low. But, to help owners or operators demonstrate that a non-productive area may be excluded from control, the final rule allows the owner or operator to use site-specific flow measurements to determine NMOC emissions.

5. Landfill Gas Treatment

The EPA is finalizing two provisions related to LFG treatment. First, the EPA is clarifying that the use of treated LFG is not limited to use as a fuel for a stationary combustion device but also allows other beneficial uses such as vehicle fuel, production of high-Btu gas for pipeline injection, and use as a raw material in a chemical manufacturing process. Second, the EPA is defining "treated landfill gas" as LFG processed in a treatment system meeting the requirements in 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX and defining "treatment system" as a system that filters, de-waters, and compresses LFG for sale or beneficial use. Owners or operators must develop a site-specific treatment system monitoring plan that includes monitoring parameters addressing all three elements of treatment (filtration, de-watering, and compression) to ensure the treatment system is operating properly for each intended end use of the treated LFG. They also must keep records that demonstrate that such parameters effectively monitor filtration, de-watering, and compression system performance necessary for each end use of the treated LFG. The treatment system monitoring plan must be submitted as part of the landfill's Title V permit application. The permitting authority will review the permit application, including the treatment system monitoring plan, as part of the general permitting process. The treatment system monitoring parameters would be included in the permit as applicable requirements and thus become enforceable conditions (*i.e.*, the landfill monitors the treatment system monitoring parameters and maintains them in the specified range).

B. What are the monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements?

1. Wellhead Monitoring

The operational standard, corrective action, and corresponding recordkeeping and reporting remain for temperature and maintaining negative pressure at the wellhead. The EPA is removing the operational standards (*i.e.*, the requirement to meet operating limits) for nitrogen/oxygen at the wellheads. Thus, the EPA is removing the corresponding requirement to take corrective action for exceedances of

nitrogen/oxygen at the wellheads. These adjustments to the wellhead monitoring parameters apply to all landfills.

Although landfill owners or operators are not required to take corrective action based on exceedances of nitrogen/oxygen levels at wellheads, they are required to monitor and maintain records of nitrogen/oxygen levels at wellheads on a monthly basis to inform any necessary adjustments to the GCCS and must maintain records of all monthly readings. The landfill owner or operator must make these records available to the Administrator (EPA Administrator or administrator of a state air pollution control agency or his or her designee) upon request.

2. Surface Monitoring

The EPA is finalizing the proposed requirement to monitor all surface penetrations. Landfills must conduct SEM at all cover penetrations and openings within the area of the landfill where waste has been placed and a GCCS is required to be in place and operating according to the operational standards in 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX. Specifically, landfill owners or operators must conduct surface monitoring on a quarterly basis around the entire perimeter of the collection area, and along a pattern that traverses the landfill at no more than 30-meter intervals, at all cover penetrations, and where visual observations may indicate elevated concentrations of LFG, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover. Cover penetrations include wellheads, but do not include items such as survey stakes, fencing or litter fencing, flags, signs, trees, and utility poles.

3. Corrective Action

The owner or operator must measure the LFG temperature at the wellhead and gauge pressure in the gas collection header applied to each individual well on a monthly basis. If there is an exceedance (*i.e.*, LFG temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) or positive pressure), the owner or operator must initiate corrective action within 5 days. If the temperature exceedance or negative pressure cannot be achieved within 15 days, then the owner or operator must determine the appropriate corrective action by conducting a root cause analysis and correct the exceedance as soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days after the first measurement of the temperature exceedance or positive pressure. For corrective action that takes longer than 60 days to fully implement, the owner or operator must also conduct a corrective action analysis and develop

an implementation schedule for the corrective action that does not exceed 120 days. The owner or operator must also notify the Administrator of any corrective action exceeding 60 days within 75 days and also include a description of the root cause analysis, corrective action analysis and implementation schedule in the annual report. If corrective action is expected to take longer than 120 days after the initial exceedance, the owner or operator must submit the corrective action plan and corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator for approval within 75 days of the first measurement of positive pressure. Owners or operators must keep records of corrective action analyses. Owners or operators must include corrective action records in the annual compliance report for corrective actions that take greater than 60 days to implement.

4. Update and Approval of Design Plan

The EPA is reaffirming some requirements and revising others to address design plans. Design plans must continue to be prepared and approved by a professional engineer. The landfill owner or operator must then notify the Administrator that the plan is completed and provide a copy of the plan's signature page. The Administrator will now have 90 days to make a decision about whether the plan should be submitted for review. If the Administrator chooses to review, the approval process continues as outlined in this section. However, if the Administrator indicates that submission is not required or doesn't respond within 90 days, the landfill owner or operator can continue to implement the plan with the recognition that they are proceeding at their own risk. In the event that the design plan is required to be modified to obtain approval, the owner/operator must take any steps necessary to conform any prior actions to the approved design plan and any failure to do so could result in an enforcement action.

The EPA is also finalizing two criteria for when an affected source must update its design plan and submit it to the Administrator for approval. A revised design plan must be submitted on the following timeline: (1) Within 90 days of expanding operations to an area not covered by the previously approved design plan; and (2) prior to installing or expanding the gas collection system in a manner other than the one described in the previous design plan. The final rule continues to require landfill owners or operators to prepare both an initial and revised design plan.

5. Electronic Reporting

The EPA is requiring owners or operators of new or modified MSW Landfills to submit electronic copies of certain required performance test reports, NMOC emission rate reports, annual reports, Tier 4 emission rate reports, and wet landfilling practices through the EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) using the Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface (CEDRI). Owners or operators are allowed to maintain electronic copies of the records in lieu of hardcopies to satisfy federal recordkeeping requirements.

The requirement to submit performance test data electronically to the EPA applies only to those performance tests conducted using test methods that are supported by the Electronic Reporting Tool (ERT). A listing of the pollutants and test methods supported by the ERT is available at: www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ert/ert_info.html. When the EPA adds new methods to the ERT, a notice will be sent out through the Clearinghouse for Inventories and Emissions Factors (CHIEF) Listserv (www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories/emissions-inventory-listservs) and a notice of availability will be added to the ERT Web site. You are encouraged to check the ERT Web site regularly for up-to-date information on methods supported by the ERT.

The EPA believes that the electronic submittal of the reports addressed in this rulemaking will increase the usefulness of the data contained in those reports, is in keeping with current trends in data availability, will further assist in the protection of public health and the environment and will ultimately result in less burden on the regulated community. Electronic reporting can also eliminate paper-based, manual processes, thereby saving time and resources, simplifying data entry, eliminating redundancies, minimizing data reporting errors and providing data quickly and accurately to the affected facilities, air agencies, the EPA and the public.

The EPA Web site that stores the submitted electronic data, WebFIRE, will be easily accessible to everyone and will provide a user-friendly interface that any stakeholder could access. By making the records, data, and reports addressed in this rulemaking readily available, the EPA, the regulated community, and the public will benefit when the EPA conducts its CAA-required reviews. As a result of having reports readily accessible, our ability to carry out comprehensive reviews will be

increased and achieved within a shorter period of time.

We anticipate fewer or less substantial information collection requests (ICRs) in conjunction with prospective CAA-required reviews may be needed. Under an electronic reporting system, the EPA would have air emissions and performance test data in hand; we would not have to collect these data from the regulated industry. The data would provide useful information on actual emissions, types of controls in place, locations of facilities, and other data that the EPA uses in conducting required reviews or future assessments. We expect this to result in a decrease in time spent by industry to respond to data collection requests. We also expect the ICRs to contain less extensive stack testing provisions, as we will already have stack test data electronically. Reduced testing requirements would be a cost savings to industry. The EPA should also be able to conduct these required reviews more quickly. While the regulated community may benefit from a reduced burden of ICRs, the general public benefits from the agency's ability to provide these required reviews more quickly, resulting in increased public health and environmental protection.

Air agencies could benefit from more streamlined and automated review of the electronically submitted data. Having reports and associated data in electronic format will facilitate review through the use of software "search" options, as well as the downloading and analyzing of data in spreadsheet format. The ability to access and review air emission report information electronically will assist air agencies to more quickly and accurately determine compliance with the applicable regulations, potentially allowing a faster response to violations which could minimize harmful air emissions. This benefits both air agencies and the general public.

For a more thorough discussion of electronic reporting required by this rule, see the discussion in the 2014 proposed NSPS (79 FR 41818) and the 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines (80 FR 52127). In summary, in addition to supporting regulation development, control strategy development, and other air pollution control activities, having an electronic database populated with performance test data will save industry, air agencies, and the EPA significant time, money, and effort while improving the quality of emission inventories and air quality regulations and enhancing the public's access to this important information.

6. Landfills Recirculating Leachate or Adding Other Liquids

In the 2014 ANPRM and 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines, the EPA solicited input on whether additional action should be taken to address emissions from wet landfills. As discussed in section VI.A.3 of this preamble, there were a wide variety of perspectives provided in the public comments, and while many commenters supported separate thresholds for wet landfills, the EPA did not receive sufficient data to support a separate subcategory for landfills adding leachate or other liquids. In addition, the EPA has several other pending regulatory actions that could affect wet landfills. Accordingly, the EPA believes it is appropriate to further assess emissions from wet landfills prior to taking additional action. Therefore, the EPA is finalizing electronic reporting of additional data elements, as discussed in Section V.A.2 of this preamble, to inform potential action on wet landfills in the future.

C. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions

The standards in 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX apply at all times, including periods of startup or shutdown, and periods of malfunction. The EPA is reaffirming the work practice standard that is applicable during SSM events wherein the landfill owner or operator is required to shut down the gas mover system and close all valves in the collection and control system potentially contributing to the venting of the gas to the atmosphere within 1 hour of the collection or control system not operating. The landfill owner or operator must also keep records and submit reports of all periods when the collection and control device is not operating.

D. Other Corrections and Clarifications

The EPA is finalizing the following clarifications and corrections to subpart XXX, which are consistent with the May 23, 2002 and September 8, 2006 proposed amendments to subpart WWW.

Consistent with the May 23, 2002 and September 8, 2006 proposed amendments, the EPA is finalizing language in subpart XXX to exempt owners/operators of boilers and process heaters with design capacities of 44 megawatts or greater from the requirement to conduct an initial performance test (40 CFR 60.762(b)(2)(iii)(B)).

Consistent with the September 8, 2006 proposed amendments, the EPA is

finalizing the removal of the term “combustion” from the requirement to monitor temperature of enclosed combustors (40 CFR 60.768(b)(2)(i) and 40 CFR 60.768(c)(1)(i)).

Consistent with the September 8, 2006 proposed amendments, we are amending the definition of “household waste” and adding a definition of “segregated yard waste” in subpart XXX (40 CFR 60.761) to clarify our intent regarding the applicability of the landfills NSPS to landfills that do not accept household waste, but accept segregated yard waste.

V. Summary of Significant Changes Since Proposal

A. Changes to Monitoring, Recordkeeping, and Reporting

1. Corrective Action

We are revising the procedural requirements for correcting positive pressure and temperature by allowing owners or operators 60 days to correct exceedances. If the owner or operator cannot achieve negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) by 60 days after the initial exceedance, owners or operators must conduct a root cause analysis to identify the most appropriate corrective action, which can include, but is not limited to, expanding the GCCS. For corrective action that takes longer than 60 days, owners or operators must develop an implementation schedule to complete the corrective action as soon as practicable, but no more than 120 days following the initial positive pressure or temperature reading. Additionally, owners or operators must keep records of the corrective action analysis. Owners or operators must submit the corrective action and corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator for approval when implementation of the corrective action is expected to take longer than 120 days after the initial exceedance.

This change provides flexibility to owners or operators in determining the appropriate remedy, as well as the timeline for implementing the remedy.

2. Landfills Recirculating Leachate or Adding Other Liquids

The EPA is adding electronic reporting requirements for wet areas of landfills. The additional reporting applies to areas of the landfill that have recirculated leachate within the last 10 years and to areas where other liquids were added within the last 10 years.

The EPA is requiring these landfills to annually report quantities of liquids added and/or leachate recirculated. The first report will contain historical

quantities, where those data are available in on-site records. The EPA is also requiring the landfill to report the surface area over which the liquids are added or the leachate is recirculated during each reporting year. The EPA is also requiring the landfill to report the total waste disposed in the area with recirculated leachate or added liquids as well as the annual waste acceptance rates in those same areas. As discussed in Section VI.A.3 of this preamble, this additional electronic reporting for wet landfills will inform potential future action on wet landfills.

3. Portable Gas Analyzers

We are allowing the use of portable gas composition analyzers in conjunction with Method 3A to monitor the oxygen level at a wellhead. The portable gas composition analyzer may be used to monitor the oxygen level at a wellhead provided that the analyzer is calibrated and meets all QA/QC requirements according to Method 3A. ASTM D6522–11 may be used as an alternative to Method 3A for wellhead monitoring as long as all the quality assurance is conducted as required by ASTM D6522–11. To use ASTM D6522–11, the sample location must be prior to combustion.

This change allows owners or operators to employ proven, reliable devices that are commonly used in practice to measure wellhead parameters. This change also eliminates the need for the landfill owner or operator to request portable analyzers as an alternative, as well as the need for agency review or approval of such requests. In addition to providing reliable results when used properly, portable analyzers have a number of benefits, including common use, the ability to provide additional information on gas composition, and the ability to download data to a spreadsheet for easy access and analysis.

4. More Precise Location Data

The EPA is finalizing a requirement for landfills to report the latitude and longitude coordinates of each surface emissions exceedance (500 ppm methane or greater) with an instrument accuracy of at least 4 meters. This change will provide a more robust and long-term record of GCCS performance. Landfill owners or operators and regulators can use locational data to gain perspective on how the LFG collection system is functioning over time and owners or operators will be able to track trends in GCCS performance and cover practices to ensure a well operating system and minimize emissions.

5. Update and Approval of Design Plan

Landfill owners or operators must submit an updated design plan for approval based on the following criteria: (1) Within 90 days of expanding operations to an area not covered by the previously approved design plan; and (2) before installing or expanding the gas collection system in a way that is not consistent to the previous design plan. In the final NSPS, the EPA removed a third criteria that was proposed: Update the design plan prior to implementing an approved alternative operating parameter value for temperature, nitrogen, or oxygen, if the owner or operator has requested alternative operating parameter values.

B. Tier 4

In the 2014 proposed NSPS, the EPA requested comment on whether to include an additional tier, "Tier 4," which would allow the use of site-specific measurements of surface methane emissions to determine if installation of a GCCS is required. In the 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines, the EPA proposed Tier 4 to determine if a landfill needed to install and operate a GCCS based on surface emission monitoring using EPA Method 21 (80 FR 52112). As indicated in section IV.A.2 of this preamble, the EPA is finalizing the use of Tier 4 SEM as an alternative way of determining when a landfill must install a GCCS. The details of the Tier 4 emission threshold methodology are presented in sections IV.A.2 and VI.B of this preamble.

C. Changes To Address Closed or Non-Productive Areas

Criteria for Removing GCCS. Since the emission threshold was reduced from 40 Mg/yr in the 2014 NSPS proposal to 34 Mg/yr in the 2015 supplemental NSPS proposal, the EPA is editing the criteria for removal in this final rule to be consistent with the final NMOC threshold of 34 Mg/yr. In addition, the EPA is finalizing an option for the landfill to demonstrate the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows to provide additional flexibility on low producing areas. The GCCS can be capped, removed, or decommissioned when a landfill owner or operator demonstrates that (1) the landfill is closed, (2) the calculated NMOC emission rate at the landfill is less than 34 Mg/yr on three consecutive test dates, and (3) the GCCS has operated for at least 15 years or the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows.

D. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions

In the 2014 NSPS proposal (79 FR 41812), the EPA clarified that performance standards apply at all times, including periods of SSM. The EPA also added requirements to estimate emissions during SSM events. Consistent with *Sierra Club v. EPA*, 551 F.3d 1019 (D.C. Cir. 2008), the EPA is clarifying that standards outlined in the NSPS apply at all times. In recognition of the unique nature of landfill emissions and consistent with the need for standards to apply at all times, including during periods of SSM, the EPA is reaffirming a work practice standard that applies during SSM events. During such events, owners or operators must shut down the gas mover system and close within 1 hour all valves in the collection and control system contributing to the potential venting of the gas to the atmosphere. The landfill owner or operator must also keep records and submit reports of all periods when the collection and control device is not operating.

E. Definitions for Treated Landfill Gas and Treatment System and Treatment System Monitoring

The definition of treated LFG is clarified to include not only use as a fuel for stationary combustion devices, but also allows other beneficial uses such as vehicle fuel, production of high-Btu gas for pipeline injection, and use as a raw material in a chemical manufacturing process. Additionally, the treatment system is defined as a system that filters, de-waters, and compresses LFG for sale or beneficial use. Further, the EPA is requiring site-specific treatment system monitoring plans that include monitoring parameters that address filtration, de-watering, and compression to ensure the treatment system is operating properly for the intended end use of the treated LFG.

F. Other Corrections and Clarifications

The use of EPA Method 25A and Method 18 (on a limited basis, e.g., specific compounds like methane) are included in the final rule. Method 25A in conjunction with Method 18 (for methane) or Method 3C can be used to determine NMOC for the outlet concentrations that are less than 50 ppm NMOC as carbon.

VI. Rationale for Significant Changes Since Proposal

After considering public comments and further analyzing the available data, the EPA made several changes in this final rule relative to what we proposed.

A complete list of public comments received on the proposed rule and the responses to them can be viewed in the *document*, "Responses to Public Comments on EPA's Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills and Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills: Proposed Rules" (hereafter "Response to Comments document"), which is available in Docket EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0215. This section of this preamble summarizes comments and presents responses for only provisions that have changed since the 2014 proposed NSPS and 2015 supplemental proposal.

A. Changes to Monitoring, Recordkeeping, and Reporting

1. Wellhead Monitoring

In the 2014 proposed NSPS, the EPA requested comment on alternative wellhead monitoring requirements, including potential removal of the temperature and nitrogen/oxygen monitoring requirements, or a reduction in the frequency of this monitoring. For example, the EPA indicated that it could reduce the frequency of wellhead monitoring for these three parameters (temperature and nitrogen/oxygen) from monthly to a quarterly or semi-annual schedule. The EPA requested comments on whether the potential exclusion should apply to a subset of landfills or landfill areas based on beneficial use of LFG.

In the 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines, the EPA proposed to remove the operational standards (*i.e.*, the requirement to meet operating limits) for temperature and nitrogen/oxygen at the wellheads, thus removing the corresponding requirement to take corrective action for exceedances of these parameters. This approach was taken to eliminate the need for owners or operators to request higher operating values (HOVs) for these parameters, submit alternative timelines for corrective action, or expand the GCCS to address exceeding these wellhead standards. The EPA proposed to maintain the requirement to monitor nitrogen/oxygen and temperature on a monthly basis, but to remove the requirement to report exceedances from fluctuations or variations in these parameters in the annual reports. Instead of annual reporting, the EPA proposed that landfill owners or operators maintain the records of this monthly monitoring on site to inform any necessary adjustments to the GCCS and make these records available to the Administrator upon request. The EPA proposed to maintain the requirement to

operate the GCCS at negative pressure and in a manner that collects the most LFG and minimizes losses of LFG through the surface of the landfill. The EPA also requested comments on whether it should add a requirement to monitor wellhead flowrate, or any other wellhead monitoring parameters, that would help to ensure a well-operated GCCS (80 FR 52138).

Comment: Several commenters want the EPA to maintain the wellhead operational standards, including states, industry consultants, and environmental organizations, with one environmental organization stating that these wellhead parameters are the only warning signal for potential fire hazard. One state stated that the removal of the operational standards could lead to some landfill owners or operators not operating the GCCS in an effective manner, thus creating a potential for increased LFG emissions through the landfill surface.

Many other commenters supported removing the nitrogen/oxygen and temperature operational standards, including industry, some states, and the Small Business Association. Several commenters indicated that a lack of response or approval of HOV requests or alternative timelines for corrective action, despite appropriate justification, is a significant administrative barrier in the current NSPS and Emission Guidelines. These commenters stated that a lack of response to or approval of HOVs results in owners or operators having to install new wells to correct for temperature or oxygen exceedance even though such expansion of the GCCS does not correct the exceedance and may be contrary to a well-operated GCCS. One commenter stated that removing the operational standards would alleviate one of the most significant barriers to installing interim gas collection measures and would alleviate the corresponding administrative burden of requesting HOVs. Other commenters stated that removing the operational standards would not only reduce administrative burden, but would also facilitate early installation of GCCS and the use of appropriate best management practices to maximize gas collection. Two comments from state agencies agreed with removing the operational standards, and agreed with retaining monthly monitoring of temperature and nitrogen/oxygen and retaining the corresponding monitoring data.

Several commenters suggested that certain monitoring data should be reported on a semi-annual basis so that agencies can identify or prevent fires. For example, state agency commenters

suggested that the EPA require semi-annual reporting of wellhead readings above 5 percent oxygen and 130 degrees Fahrenheit, which was supported by supplemental comments received from the industry and industry trade organizations. One commenter also suggested reporting of any subsurface fire. One regional agency wanted the results to be reported if temperature exceeds 150 degrees Fahrenheit and also suggested reporting any methane to carbon dioxide ratio less than 1.

Commenters that supported the removal of the operational standards for temperature and nitrogen/oxygen also contended that the nitrogen/oxygen and temperature wellhead parameters are poor indicators of landfill fires or inhibited decomposition and that landfill owners or operators already have their own incentive to prevent landfill fires. Commenters added that expanding the LFG collection system by drilling new wells may introduce more air into the landfill, which can exacerbate a fire and actually increase oxygen content. Commenters that favored retaining the operational standards for temperature and nitrogen/oxygen contend that temperature and nitrogen/oxygen data are essential to inform regulators of the presence of potential for a landfill fire.

Response: After carefully considering public comments and available data, the EPA is removing the operational standards (*i.e.*, the requirement to meet operating limits) for nitrogen/oxygen, but not temperature. Landfill owners or operators must continue to monitor nitrogen/oxygen on a monthly basis, however, to ensure that the GCCS is well maintained and operated, collects the most LFG, and minimizes losses of LFG through the surface of the landfill. Landfill owners or operators must maintain records of this monthly monitoring and make these records available to the Administrator upon request. The EPA is requiring monthly monitoring and recordkeeping for these wellhead monitoring parameters (*i.e.*, oxygen, nitrogen, temperature, and pressure), since these are key indicators that are already being monitored by landfill owner or operators to determine how well the landfill is being operated, including the capturing and destroying landfill gas, promoting efficient anaerobic decomposition and/or preventing landfill fires.

Because of concerns regarding fire hazards, the EPA is retaining the operational standard for temperature. Landfill owners or operators must electronically submit, as part of their annual report, all readings that show LFG temperatures greater than 55

degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit), and document the root cause and corrective action taken to correct for this exceedance, as discussed in section VI.A.2 of this preamble. While several commenters supported removing the temperature parameters, other commenters were concerned with fire risks if the parameter was removed. In addition, given the EPA experience with consent decrees and other enforcement actions involving elevated temperature values, the EPA has decided to retain temperature as an operating standard in the final rule. This overall approach will reduce the number of requests for HOVs and alternative timeliness for nitrogen/oxygen parameters. In addition, note that regulatory agencies can request data records of oxygen, nitrogen, or temperature monitoring, as measured on a monthly basis, at any time.

Landfills are subject to 40 CFR part 60, subpart A. These provisions require landfill owners or operators, to the extent practicable, to maintain and operate any affected facility including associated air pollution control equipment in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions. Due to the extreme environmental consequences of a subsurface landfill fire, these provisions obligate landfill owners or operators to take all practical steps necessary to avoid landfill fires. While this action removes requirements to meet operational standards for nitrogen/oxygen at wellheads and to make corrective actions, landfill owners or operators must continue all due diligence to ensure that the GCCS is not overdrawn, thereby creating a flammable subsurface environment. Because the corrective action requirements for certain parameters have been retained, the EPA is reaffirming its provisions for HOVs. The HOV provisions were originally enacted to address variations in temperature between landfills and between wells. With a sufficient demonstration (*i.e.*, supporting data showing the elevated parameter does not cause fires or significantly inhibit anaerobic decomposition by killing methanogens), an HOV may be established for temperature, nitrogen, or oxygen at a particular well. The EPA encourages regulatory authorities review requests for HOVs in a timely manner and to make use of these mechanisms where appropriate.³⁸

³⁸The EPA asserts the importance of case specific HOV requests and approvals. However, to address concerns from HOV request reviewers and those

2. Corrective Action

In a 1998 **Federal Register** notice (63 FR 32748, June 16, 1998), the EPA amended the wellhead monitoring provisions of 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW to allow an alternative timeline for correcting wellhead exceedances to be submitted to the Administrator for approval. The rule change made the wellhead monitoring provisions consistent with the SEM provisions, which allow an alternative remedy and corresponding timeline for correcting an exceedance to be submitted to the Administrator for approval. The EPA noted in the 1998 preamble that any timeline extending more than 120 days must be approved by the regulating agency. Since 1998, questions have been raised about the timing of correcting wellhead exceedances and whether a landfill needs agency approval for corrective action timelines that exceed 15 calendar days but are less than the 120 days allowed for expanding the GCCS.

The EPA clarified in the proposed subpart XXX that, with the exception of system expansion, all corrective actions expected to exceed 15 calendar days should be submitted to the agency for approval of an alternate timeline. Additionally, the EPA proposed that if a landfill owner or operator expects the system expansion to exceed the 120-day allowance period, it should submit a request and justification for an alternative timeline. Further, the EPA solicited comment on extending the requirement for notification from 15 days to as soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days.

The proposed Emission Guidelines noted that the proposed removal of operational standards for nitrogen/oxygen and temperature would drastically reduce the number of requests for alternative corrective action timelines. However, the requirement to maintain negative pressure at the wellhead remained in the proposal. Therefore, the EPA proposed a timeline for correcting positive pressure, including a requirement to submit an alternative corrective action timeline request to the Administrator if the landfill cannot restore negative pressure within 15 calendar days or the initial failure to maintain negative pressure and the landfill is unable to (or does not plan to) expand the gas collection within 120 days of the initial exceedance.

The EPA explained in the preamble for the 2015 Emission Guidelines proposal that it did not specify a schedule in the proposed rule language by when a landfill would need to submit alternative timeline requests because the EPA determined that investigating and determining the appropriate corrective action, as well as the schedule for implementing corrective action, would be site specific and depend on the reason for the exceedance (80 FR 52126). In addition, the EPA requested comment (80 FR 52126) on an alternative timeline that extends the requirement for notification from 15 days to as soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days from when an exceedance is identified.

Comment: The EPA received comments on the proposed changes, including the time allowed for corrective action and for submitting alternative timeline requests for approval by the Administrator. Regarding the timeframe for submitting a request, several state agencies recommended extending the 15-day timeline for a request to be submitted and indicated that 15 days is not sufficient time to evaluate the problem and plan for corrective action, which may often involve construction activities. There were varied opinions from the state agencies on what length of time beyond 15 days is appropriate. Two agencies supported an extension to as soon as practicable but no later than 60 days, while other agencies specified that the request should be submitted within 30 days from the initial exceedance.

Industry representatives from private and publicly owned landfills as well as waste industry consultants opposed the requirement to submit a request for an alternative corrective action timeline within 15 days. The commenters were concerned that 15 days is not enough time to assess the appropriate solution across miles of interconnected piping. In addition, the commenters were concerned that a 15-day time period would increase the paperwork for both the landfill and the reviewing regulatory agency. One commenter indicated that while many repairs can be completed within 60 days, some repairs, especially in cold weather climates, may take longer. One industry commenter suggested that a timeframe of 90 days to complete any adjustments or repairs is appropriate. If the corrections could not be made within 90 days, the commenter stated that the landfill would be prepared to have the system expanded within 120 days.

Industry commenters raised the issue that the timeline for corrective action for

surface exceedances in the current subpart WWW regulations, 40 CFR 60.755(c)(4)(v), allow 120 days to install a new well or other collection device or submit an alternative timeline for another corrective action. These commenters also indicated that the 1998 NSPS amendments modified the corrective action for wellhead parameter exceedances to be consistent with the timeframe allowed for correcting surface exceedances (63 FR 32748, June 16, 1998). The commenters also noted that the 1998 amendments recognized that installation of a new well may not always be the appropriate corrective action for remedying a wellhead exceedance.

Despite the 1998 rule amendments, several of these industry commenters note that interpretation and implementation of the 1998 amendments to 40 CFR 60.755(a)(3) have been inconsistent, with some agencies only requiring the landfill owner or operator to submit requests if the corrective action will take longer than 120 days. Other states have taken the position that any exceedances that cannot be resolved within 15 days must automatically result in a requirement to expand the GCCS. One commenter referenced determinations that required landfills to submit an alternative timeline request within 15 days. One commenter indicated that the original rule never anticipated notification and a request for an alternative compliance timeline within 15 days, while another commenter indicated that the state of Texas requires landfills to submit alternative timelines only if the corrective action requires more than 120 days to complete.

In consideration of the 1998 final rule notice, industry commenters, recommended that EPA require landfill owners or operators to submit an alternative timeline request for approval as soon as practicable and only in circumstances in which a system expansion or alternative corrective action will require more than 120 days to complete. One of the commenters suggested that this approach was consistent with the Petroleum Refineries NSPS (40 CFR part 60, subpart Ja). The commenter noted that while the Landfills NSPS requires special approval to avoid the default corrective action of expanding the GCCS, the Refineries NSPS requires a root cause analysis to identify the appropriate corrective action, without specifying a default approach. The Refineries NSPS requires a root cause analysis and a corrective action analysis for exceedances and requires the facility to implement the corrective action within

submitting requests, an example of regulatory guidance for HOV demonstrations can be found at http://www.epa.ohio.gov/portals/34/document/guidance/gd_1002.pdf.

45 days. If the corrective action cannot be completed in 45 days, the refinery must document and record all corrective actions completed to date. For actions not fully completed by day 45, they must develop an implementation schedule, as soon as practicable, for beginning and completing all corrective action.

One commenter provided some ideas for landfills to demonstrate good faith effort to comply with the 120-day corrective action schedule. They suggested the rules clarify that the landfill owner or operator is required to submit a notification to the agency that identifies and describes the diagnosis performed, the results of the diagnosis, identifies the corrective measure or alternative remedy to be implemented and reason(s) why system expansion is not appropriate to correct the exceedance. Under such an approach, corrective measures other than expansion that take 0–60 days to complete from the initial exceedance would not require any notification or approval but they would be documented in the annual compliance report. For corrective actions other than expansion that take longer than 60 days but less than 120 days to complete, the landfill owner or operator would notify the regulatory agency by day 75 from the date of the initial exceedance. This would allow 45 days for the agency to review and comment, and such notification would not require agency approval so as not to delay the site from proceeding with and completing the corrective action, as long as the corrective actions are completed within the 120-day timeframe.

Industry commenters indicated that the timeline for corrective action is affected by other regulations. Two of these commenters noted that any corrective action that involves disturbing the final landfill cover could delay diagnosing the problem. All of these commenters noted that a 60-day timeframe is problematic for landfills affected by the Asbestos NESHAP (40 CFR part 61, subpart M), which requires a 45-day notification prior to disturbing areas that may have asbestos containing material.

Response: The EPA is retaining the corrective action requirements for temperature in addition to negative pressure. The EPA recognizes the importance of temperature as a critical indicator of landfill fires and its effect on methanogens. Further, removal of the corrective action requirements for temperature could have the unintended consequence of improper operation of a GCCS, which could lead to a subsurface fire. Due to the important of this

parameter, e-reporting requirements for excessive temperatures have also been established to better assess landfill fires.³⁹

After carefully considering the comments received and evaluating the available data, the EPA is finalizing corrective action requirements that generally give owners or operators 60 days to investigate and determine the appropriate corrective action and then implement that action. The EPA has retained the requirements for temperature and positive pressure, in that if positive pressure or temperature exceedances exist, action must be initiated to correct the exceedances within 5 calendar days. This requirement has been retained to ensure the landfill takes prompt action to ensure the GCCS remains well-operated. The EPA recognizes, however, that the appropriate corrective action, as well as a schedule to implement it, is site-specific and depends on the reason for the exceedance. Therefore, for corrective action that takes longer than 60 days after the initial exceedance to implement, the EPA is providing flexibility for the landfill to determine the appropriate course of action based on a root cause analysis. Specifically, if the owner or operator cannot achieve negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) at the GCCS wellhead within 15 days, then the owner or operator must conduct a root cause analysis and correct the exceedance as soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days after positive pressure or temperature above 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) was first measured. An implementation schedule is required for exceedances that take longer than 60 days to correct. A root cause analysis is an assessment conducted through a process of investigation to determine the primary cause(s), and any other contributing cause(s), of positive pressure at a wellhead or temperature above 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit). The root cause analysis and documentation of the corrective action taken to restore negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) must be kept on site as a record, but they do not have to be submitted or approved.

If negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) cannot be achieved within

60 days, then the owner or operator must develop an implementation schedule to complete the corrective action(s) as soon as practicable, but no more than 120 days following the positive pressure or temperature reading. The implementation schedule, root cause analysis, and documentation of the corrective action taken to restore negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) must be submitted in the facility's next annual report, but these items do not have to be approved.

If the exceedance cannot be corrected (or is not expected to be corrected) within 120 days, then the owner or operator must submit the root cause analysis, plan for corrective action to restore negative pressure or temperature of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit), and the corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator. The Administrator must approve the plan for corrective action and the corresponding timeline. The owner or operator must submit the proposed corrective action and timeline to the Administrator for approval as soon as practicable but no later than 75 days after the initial exceedance. Requiring approval by the regulatory agency for corrective action timelines that extend beyond 120 days is consistent with the corrective action timeline for surface emissions in 40 CFR 60.765(c)(4)(v). This approach also prevents the landfill owner or operator from delaying submittals for corrective action requests until day 120. Once the negative pressure has been restored, the facility must document the corrective actions taken in the facility's next annual report.

For the corrective action required to address positive pressure, the owner or operator must keep a record of the root cause analysis conducted, including a description of the recommended corrective action(s); the date for corrective action(s) already completed following the positive pressure reading; and for action(s) not already completed within 60 days of the initial positive pressure reading, a schedule for implementation, including proposed commencement and completion dates. For corrective actions taking longer than 60 days to correct the exceedance, the owner or operator would also include in the annual report the root cause analysis, recommended corrective action(s), date corrective actions were completed, and schedule for implementing corrective actions. The owner or operator must also notify the Administrator within 75 days. For corrective actions that take longer than 120 days to correct the exceedance, the

³⁹ The need to rely on temperature in addition to pressure is also illustrated in the report titled *Subsurface Heating Events at Solid Waste and Construction and Demolition Debris Landfills: Best Management Practices* at <http://www.epa.ohio.gov/portals/34/document/guidance/subsurface%20heating%20events.1009.pdf>.

owner or operator would include, in a separate notification submitted to the Administrator for approval as soon as practicable, but no later than 75 days after the initial positive pressure reading, the root cause analysis, recommended corrective action(s), date corrective actions taken to date were completed, and proposed schedule for implementing corrective actions.

3. Landfills Recirculating Leachate or Adding Other Liquids

In the 2014 ANPRM and 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines, the EPA solicited input on whether additional action should be taken to address emissions from wet landfills (*i.e.*, landfills that recirculate leachate or add liquids). Commenters differed on whether the EPA should require separate thresholds or different lag times for landfills that recirculate leachate or add liquids. (The lag time is the time period between when the landfill exceeds the emission rate threshold and when controls are required to be installed and started up.) Commenters supported more environmentally protective requirements for wet landfills and asserted that wet landfills produce more methane but actually collect less. Commenters stated that the EPA should shorten the lag time for installing controls. Other commenters opposed separate requirements for wet landfills and contended that additional requirements for wet landfills would achieve minimal emission reductions and would result in a significant additional burden for landfills that recirculate leachate. One commenter said that the EPA should focus on potential emission reductions at landfills that recirculate leachate.

Commenters also differed on what methane generation rate (k-value) should be used in the landfills NSPS for wet landfills. One commenter indicated that they have previously provided several studies on k-values for wet landfills to EPA and urged the EPA to update the emission factors for wet landfills based on this literature prior to adjusting the control requirements at landfills recirculating leachate or adding other liquids. Another commenter asked the EPA to use higher, more representative k-values, or perhaps a sensitivity analysis for a range of k-values to estimate the impacts of controlling emissions from wet landfills in the landfills NSPS.

Based on the diverse nature of the feedback provided and several other outstanding EPA actions affecting the control requirements and emission factors for wet landfills, the EPA is not

creating separate emission threshold or lag time requirements for wet landfills in this action. Instead, the EPA believes it is appropriate to further assess emissions from wet landfills prior to taking additional action on control requirements or changes to the k-values. As a result, the EPA is finalizing additional electronic reporting requirements for wet landfills with a design capacity of 2.5 million Mg or greater to inform potential future action on wet landfills. The final rule is limiting reporting of this additional data to wet landfills that meet the current size threshold of 2.5 million Mg of design capacity to be consistent with the universe of landfills that are affected by the rule.

Specifically, the final NSPS requires annual electronic reporting of the volume of leachate recirculated (gallons per year) and the volume of other liquids added (gallons per year), as well as the surface area over which the leachate is recirculated (or sprayed), and the surface area (acres) over which any leachate or liquids are applied. The quantity of leachate recirculated or liquids added should be based on company records or engineering estimates. The initial report will collect historical data for the 10 years preceding the initial annual reporting year, to the extent the data are available in on-site records, along with data corresponding to the initial reporting year. After the initial report, the other annual electronic reports will include only the quantities of leachate recirculated and/or added liquid and their corresponding surface areas for each the subsequent reporting year. The EPA believes many landfills, especially those operating with a Research, Development, and Demonstration (RD&D) permit, already keep records and may submit reports containing quantities of liquids added. So, the effort to track these additional data is expected to be minimal. RD&D permits are issued through Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) subtitle D part 258 regulations for MSW landfills. The EPA is also aware of some state rules that require reporting of leachate or added liquids outside of the Clean Air Act reporting requirements. Consolidating these data in an electronic format in a central repository can help inform how leachate or added liquids affect LFG generation and collection whether air emission standards should be adjusted for wet landfills.

The EPA is also requiring the landfill to report the total waste disposed (Mg) in the area with recirculated leachate and/or added liquids, as well as the

annual waste acceptance rates (Mg/yr) in those same areas. Recognizing that the waste quantities may be tracked at the scale house entry to the landfill and not the specific cell where the liquids are added, the EPA is allowing the landfill to report data based on on-site records or engineering estimates.

The EPA is allowing owners or operators of landfills to discontinue annual reporting of the wet landfill report after the landfill has submitted its closure report recognizing that this information would be difficult to obtain after the landfill closed, these landfills are unlikely to still be adding liquids if closed, and also because the gas generation from these landfills are on the downward side of their gas generation curve.

The EPA is also aware of annual LFG collected and annual LFG generation data electronically reported to 40 CFR part 98, subpart HH of the GHGRP and therefore the EPA is not requesting reporting of these data in this rule to avoid duplicative requests. However, the EPA may link the wet landfill practices data collected under the landfills NSPS with the annual gas collected data under subpart HH in order to inform how liquids addition affects LFG emissions. Similarly, the EPA understands that precipitation may affect gas generation. However, since precipitation data are readily available through the National Weather Service, the EPA is not requiring reporting of this parameter. Instead, the EPA will use existing electronic data already available to link up with data collected under this final rule. These additional data will be used to assess the appropriateness of potential future action on wet areas of landfills.

The Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) requires each federal agency to obtain OMB approval before undertaking a collection of information directed to 10 or more people. The PRA applies whether a "collection of information is mandatory, voluntary, or required to obtain or retain a benefit." The EPA believes the additional data on wet landfills will be beneficial for evaluating whether separate thresholds for wet landfills are appropriate when revising future MSW landfill standards. Because the EPA understands that many of the data elements in the wet landfill report, including quantities of leachate or other liquids added and the surface areas over which those liquids are added are tracked at a state level as part of a leachate management or RD&D permit, the EPA does not anticipate these data. Additionally, the EPA is allowing landfill owners or operators to report the data elements in the wet landfill

monitoring report using either engineering estimates or on-site records to minimize the burden on respondents, depending on the types of records the landfill owner/operator may keep.

This is a new rule and a new collections submitted to OMB under EPA ICR number 2498.03. This collection is similar to collections for subpart WWW. Thus, many of the line item burden estimates in this ICR estimate are the same as the burdens submitted to OMB under ICR number 1557.09 for the most recent ICR renewal for subpart WWW.

4. Portable Analyzers

Commenters on the proposed NSPS (79 FR 41796) requested that the EPA specify that portable gas composition analyzers are an acceptable alternative to Methods 3A or 3C, and noted that these devices are commonly used in practice to measure wellhead parameters and are calibrated according to the manufacturer's specifications. Currently, approvals of these analyzers are done on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, in the preamble for the proposed revisions of the Emission Guidelines (80 FR 52141), the EPA requested data or information on using a portable gas composition analyzer according to Method 3A for wellhead monitoring. The EPA also requested data on other reference methods used for calibrating these analyzers.

Comment: Many commenters supported the use of portable gas composition analyzers and requested that the EPA specify that these analyzers may be used as an approved alternative monitoring method for well monitoring. Three state agencies indicated the use of the portable analyzers is common practice. One of these agencies stated that Method 3A and Method 3C are designed to be used in "quasi-CEMS" and/or "laboratory benchtop" situations and most landfill operators are not using this type of equipment to test wellhead LFG; instead, landfill operators are using handheld-size portable analyzers. Another state agency stated that portable gas composition analyzers (*e.g.*, Landtec GEM 2000) are a standard for conducting MSW landfill well monitoring and the analyzers provide additional information on gas composition than what the current Emission Guidelines require, which provides operators with a better understanding of the condition of the landfill. This commenter said that a primary advantage of portable gas composition analyzers, for both landfills and regulators, is that these devices take and record the monitored readings (as well as other information on gas

composition that is not required to be monitored in the Emission Guidelines), which can then be downloaded into a spreadsheet and prevent landfills from making data collection mistakes. The commenter suggested that the EPA and state air pollution control agencies would benefit if the EPA were to require landfills to submit, in their semi-annual reports, all of the monitoring data recorded by portable gas composition analyzers.

One commenter stated that most portable gas composition analyzers can be used to measure the oxygen level at the wellhead and can be calibrated according to Method 3A, but are unlikely to be calibrated according to Method 3C (to measure oxygen or nitrogen levels) because such calibration requires the use of gas chromatograph equipment with a thermal conductivity detector and integrator. The commenter said that Method 3A is straightforward and does not specify a particular technology. Several commenters specifically referenced the comments from an equipment manufacturer, which provided specific details on how its Landtec GEM Series portable analyzers are able to comply with each specific requirement in Method 3A, including the calibration requirements. Two of these commenters said that portable gas composition analyzers should be allowed in both the Emissions Guidelines and NSPS. Another of these commenters requested that the EPA add language to the rule to recognize that balance gas is commonly used as a surrogate for nitrogen.

With regard to the EPA's request for data on other reference methods used for calibrating portable gas composition analyzers, one commenter suggested that the EPA allow ASTM D6522 as an alternative to Method 3A because an analyzer can easily be calibrated for oxygen alone following ASTM D6522. The commenter stated that although the QA/QC procedures in ASTM D6522 are different from Method 3A, they are just as rigorous as Method 3A. The commenter stated that it has extensive data available showing portable gas composition analyzers are routinely calibrated according to ASTM Method D6522 for measuring NO_x, CO, and oxygen during engine testing. This commenter also stated that any analyzer or device must be calibrated according to an EPA approved method and not just manufacturer's specifications.

Response: The EPA appreciates the commenters providing information regarding the use of portable gas composition analyzers for landfill monitoring. Commenters provided data showing that their portable gas

composition analyzers are used to monitor the oxygen level at a wellhead and are capable of meeting the calibration requirements in Method 3A. Therefore, in today's action, we are clarifying the use of portable gas composition analyzers with Method 3A. A portable gas composition analyzer may be used to monitor the oxygen level at a wellhead provided that the portable analyzer is calibrated and meets all QA/QC according to Method 3A. Although we did not receive enough information regarding calibration methods that could be used on a portable gas composition analyzer to monitor the nitrogen level at a wellhead, any portable combustion monitor analyzer that uses gas chromatography and thermal conductivity technology may be used with Method 3C. Other technologies for the measurement of nitrogen may be used in lieu of Method 3C through the administrative alternative test method process outlined in 40 CFR 60.8(b)(2).

Regarding the suggestion to allow ASTM D6522–11 as an alternative to Method 3A, the EPA thanks the commenter for their perspective. As long as all the quality assurance is conducted as required by ASTM D6522–11, then ASTM D6522–11 may be used as an alternative to Method 3A for wellhead monitoring (prior to combustion). Examples of quality assurance required by ASTM D6522–11 include, but are not limited to: Analyzers must have a linearity check, interference check, bias check using mid-level gases, stability check, and be calibrated before a test; and a calibration error check and the interference verification must be conducted after the testing has occurred. Due to a different sample matrix typically found in post-combustion gas streams as stated in the applicability of ASTM D6522–11, the interference check must be done on the oxygen measurement with the appropriate gases (*e.g.*, carbon dioxide, VOC mixture, and methane) and concentration ranges. The ASTM D6522–11 method also has calibrations before and calibration checks after testing. According to Methods 3A, 3C, and ASTM D6522–11, the data are valid only when they pass the bias check or zero and upscale calibration error check. The EPA does not believe manufacturers' specifications are rigorous enough to ensure data are of a proper quality.

5. More Precise Location Data

The EPA proposed more specific requirements for reporting the locations where measured methane surface emissions are 500 ppm above

background in the 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines (80 FR 52124). Specifically, the EPA proposed to require landfills to report the latitude and longitude coordinates of each surface emissions monitoring (SEM) exceedance using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 3 meters. This includes surface methane readings above 500 ppm for landfills conducting quarterly SEM with GCCS in place, as well as landfills that are conducting Tier 4 SEM to determine the timing of GCCS installation.

Comments: Several commenters support and several commenters oppose the EPA's proposed requirement to report the latitude and longitude coordinates of each methane surface emissions exceedance using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 3 meters.

Of those commenters that support the requirement, one said that making global positioning system (GPS) coordinates of each exceedance available will assist owners or operators in determining the location and timing of exceedances relative to the GCCS components and would also assist in inspections and enforcement. This commenter added that these requirements provide important compliance monitoring assurances as well as important information to landfill owners or operators regarding their GCCS effectiveness. Other supportive commenters argued that all SEM data and GPS coordinates should be recorded, no matter whether there is an exceedance. One of these commenters, a state agency, said that the NSPS and Emission Guidelines have historically required retention of only exceedance data, but GPS data correlated with SEM readings would be an invaluable addition to the monitoring procedure. Another commenter said recording all SEM data (rather than only exceedances) is necessary to show compliance with the monitoring requirement; and by linking the methane readings with positioning data, the time required to process the data will be reduced. Commenters said that by correlating the SEM readings directly with the location of the reading, facilities and their regulators can easily gain a clear picture of how the LFG collection system was functioning and anticipate problems before they arise by tracking trends in the data.

Of the commenters that oppose the requirement that owners or operators of landfills report the latitude and longitude coordinates of each exceedance using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 3 meters, one said it is unclear why coordinate information

must be reported, given that it merely adds burden for sites to collect and report as well as for agencies to review. Two of these commenters argued that the added expense to purchase an instrument (*i.e.*, a GPS device), use that GPS device in the field, and then plot the GPS data on a map, may provide no additional value to the operator compared to marking exceedances with marker flags. One of these commenters stated that 3 meters is too much of an error range such that the use of GPS alone may not allow the operator to return the exact spot of the exceedance, and may still necessitate the use of a marker flag. Another of these commenters added that the existing approach of marking exceedances at their exact physical location with a marker flag is actually more accurate because it does not rely on a technology with accuracy limitations.

Some of the commenters that oppose the requirement said that it is unclear from the docket materials (*e.g.*, the Regulatory Impact Analysis) whether the EPA evaluated: (1) If GPS equipment can achieve an accuracy of at least 3 meters; (2) the cost to purchase or rent GPS equipment; and/or (3) the size and weight of the GPS equipment with regard to requiring a technician to carry another field monitoring instrument. One of these commenters added that because GPS equipment is not typically integrated into other monitoring devices, monitoring technicians will be required to carry the GPS equipment in addition to the monitoring equipment, which could be difficult and present a safety concern.

Response: The EPA is finalizing a requirement for landfills to report the latitude and longitude coordinates of each surface emissions exceedance, as proposed in the 2015 Emission Guidelines, except the instrument accuracy must be at least 4 meters instead of 3 meters. GPS technology is readily available and is currently in use at landfills in California and other landfills employing electronic LFG data management systems. These GPS devices have the ability to identify latitude and longitude coordinates in decimal degrees with at least five decimal places. This level of accuracy and precision is consistent with the requirements finalized in the Petroleum Refinery Sector Risk and Technology Review and New Source Performance Standards (80 FR 75250). The EPA is aware of one device that is already in use by some landfills in California to conduct surface emissions monitoring and to create a more comprehensive understanding of the GCCS. The instrument, containing a flame

ionization detector (FID), is linked by Bluetooth wireless technology to a GPS-enabled handheld field instrument. This instrument has an accuracy of 2–4 meters.

When reviewing site records on the location of the traversed path and where surface emission leaks were identified, inspectors will be able to identify areas of the landfill where surface monitoring activities may be incomplete, which may assist with targeting inspections to problem areas of the landfill. In addition, more precise location data will allow the landfill owner or operator to overlay the coordinates of surface exceedances against maps of the GCCS to determine spatial and temporal patterns of exceedances relative to GCCS components. Both the landfill owner or operator and regulators can use locational data to gain perspective on how the LFG collection system is functioning over time and will allow the landfill to track trends in GCCS performance and cover practices.

Using GPS locational data will provide a more robust and long-term record of GCCS performance compared to the short-term practice of simply marking an exceedance location with a marker flag. Owners or operators may continue the practice of marking exceedances with a flag, but GPS data will allow the landfill owner or operator to return readily to the location of the exceedance to not only take the required corrective action, but also to track and inform long-term performance of the GCCS to minimize emissions.

The EPA included the rental price of a Trimble Integrated Landfill Gas Solution device, which combines a FID linked by Bluetooth wireless technology to a GPS-enabled handheld field instrument, in the revised testing and monitoring cost analysis for both the final NSPS and final Emission Guidelines. The GPS location is recorded in real time as the technician traverses the path so the labor involved in gathering and recording the data with GPS coordinates is expected to be minimal. In fact, the recording of each surface reading and the corresponding locational data is automatic, in contrast to the older technology, which may have involved handwriting an exceedance in a notebook and then transposing the data to a computer after returning from the field. Eliminating transposing the data could reduce data entry errors and improve data accuracy and credibility. The GPS device is already in use by landfills that maintain an electronic LFG data management system to map long-term trends in GCCS performance. The GPS device weighs approximately 21 ounces (including

battery weight) and can be clipped to a belt or attached to a backpack to allow the technician to complete the monitoring safely.

6. Update and Approval of Design Plan

The EPA proposed three criteria for when a design plan must be submitted for approval: (1) Within 90 days of expanding operations to an area not covered by the previously approved design plan; (2) before installing or expanding the gas collection system in a way that is not consistent with the previous design plan; and (3) prior to implementing an approved alternative operating parameter value for temperature, nitrogen, or oxygen, if the owner or operator has requested alternative operating parameter values. Further, the EPA proposed to maintain the same site-specific design plan review and approval procedures while soliciting comment on ways to streamline the design plan submission and approval procedures. Similarly, the August 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines included the first two criteria but omitted the third criteria to submit an updated design plan prior to implementing an approved alternative operating parameter value for temperature, nitrogen, or oxygen.

Comment: Commenters opposed the requirement to update the design plan prior to implementing an approved alternative operating parameter value for temperature, nitrogen, or oxygen because the requirement to obtain approval of the updated design plan creates a duplicative approval process for these alternative values. Commenters stated that the EPA has removed operational flexibility and placed additional burden on the regulatory agencies by requiring this update and approval process for design plans. Several commenters noted that there is no approval timeline, which leaves landfills in limbo regarding their operations, even when alternative operating values have already been approved for the landfill.

Response: As discussed in Section VI.A.1 of this preamble, the EPA is finalizing the removal of operational standards for nitrogen/oxygen levels at the wellhead. High temperature values will be reported electronically on an annual basis. Thus, the EPA has also removed the criterion to update the design plan for alternative operational standards. The EPA did not finalize this criterion, in order to minimize additional burden on approving agencies and landfill owners or operators. See the Response to Comments document located in the docket for this final rule for additional

discussion related to updates and approval of the design plan.

B. Tier 4

The proposed subpart XXX included three different tiers that are available to an affected landfill to estimate whether or not the landfill exceeds the NMOC emission threshold, thus requiring collection and controls. The EPA requested comment on whether to include an additional tier, "Tier 4", which would allow the use of site-specific measurements of surface methane emissions to determine if installation of a GCCS is required.

Further, in the Emission Guidelines, the EPA proposed Tier 4 as an alternative site-specific emission threshold determination for when a landfill must install and operate a GCCS (80 FR 52112). Under the proposed Tier 4, landfills could demonstrate that surface methane emissions are below 500 ppm for four consecutive quarters based on the results of quarterly site-specific methane emissions monitoring of the perimeter of the landfill and entire surface of the landfill along a pattern that traverses the landfill at 30-meter (98-ft) intervals, in addition to where visual observations may indicate elevated concentrations of LFG, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover and all cover penetrations. Once a landfill opts to use Tier 4, any reading of 500 ppm or greater would require the installation and operation of a GCCS within 30 months of the Tier 2 exceedance. For both Tier 4 SEM for determining the timing for GCCS installation and SEM to ensure a well-operated GCCS, the EPA considered limiting SEM during windy conditions. Specifically, in the Emission Guidelines, the EPA proposed that SEM must be terminated when the average wind speed exceeds 5 mph or the instantaneous wind speed exceeds 10 mph. However, the EPA also proposed that the Administrator may approve alternatives to this wind speed SEM termination for landfills consistently having measured winds in excess of these specified limits.

The EPA received several comments on both the general request for comment on a Tier 4 provision in the 2014 NSPS proposal as well as more specific comments on the proposed Tier 4 provision included in the 2015 Emission Guidelines proposal. These comments are summarized below.

Comment: Many commenters, representing industry, state regulatory agencies, and environmental interests, supported the Tier 4 SEM approach for determining when a GCCS must be installed. In addition, the

Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) presented the idea of a surface concentration threshold as one of many potential alternatives to further reduce emissions from landfills in its January 2013 whitepaper.⁴⁰ Commenters stated that the option to conduct site-specific measurements using SEM is a more accurate indication of when gas collection is necessary to reduce emissions, compared to modeled emission rates. SEM is a data-driven approach that is better able to adjust for differentials in gas generation that may be a result of climate differences, waste acceptance rates, and cover soil materials that vary between landfills in different regions of the United States. One of these commenters claims that modeling can also cause landfills to install GCCS prematurely, incurring a financial burden that is not warranted.

One commenter disagreed with using Tier 4 to determine the timing of GCCS installation and suggested that the approach provides landfills another option to delay installation of controls. This commenter suggested either removing the provision or making Tier 4 much more stringent. Other commenters expressed concern about state agencies' lack of experience with SEM and time to determine whether Tier 4 monitoring requires a GCCS to be installed. These commenters also requested guidance for Tier 4 implementation procedures.

Commenters disagreed on the potential benefits of a Tier 4 option. Commenters representing both industry and environmental interests asserted the SEM option would encourage landfill owners or operators to implement methane reduction practices, such as the use of oxidative landfill covers, organic waste diversion, and interim gas control measures (horizontal gas collectors, connecting a leachate collection recovery system into a GCCS), noting that such practices could be implemented more quickly and more cost-effectively than a GCCS installed in accordance with the design plan requirements of the current NSPS. One commenter indicated that the use of SEM in determining the need to install a GCCS would reduce costs and energy consumption for landfills otherwise required to install controls. The commenter also asserted that landfills would not generate a sufficient amount of gas to support a collection system but would remain below surface emission thresholds based on site-specific

⁴⁰ Environmental Defense Fund. Recommendations and Considerations for EPA's Forthcoming Revisions to Section 111 Standards for MSW Landfills. January 2, 2013. See EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0215-0050.

measurements. Two commenters disagreed that Tier 4 would encourage organics diversion at landfills. One of these commenters agreed that Tier 4 would encourage the use of other methane reduction practices such as oxidative covers and interim gas controls, but these practices would be done at the expense of more effective installation of active GCCS.

Commenters made several specific suggestions regarding details of how Tier 4 should be implemented, including which landfills should qualify for Tier 4, the areas subject to SEM under Tier 4, the surface emission concentration to identify exceedances and how many exceedances would be needed to trigger GCCS installation under Tier 4, the ordering of Tiers 1–3 relative to Tier 4, and meteorological conditions necessary to achieve robust results. A summary of each of these implementation comments is presented below.

Which landfills should qualify. Some commenters believe that the EPA should limit the types of landfills that qualify for Tier 4. One commenter opposed the inclusion of a Tier 4 option for new landfills, stating that it allows a subset of new landfills to delay methane capture requirements when these landfills will be required to install a GCCS in the future and should have a GCCS designed and installed during landfill construction. One commenter encouraged the EPA to ban Tier 4 for landfills with a voluntary (non-regulatory) GCCS because it is possible that GCCS design, monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements could be avoided indefinitely through the use of a non-regulatory GCCS that may not provide the same level of control as required by the EPA landfills regulations. Another commenter thinks that Tier 4 could be conducted at landfills with a GCCS installed, but that the GCCS should follow typical operational conditions during the Tier 4 test. In other words, if portions of the site are typically offline due to decreased gas flow, the commenter thinks those portions must remain offline during Tier 4. Further, one commenter believes that no means of gas control whatsoever should be employed during the Tier 4 exemption.

Which areas. Commenters also recommended certain Tier 4 procedures for GCCS installation. They recommended conducting Tier 4 over the parts of the landfill that are required to install a GCCS, following the SEM methods currently established in 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW. If no exceedances of 500 ppm over background concentration occur, then

GCCS installation would not be required. Quarterly SEM would be conducted thereafter until the landfill or area of the landfill is closed. Closed areas would also be reviewed using the SEM approach, but if no exceedances occur, those closed areas would no longer be required to be tested.

Surface exceedances and corrective action. Regarding how many surface exceedances identified using Tier 4 should trigger GCCS installation requirements, commenters generally supported some form of corrective action allowance. Some commenters recommended that if an exceedance occurred during Tier 4 SEM testing, then landfill owners or operators should follow the same procedures and timelines for remediation and re-monitoring as outlined in 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW. These commenters further suggested that if an exceedance could not be remediated under the existing subpart WWW procedures, then the landfill would be required to prepare a GCCS design plan within 1 year of the initial exceedance and install a GCCS within the monitored area within 30 months of the initial exceedance. One commenter claimed that a lack of corrective action would cause facilities to avoid using Tier 4, causing it to seldom be used. Another commenter recommended some level of corrective action, because a single exceedance would not mean that LFG emissions were sufficient to necessitate GCCS installation. One commenter recommended providing a short period of time for corrective action and re-testing before GCCS installation. Other commenters recommend that Tier 4 SEM be modified to allow for a single, 10-day corrective action period for each exceedance of the 500 ppm threshold. Another commenter agreed to allow 10 days to correct the first exceedance, but also recommended allowing 10 days to correct the second exceedance, 1 year from the third exceedance to prepare the GCCS design plan, and 30 months from the initial exceedance to install the GCCS.

Order of tiers. In regards to moving through the tiers, commenters presented one of two opinions. Some commenters suggested that Tier 4 be available for use in place of or in addition to performing a Tier 1 or Tier 2 analysis. Several commenters suggested that Tier 4 could be employed at any point following a Tier 1 or Tier 2 test where the calculated NMOC emission rate was greater than the NMOC threshold for installing a GCCS. On the other hand, another commenter suggested that Tier 4 become the new Tier 3.

Threshold concentration. Commenters disagreed on the appropriate surface threshold concentration. Several commenters did not support a threshold below 500 ppm. Other commenters supported the adoption of a 200 ppm threshold for Tier 4 consistent with the CA Landfill Methane Rule (LMR) and incorporating an integrated limit of 25 ppm for Tier 4.

Frequency. There were a variety of opinions on how often SEM should be conducted for Tier 4. One commenter (suggested the SEM should be done annually instead of quarterly. Two other commenters were concerned with reducing the frequency to semi-annually unless the landfill no longer accepted waste. One of these commenters noted that if a landfill has already crossed the 34 Mg/yr NMOC threshold and the facility continues to receive solid waste, then the expected gas generation will continue to increase.

Wind restrictions. In the 2015 Emission Guidelines, the EPA proposed Tier 4 as an alternative site-specific emission threshold for determining when a landfill must install and operate a GCCS. For both Tier 4 SEM for determining the timing for GCCS installation and SEM to ensure a well-operated GCCS, the EPA considered limiting SEM during windy conditions. Specifically, in the 2015 Emission Guidelines, the EPA proposed that SEM must be terminated when the average wind speed exceeds 5 mph or the instantaneous wind speed exceeds 10 mph. However, the EPA also proposed that the Administrator may approve alternatives to this wind speed surface monitoring termination for landfills consistently having measured winds in excess of these specified limits.

Many commenters, including many state agencies, opposed limiting surface monitoring during windy conditions, stating that the wind restrictions would be a significant inhibitor to completing the required monitoring in many regions of the country due to typical windy conditions. Commenters also stated that it would be difficult to schedule and reschedule dedicated sampling crews.

Commenters claimed that climate conditions across the United States are too variable, that monitoring the wind using an anemometer is not representative of wind conditions where the surface monitoring is required (5–10 cm of surface), and that it is difficult to assemble monitoring teams and schedule monitoring events if they may be cancelled due to wind. One commenter supports the development of a Tier 4 SEM methodology that is functional during windy conditions.

Other commenters support the removal of the wind speed criteria and replacement with a requirement that surface monitoring be performed during typical meteorological conditions. Lastly, one commenter pointed out that the Tier 4 proposal is inconsistent with the ongoing quarterly SEM requirements since Tier 4 has wind restrictions and the ongoing quarterly SEM does not.

One commenter noted that EPA recognized wind speed can skew the results of SEM. Another commenter did not submit comments specific to the wind speed limitations; however, this commenter supported the SEM approach in the CA LMR, which does include wind speed restrictions.

Traverse pattern. One commenter recommended that EPA require enhanced SEM as part of Tier 4 demonstrations, including tighter walking patterns, consistent with the CA LMR.

Recordkeeping and reporting requirement. Some commenters believed the requirement to maintain all data was burdensome and that landfills should only be required to document exceedances of the 500 ppm threshold. These same commenters supported the notification requirement; however, one commenter believes landfills should not be required to reschedule monitoring events based on the availability of regulatory authorities. Furthermore, two commenters thought the notification requirement was acceptable but with the existing wind requirements, coordination with regulators could become even more challenging. Another commenter did not support the notification requirement because Tier 4 is voluntary.

Response: After considering public comments and input from small entity outreach, the EPA is finalizing Tier 4 SEM procedures for determining when a landfill must install a GCCS. Tier 4 provides operational flexibility and allows owners or operators of landfills that have exceeded the modeled NMOC emission rate threshold to demonstrate that site-specific surface methane emissions are below a specific threshold.

The EPA agrees with commenters that the Tier 4 SEM option will encourage landfill owners or operators to implement methane reduction practices, such as the use of oxidative landfill covers, organic waste diversion, and interim gas control measures and that such practices can be implemented more quickly and more cost-effectively than an NSPS-compliant GCCS. Such measures can directly affect surface emissions and when employed would help a landfill ensure that surface

emissions are low. The EPA expects that delaying installation of a regulatory GCCS will not have a significant negative impact on public health or the environment, if the surface emissions can be demonstrated to be kept below the threshold with early control or voluntary control measures. In fact, the EPA expects that alternative methane reduction operational practices employed by landfill owners or operators who are interested in Tier 4 will reduce near-term emissions of LFG from the surface of the landfill.

Under Tier 4, the landfill owner or operator would continue to calculate the NMOC emission rate using Tiers 1, 2, or 3, and report results in the annual report to demonstrate that NMOC emissions are less than 50 Mg/yr. However, a landfill that can demonstrate that surface emissions are below 500 ppm over the entire perimeter of the landfill and along a pattern that traverses the landfill at 30-meter intervals for four consecutive quarters will not trigger the requirement to install a GCCS even if Tier 1, 2, or 3 calculations indicate that the 34 Mg/yr threshold has been exceeded. Regarding frequency of monitoring, the EPA is finalizing an approach where quarterly SEM is required for Tier 4 indefinitely unless the landfill is closed. Closed landfills would be able to reduce the frequency of surface emission monitoring to annually after four quarters of no surface exceedances of 500 ppm methane or greater. Landfills that are closed are on the downside of their gas generation profile.

Tier 4 is allowed only if the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that NMOC emissions are greater than or equal to 34 Mg/yr but less than 50 Mg/yr using Tier 1 or Tier 2. Tier 3 was not required because tiers 1 and 2 are more commonly used. If both Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicate NMOC emissions of 50 Mg/yr or greater, then Tier 4 cannot be used. This change avoids a potential conflict between what is required under the Emission Guidelines and what is required by the landfills NESHAP for landfills with modeled NMOC emissions greater than 50 Mg/yr. It also ensures that landfills with modeled NMOC emissions at 50 Mg/yr or more continue to be required to install controls at an NMOC level and on a schedule that is at least as stringent as the current NSPS (40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW). To demonstrate that NMOC emissions are less than 50 Mg/yr according to Tier 1 and Tier 2, landfill owners or operators will continue to calculate the NMOC emission rate and report results annually.

If the landfill opts to use Tier 4 for its emission threshold determination and there is any measured concentration of methane of 500 ppm or greater from the surface of the landfill, the owner or operator must install a GCCS, and the landfill cannot go back to using Tiers 1, 2, or 3. Once there is any measured concentration of methane of 500 ppm or greater from the surface of the landfill, the EPA is requiring a GCCS to be installed and operated within 30 months of the most recent NMOC emission rate report with a calculated NMOC emission rate of 34 Mg/yr or greater according to Tier 2. Starting the 30 months from the most recent NMOC emission rate report ensures that a GCCS is installed in a timely manner. The EPA believes that if a landfill owner or operator chooses to use Tier 4 SEM, it is appropriate to require the installation and operation of a GCCS when any reading of 500 ppm or greater is detected during the quarterly SEM event. Since Tier 4 is allowed only if the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that NMOC emissions are greater than or equal to 34 Mg/yr NMOC, but less than 50 Mg/yr using Tier 1 or Tier 2, we would expect the methane emissions at the landfill to be below the 500 ppm threshold. If an exceedance of the threshold is detected, it would be indicative of higher emissions than would normally be expected at a landfill.

The EPA is requiring installation of a GCCS upon any measured concentration of methane of 500 ppm or greater from the surface of the landfill—without any corrective action, to ensure that landfills employ operational practices that minimize emissions. A reading of 500 ppm methane for a landfill that has modeled NMOC emissions greater than or equal to 34 Mg/yr NMOC would indicate that the landfill conditions warrant installation of a GCCS.

The EPA selected a 500 ppm threshold for Tier 4 because 500 ppm is consistent with the level the EPA determined to be appropriate to demonstrate that a GCCS is well-designed and well-operated. In other words, when conducted properly, SEM is a good indicator of how well a GCCS is operating overall. For landfills without a GCCS (including those that may be using other LFG mitigation strategies), the level of 500 ppm methane will demonstrate that site-specific surface methane emissions are as low as those allowed at a landfill with a well-operated and well-designed GCCS in place. (See the docketed memorandum “Establishing a Site-Specific Emission Threshold Alternative for MSW Landfills, 2015.”) Therefore,

the EPA believes this alternative site-specific concentration threshold will achieve the goal of minimizing methane emissions to the atmosphere. In addition, this approach is consistent with the surface concentration threshold approach in the CA LMR.

In response to public comments concerned with implementation of Tier 4 with wind speed restrictions, the EPA is retaining a wind speed limitation but allowing the use of a wind barrier when onsite wind speed exceeds the limits in the regulation. The EPA is also providing additional clarifications about probe placement (as described in section IV.A.2 of this preamble) for Tier 4 SEM. In the proposed NSPS (80 FR 52136), the EPA acknowledged concerns about the accuracy of SEM under windy conditions. The EPA is including the wind speed restriction, because air movement can affect whether the monitor is accurately reading the methane concentration during surface monitoring. Because Tier 4 is an optional emission threshold methodology, the EPA believes that wind speed restrictions and the use of wind barriers are appropriate to ensure the reliability of the results, which in turn determine the timing of GCCS installation. We also refined the wind speed criteria to account for gusts up to 10 mph and clarified that measurements must be terminated if the average wind speed exceeds 25 mph.

Regarding landfills equipped with a non-regulatory GCCS, the EPA is allowing the non-regulatory GCCS to be in operation during the Tier 4 SEM demonstration, but only if the non-regulatory GCCS has operated for at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration (6,570 hours), as discussed below. The EPA recognizes that many landfills have acted early to control their emissions and installed a GCCS before surpassing the size and NMOC emission thresholds in the landfills regulations in order to recover and utilize LFG methane for beneficial use, flare for carbon credits, control odors, or meet state-specific regulations that may be more stringent than the federal NSPS standards. Thus, during the SEM demonstration, the non-regulatory GCCS must continue to operate as it normally would to collect and control as much LFG as possible. Although these landfills do not operate their GCCS under the landfills NSPS, they employ the same technology that would be applied to comply with the landfills NSPS. Many of these non-regulatory GCCSs are located at sites that are likely to eventually exceed the NSPS size and NMOC emissions

thresholds and thus if no exceedances are identified during a Tier 4 SEM, the system is operating at a level consistent with the landfills NSPS collection and control requirements and operational standards at a point in time earlier than when federal regulations would require. These near-term methane reductions from non-regulatory GCCS are beneficial to the environment and the goal of achieving short-term emission reductions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas. In addition, landfill owners or operators have incentive to operate the GCCS as efficiently as possible to collect and control LFG to avoid surface exceedances, as it would reduce paperwork requirements associated with the compliance provisions of the landfills NSPS. The non-regulatory GCCS would have to be robust to keep readings below 500 ppm methane during an SEM demonstration.

To not allow the Tier 4 demonstration while a non-regulatory GCCS is in operation under these circumstances would create a disincentive for landfill owners or operators to install control systems voluntarily before emissions reach the regulatory threshold for review. The requirement to operate the GCCS at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration (described below) will ensure that the non-regulatory GCCS is in regular use and thus represents accurate operation of the facility.

The landfill owner or operator is allowed to operate the non-regulatory GCCS during the Tier 4 demonstration, but only if the non-regulatory GCCS has operated for at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration (6,570 of 8,760 hours). To demonstrate that the non-regulatory GCCS operated at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration, landfill owners or operators must keep records of the total operating hours of the gas collection system as measured for each destruction device (*i.e.*, at the flare, engine, or other destruction device), as well as the annual operating hours where active gas flow was sent to each destruction device. If the non-regulatory GCCS has not operated at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration, then the landfill is not eligible for Tier 4. The EPA seeks to encourage use of voluntary non-regulatory GCCS systems for early gas collection before emissions reach the regulatory threshold for review, while still allowing landfill owners and operators to use Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring approach to determine if a

GCCS is required. We believe that requiring the operation of the non-regulatory GCCS at least 75 percent of the hours during the 12 months leading up to the Tier 4 SEM demonstration (described below) will ensure that the non-regulatory GCCS is in regular use and thus results would be representative of the operation of the landfill.

Regarding other recordkeeping and reporting requirements associated with Tier 4, the EPA is finalizing the requirement to retain all surface data readings, including calibration data and traverse path and sampling location data based on GPS coordinates up to 5 decimal places. This approach will improve transparency of Tier 4 results, and make them readily available to any inspector coming to the landfill. Further, many sites already use data loggers to collect and store SEM readings and evaluate geospatial surface emission trends over time and the EPA disagrees that it would be overly burdensome to record these data and maintain them on-site. While the final rule is specifically requiring an electronic record of the latitude and longitude coordinates of each surface measurement, the EPA is not specifying a file extension for storing a record of an actual digital map file because each landfill or each regulatory agency may employ different GIS mapping or data management software programs. Instead, the EPA believes the electronic record of latitude and longitude coordinates associated with each surface emission sample will be more appropriate to withstand variation in technology versions over time or across different agencies, while still providing for a record format that can be easily converted into a map. The records will also include wind speed data, a timestamp (to the nearest second) of when the sample collection begins, and a log of the length of time each sample was taken (*e.g.*, the time the probe was held over the surface for each sample). The EPA is also finalizing a recordkeeping requirement to take and store digital photographs of the instrument setup. The photographs must be time and date-stamped and taken at the first sampling location prior to sampling and at the last sampling location after sampling at the end of each sampling day, for the duration of the Tier 4 monitoring demonstration. The EPA believes these records will help provide credibility to the Tier 4 sampling results.

The EPA is also finalizing a requirement to notify delegated authorities 30 days prior to the Tier 4 test so that officials can be present to observe the SEM. This notification is

consistent with other notification requirements for stack testing. This notification requirement will also mitigate concerns that the SEM is being conducted incorrectly and ensure transparency of results achieved during the SEM approach. In the event the Tier 4 SEM is postponed due to weather conditions or other unforeseen events, the EPA is requiring the owner or operator to notify the delegated authority to arrange a rescheduled Tier 4 SEM date.

Emerging Measurement Technologies. Today's rulemaking provides certain MSW landfill owners or operators the option of using either modeling or the Tier 4 SEM approach to determine whether controls are required to be installed at specific landfills. Current modeling approaches, which rely on the decomposition rate of different waste streams buried in a landfill, are prone to uncertainties due to inaccuracies in input data and often unverifiable assumptions. Current surface emission measurement methodologies can also have associated uncertainties.

New methane emissions measurement methodologies are emerging that are anticipated to provide landfill methane emission rates (mass per unit time) over time, thereby reducing significantly the uncertainty associated with current modeling and emission measurements approaches. Two promising examples of new methane measurement methodologies being used by research groups to quantify landfill methane emissions are mobile tracer correlation (TC)^{41 42 43 44} and discrete area source eddy covariance (DASEC).⁴⁵

1. *Mobile tracer correlation.* This method provides a "snap-shot in time" assessment of whole facility methane

⁴¹ Development of a mobile tracer correlation method for assessment of air emissions from landfills and other area sources, Foster-Wittig, T.A.; Thoma, E.D.; Green, R.B.; Hater, G.R.; Swan, N.D.; Chanton, J.P. *Atmos. Environ.* 2015, 102 (0), 323–330.

⁴² Quantification of methane emissions from 15 Danish landfills using the mobile tracer dispersion method, Mønster, J.; Samuelsson, J.; Kjeldsen, P.; Scheutz, C. *Waste Manage.* 2015, 35 (0), 177–186.

⁴³ Methane Emissions Measured at Two California Landfills by OTM-10 and an Acetylene Tracer Method, Green, R.B., Hater, G.R., Thoma, E.D., DeWees, J., Rella, C.W., Crosson, E.R., Goldsmith, C.D., Swan, N., Proceedings of the Global Waste Management Symposium, San Antonio, TX, October 3–6, 2010.

⁴⁴ Development of Mobile Measurement Method Series OTM 33; Thoma, E.D.; Brantley, H.L.; Squier, B.; DeWees, J.; Segall, R.; Merrill, R.; Proceedings of the Air and Waste Management Conference and Exhibition, Raleigh, NC, June 22–25, 2015.

⁴⁵ Using Eddy Covariance to Quantify Methane Emissions from a Dynamic Heterogeneous Area, Xu, L., Lin, X., Amen, J., Welding, K. and McDermitt, D. Impact of changes in barometric pressure on landfill methane emission. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 2014, 28(7), pp. 679–695.

emissions using on-site release of atmospheric tracer gases. It provides a total mass emission rate of methane (or other gas) per unit of time. An instrumented vehicle driving 1 km to 4 km downwind of the landfill simultaneously measures the emitted landfill methane plume along with the superimposed tracer gas release. The landfill methane emission rate is determined through a simple ratio to the known tracer gas release rate. The technique has been demonstrated using a variety of tracer gases and instruments by a number of groups to investigate emissions from landfills and other sources. The mobile tracer correlation approach is under development by the EPA as a Category C "other test method (OTM)" with potential posting in 2017 (<https://www3.epa.gov/ttnemc01/prelim.html>).

2. *Eddy covariance (EC).* This micrometeorological method estimates the source emission rate from the vertical wind speed and gas concentration above the emitting surface. This technique measures the emissions flux in mass of methane (or other gas) per unit area. The technique is well-established for measurement of emission fluxes from spatially-extended homogenous sources, such as very large, flat fields. Discrete area source eddy covariance (DASEC) is an application of EC to finite, heterogeneous area sources. This application of EC has been recently demonstrated on landfills, although method development questions on the effects of topography and variable observational foot print remain. DASEC provides the potential for long term (near continuous) measurements of discrete sections of a landfill using solar-powered on-site instrumentation. Development of this type of long term measurement capability is critical to better understand and track changes in landfill emissions overtime that may be caused by both site management and atmospheric factors.

In sum, as noted above, these techniques are still being investigated and additional work will be needed before the EPA can deem them ready for use in this application. Once additional research is completed, we believe that DASEC used in combination with mobile TC will provide a characterization of methane landfill emissions with significantly reduced uncertainty over current models or measurement techniques.

C. Changes To Address Closed or Non-Productive Areas

The EPA proposed criteria that allow a landfill owner or operator to cap or remove the GCCS from certain areas of the landfill where gas generation is expected to be diminished. Specifically, the 2014 proposed NSPS allowed GCCS removal when the landfill is closed, the GCCS has been operated for a minimum of 15 years, and the NMOC gas produced by the landfill is calculated below 40 Mg/yr for three consecutive quarters.

Comment: Commenters opposed the 15-year criteria for GCCS equipment, stating that the requirement is arbitrary and does not account for the site-specific conditions. One commenter added that the 15-year criteria presents significant compliance challenges and costs for a facility and the NSPS presents few options to address low flow and gas quality conditions. Another commenter contended that the length of time a GCCS has been operating in a portion of a landfill is unrelated to the productivity of that area and that the age of the waste is more relevant. Other commenters believe that regardless of how long a GCCS system has actually been in operation, closed landfills should be able to discontinue operations based on site-specific emission levels. One commenter believes that a closed MSW landfill should be able to remove NSPS control requirements once the site demonstrates that it emits less than the emissions threshold based on actual LFG flow and site-specific NMOC concentration in accordance with 40 CFR 60.764(b) regardless of the age of the GCCS or how long it has operated.

Several commenters noted that the provision provided in the 2015 Emission Guidelines to allow landfills to demonstrate the GCCS could not be operated for 15 years due to declining flow was vague, and more guidance was needed to provide instructions to landfills on how to demonstrate this to regulators.

Response: After considering public comments, the EPA is finalizing criteria for capping, removing, or decommissioning the GCCS that are similar to the criteria in 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW, but have been adjusted to reflect the NMOC emission threshold in the final rule and to provide flexibility on the requirement to operate the GCCS for 15 years. The final criteria are: (1) The landfill is closed, (2) the GCCS has been in operation for 15 years or the landfill owner or operator demonstrates that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flow, and (3) three successive tests for NMOC emissions are below the NMOC emission threshold of 34 Mg/yr.

The EPA is requiring that NMOC emission rate of the landfill must be less than 34 Mg/yr on three successive test dates. This makes the threshold for removing a GCCS consistent with the threshold for installing a GCCS. In addition, the EPA is retaining the requirement to operate the GCCS for 15 years, but is providing flexibility to address declining gas flow in areas where the GCCS has not operated for 15

years. If the landfill is closed and the NMOC emission rate is less than 34 Mg/yr, but the GCCS has not operated for 15 years, the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows. The EPA is providing this flexibility to address areas of declining gas flows due to the age of the waste, arid climate, or low organic content. Given that there are unique situations that could cause low gas flow, or low gas quality which would cause a GCCS to be unable to operate for 15 years, the EPA is not providing prescriptive criteria for how a landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that a GCCS could not operate for 15 years and will proceed with a site-specific approach for handling these unique cases. Some examples of data elements that could be used to demonstrate a GCCS is unable to operate may include supplemental fuel use at the flare to sustain operations or LFG quality sample measurements showing methane content lower than what is viable for combustion in the destruction device.

D. Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Provisions

In July 2014, the EPA proposed that the standards in subpart XXX apply at all times, including periods of startup or shutdown, and periods of malfunction. In addition, the proposed NSPS included recordkeeping and reporting requirements for all landfill owners or operators to estimate emissions during such periods.

Similarly, the EPA proposed standards that apply at all times in the August 2015 proposed Emission Guidelines. However, the EPA considered how the landfill emissions differ from those generated by industrial or manufacturing sources. Specifically, the EPA noted that landfill emissions are produced by a continuous biological process that cannot be stopped or restarted. Therefore, the primary concern related to SSM is with malfunction of the landfill GCCS and associated monitoring equipment, not with the startup or shutdown of the entire source. SSM periods that we have determined should be covered by the work practice standard are those periods when the landfill GCCS and associated monitoring equipment are not operating.

To address these SSM periods, the EPA proposed in the 2015 Emission Guidelines that in the event the collection or control system is not operating the gas mover system must be shut down and all valves in the GCCS contributing to venting of gas to the atmosphere must be closed within 1

hour of the collection or control system not operating. This provision is consistent with 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW. Additionally, the EPA proposed recordkeeping of combustion temperature, bypass flow, and periods when the flare flame or the flare pilot flame is out. The EPA received numerous comments on the 2014 proposed changes to the NSPS and the additional proposed edits made in the 2015 Emission Guidelines. A summary of these comments is presented below.

Sierra Club v. EPA, 551 F.3d 1019 (D.C. Cir. 2008). Many commenters stated that the *Sierra Club* decision, which addressed SSM conditions in EPA rules, applies only to rules with numerical emission limits and not to rules that are specified as a work practice. One of these commenters elaborated that *Sierra Club* applies to section 111 of the Clean Air Act. Therefore, the commenter concluded that landfills subject to the NSPS are not bound by the findings of *Sierra Club* and instead they are legally allowed to develop a clear and achievable landfill rule by considering the unique circumstances that a landfill is a biological process that cannot be stopped or restarted and that the gas collection and control systems must periodically be shut down for maintenance, repair, and expansion.

Retain the 5 day/1-hour exemption for SSM events. Many commenters, including affected industry commenters and some state agencies, disagreed with removing the provisions in 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW which allow for a 5-day exemption period for collection systems and 1-hour exemption period for treatment or control devices. These commenters indicated that by removing this provision, state and local agencies could misconstrue the rule to require that a landfill must operate the gas collection system at all times, even during SSM, including periods of collection system construction, expansion, and repair. These commenters suggested instead of removing the exemption provision during periods of SSM, compliance can be maintained as long as the landfill owner or operator minimizes emissions of LFG by following the applicable work practices and restores the system to operation as expeditiously as practicable.

One of the state agency commenters, suggested that the 5-day and 1-hour time limitations in subpart WWW are appropriate for most situations and instead of removing these exemptions, the new subpart XXX could provide a mechanism for the facility to apply to the Administration for an extension of

those timeframes. On the contrary, one state agency commenter and an NGO agreed with the standards applying at all times, including periods of SSM.

If the 5 day/1-hour exemption is not retained, the EPA should add a work practice standard for SSM events. One commenter was concerned that the preamble language for the 2014 proposed Emission Guidelines does not clarify how a landfill can demonstrate compliance with the standard during SSM events, stating that “compliance with proposed 40 CFR 60.34f(e) does not constitute compliance with the applicable standards in proposed 40 CFR 60.36f” and that “by shutting down flow to the flare or other control devices a source is unlikely to be in violation of the 98 percent emission reduction requirements since there will be no gas flowing to the control device” (emphasis added, see 80 FR 52134–52135). This commenter stated that the EPA must clarify this confusion and specify a clear set of work practices (e.g., shut down of the gas mover system and prevention of venting) that constitute compliance during SSM periods when the collection or control system is not operated. Several other industry commenters and the U.S. Small Business Administration also asked that the rule specifically accommodate periods when the collection system is not operating during activities associated with construction, expansion, repair, replacement, testing, upgrades, or other maintenance of the system or its components.

Reporting requirement to estimate NMOC emissions whenever the collection system or control system is not operating. Two commenters representing a state agency and an NGO supported reporting NMOC emissions during SSM periods. Several industry commenters provided numerous technical arguments to explain the infeasibility of accurately estimating NMOC emissions during the short periods of SSM. For example, methods to estimate LFG emissions are based on site-specific variables that estimate LFG generation over the life of the landfill, typically on an annual basis, and cannot be used to estimate hourly or daily emissions. Accordingly, the commenters contended that it is technically and practically inappropriate to require landfill owners/operators to make this estimate for the time periods that the gas collection or control systems are not operated, given the substantial technical uncertainties involved in estimating these emissions over discrete, short-term time periods. Further, other commenters noted that emissions during SSM are expected to be very low,

reporting SSM emissions is an onerous and meaningless exercise and is likely to overestimate emissions.

Two commenters asked that if the reporting requirement is retained, the EPA should limit the reporting to periods when the flare is free venting because these are the only emissions that can be estimated accurately. Several commenters asked EPA to develop guidance on how to estimate emissions during SSM if this requirement is retained in the final rule.

Several commenters stated that because there should be no deviation from the rule when the work practices of the rule are followed, there are no excess emissions, and the reported emissions are not relevant to determining compliance. Commenters are concerned that if estimated NMOC emissions are reported, states will deem the reported emissions to be "excess emissions," which could be treated as a serious violation. Therefore, reporting these emissions poses the risk of state or citizen suits for enforcement, even when a landfill is following all requirements of the rule.

Other Comments. Several commenters added that because SSM provisions apply to numerical emission limitations and a numerical limitation applies only to the control device (not the collection devices), commenters stated that SSM provisions should address only operation of the control devices during periods when LFG is routed from the collection system.

Several commenters indicated that the EPA must retain an allowance of 5 days/1 hour for downtime events so that states do not file enforcement actions for downtime events that are shorter than the previously allowed 5 days/1-hour allowance. These commenters also asked the EPA to clarify that the 1-hour allowance for shutting vents allows for free venting for 1 hour such that venting during this time period does not constitute "excess emissions" that can be deemed a serious violation.

Response: The EPA recognizes that landfills are not typical affected sources that can be started up or shut down. Landfill emissions are produced by a continuous biological process that cannot be stopped or shut down. The EPA also recognizes that the primary concern is with malfunction of the LFG collection and control system and associated monitoring equipment, not with the startup, shutdown, or malfunction of the entire source. The EPA received extensive comments on the proposed requirements applicable to landfills during SSM events, as summarized above. Consistent with the recent Court decision that vacated the

exemption in 40 CFR 63.6(f)(1) and (h)(1) for SSM (*Sierra Club v. EPA*, 551 F.3d 1019), the EPA has established standards in this rule that apply at all times.

The general provisions in 40 CFR part 60 provide that emissions in excess of the level of the applicable emissions limit during periods of SSM shall not be considered a violation of the applicable emission limit *unless otherwise specified in the applicable standard* (see 40 CFR 60.8(c)) (emphasis added). As reflected in the italicized language, an individual subpart can supersede this provision.

The EPA is finalizing a requirement in 40 CFR 60.465(e) whereby the standards apply at all times, including periods of SSM. However, the final rule reaffirms the work practice during periods of SSM (40 CFR 60.763(e)). During these SSM events, owners or operators must shut down the gas mover system and close within 1 hour all valves in the GCCS contributing to venting of the gas to the atmosphere. This provision is consistent with 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW. The landfill owner or operator must also keep records and submit reports of all periods when the collection and control device is not operating. The EPA, however, is not reinstating the 5-day exemption for SSM periods because the provision provides an exemption from compliance with the standard during SSM periods, which the EPA does not have the authority to do under the reasoning of the *Sierra Club* decision.

E. Definitions of Treated Landfill Gas and Treatment System

The EPA proposed clarifications related to LFG treatment in the proposal. Specifically, the EPA proposed to clarify that the use of treated LFG is not limited to use as a fuel for a stationary combustion device but also allows other beneficial uses such as vehicle fuel, production or high-Btu gas for pipeline injection, and use as a raw material in a chemical manufacturing process. The EPA also proposed to clarify what constitutes LFG treatment by updating the definition to include specific numerical values for filtration and dewatering in order to provide long-term protection of the combustion equipment. Specifically, the 2014 proposed NSPS included a treatment definition that required the water dew point of LFG to be reduced to at least 45 degrees Fahrenheit, rather than lowered by at least 20 °F, and specified a location for the temperature monitoring device that would demonstrate continuous compliance with the 45 degrees Fahrenheit requirement. As an alternative to these

numerical values, the EPA also requested comment on an alternative definition for treatment system as a system that filters, de-waters, and compresses LFG. Additionally, the EPA requested comment on the use of treatment system monitoring plans to document procedures to ensure that the LFG has been adequately treated for the intended use.

Similarly, the 2015 proposal to revise the Emission Guidelines for existing landfills included the clarification that the use of treated LFG is not limited to use as a fuel for a stationary combustion device and proposed a definition for LFG treatment. Specifically, the Emission Guidelines proposed a definition of treatment system as a system that filters, de-waters, and compresses LFG for sale or beneficial use. This definition did not include specific numerical values in order to allow tailoring of the level of treatment to the type and design of the specific combustion or other equipment for other beneficial uses in which LFG is used.

Further, the Emission Guidelines included a proposed requirement for owners or operators to develop a site-specific treatment system monitoring plan that would include monitoring parameters addressing all three elements of treatment (filtration, de-watering, and compression) to ensure the treatment system is operating properly for the intended end use of the treated LFG. Additional records that demonstrate that such parameters effectively monitor filtration, de-watering, and compression system performance were also proposed.

Consistent with public comments received on previous landfills documents (67 FR 36475, May 23, 2002; 71 FR 53271, September 8, 2006; 79 FR 41796, July 17, 2014; 79 FR 41772, July 17, 2014), as well as input from participants in small entity outreach, the EPA is finalizing a definition of treatment system as a system that filters, de-waters, and compresses LFG to levels determined by the landfill owner or operators based on the beneficial end use of the gas. The EPA agrees with commenters that the extent of filtration, de-watering, and compression can be site-specific and equipment-dependent, and that different levels of LFG treatment are required for the protection of combustion devices that use treated LFG as a fuel.

Many commenters on the proposed NSPS opposed basing LFG treatment on specific numerical values for filtration and de-watering because this "one-size-fits-all" approach was not appropriate, and provided no emission reductions.

One commenter specifically noted the impact of the costs of these requirements on small entities. Additional discussion of the concerns related to costs can be found in the Response to Comments document located in the docket for this rulemaking.

Commenters also supported the use of a site-specific treatment system monitoring plan in place of the proposed numeric values and continuous monitoring and recordkeeping requirements. However, these commenters opposed submission of these monitoring plans for approval from the Administrator. Specifically, the commenters stated that LFG treatment systems are closed loop systems that process LFG for beneficial use and are not control devices that are subject to emission limits. Two commenters cited specific examples from recent rulemaking actions that have similar operation, maintenance, and monitoring plans that are prepared, followed, maintained, and made available to the Administrator for review upon request. For example, the greenhouse gas reporting program (GHGRP) rules require each reporting facility to prepare, follow, and maintain a monitoring plan which is made available to an inspector upon request. Another example cited included the Operation, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan required in the NESHAP for Brick and Structural Clay Products Manufacturing and the NESHAP for Clay Ceramics Manufacturing which were finalized on September 24, 2015.

In consideration of these comments, the EPA is finalizing a requirement that owners or operators must develop a site-specific treatment system monitoring plan that includes monitoring parameters that address filtration, dewatering, and compression to ensure the LFG treatment system is properly operating for the intended end use of the treated LFG. The EPA is also finalizing a requirement that landfills owners or operators seeking to demonstrate compliance using a LFG treatment system must maintain and operate all monitoring systems in accordance with the site-specific treatment system monitoring plan and maintain records of parameters that ensure the treatment is operating properly for the intended use of the gas. The EPA is not finalizing the requirement that these monitoring plans obtain Administrator approval because the treatment system monitoring plan must be submitted as part of the landfill's Title V air pollution control permit application and these monitoring parameters would be integrated into the

permit as enforceable conditions (*i.e.*, the landfill monitors the treatment system monitoring parameters and maintains them in the specified range).

The EPA is also finalizing revisions to 40 CFR 60.762(b)(2)(iii)(C) to clarify that if treated LFG cannot be beneficially used for reasons such as end-user capacity limitations, market conditions for gas sales, or unforeseeable shutdowns of the beneficial use equipment, then the treated gas must be controlled in a flare. The flare requirements apply to any gas routed to flares, regardless of whether the LFG is treated. The intent is to require all gas not used for beneficial use to be controlled in either a non-enclosed flare or a control system designed to reduce NMOC by 98 weight-percent to an outlet NMOC concentration of less than 20 ppm, in accordance with 40 CFR 60.762(b)(A) or (B).

F. Other Corrections and Clarifications

1. Test Methods

In the 2014 proposed NSPS, the EPA did not include EPA Method 18 or EPA Method 25A. In the 2015 proposed Emissions Guidelines, the EPA proposed to include Method 25A based on public comments received on the 2014 proposed NSPS and the EPA's recognition that the use of Method 25A is necessary for measuring outlet concentrations less than 50 ppm NMOC. However, the EPA did not propose to include Method 18 (80 FR 52112) because the EPA had determined that Method 18 was not appropriate or cost effective for testing the large number of NMOCs found in landfill samples. Specifically, 40 target analytes are listed in the current landfills section of AP-42 and 160 analytes are listed in the draft landfills section AP-42. The EPA determined that the extensive quality assurance required by the method makes the method technically and economically prohibitive for all the potential target analytes.

Comment: Commenters (requested that the EPA retain both Methods 18 and 25A in the final rule and cited a number of reasons that the EPA should retain them, including both technical and legal reasons. Commenters stated that landfill owners or operators have relied on these test methods to demonstrate compliance for performance testing of enclosed flares as a part of EPA policy for over a decade under 40 CFR 60.764 [60.754]. One commenter emphasized the importance of Method 25A because its use is required for many sources with an outlet concentration of less than 50 ppmv NMOC as carbon.

The commenters noted that the majority of LFG destruction devices show NMOC concentrations below 50 ppmv as carbon. Due to issues with Methods 25/25C in measuring NMOC content under this level, commenters observed that the proposed NSPS rule change effectively removes the ability to accurately measure compliance with the 20 ppmv outlet standard for a large class of enclosed combustors. Commenter believes that Method 25A is the superior testing methodology for certain circumstances and is more commonly used in practice. Commenters cited limitations of Method 25, including sensitivity of the test method to water and carbon dioxide and the inability to measure NMOC content below 50 ppmv as carbon.

Commenters also contended that the EPA did not provide any justification for removing these methods. Commenters stated that the EPA did not provide any factual data, methodology, or any legal or policy justification for its proposed exclusion of Method 25A or Method 18; thus commenters claimed that the EPA did not satisfy the notice-and-comment requirements of the CAA.

Response: After considering public comments, the EPA is including both EPA Method 25A and EPA Method 18 in the final landfills regulations (40 CFR part 60, subparts Cf and XXX).

After reviewing the comments received on the NSPS for new landfills proposed on July 17, 2014, the EPA recognizes that the use of Method 25A is necessary for measuring outlet concentrations less than 50 ppm NMOC. EPA Method 25A determines total gaseous organic concentration of vapor (total organic compounds). Because the rule regulates NMOC, EPA Method 18 or Method 3C is needed to determine the concentration of methane in the gas stream. Method 25A, in conjunction with Methods 18 or 3C (for methane), can be used to determine NMOC for the outlet concentrations less than 50 ppm NMOC as carbon. Note that Method 25A flame ionization detectors are insensitive to formaldehyde.

While Method 18 may be used in conjunction with Method 25A for methane or specific compounds of interest, there are limitations on the number of analytes that can be reasonably quantified in measuring the sum of all NMOCs. With the possibility of 40 target analytes listed in the current landfill section of AP-42 (160 analytes in the draft landfill AP-42), Method 18 is not an appropriate or cost effective method to test all NMOCs found in landfill samples. The extensive QA required by the method makes the method technically and economically

prohibitive for all the potential target analytes.

2. Tier 2 Sampling Procedure

The EPA continues to believe that the number of samples required per hectare is appropriate for Tier 2. As described in 40 CFR 60.764, the EPA is reaffirming that the two samples are required per hectare and if additional samples are taken, all samples must be used in determining the site-specific NMOC concentration. Landfill owners or operators must also ensure that the probes are evenly distributed over the landfill surface. The EPA explored a number of methods, including a statistical approach, when establishing requirements for the number and location of Tier 2 samples for the original rule. Public commenters raised significant concerns with approaches based on equations. As such, the EPA determined that a simplified method (2 samples per hectare) was best and received no public comments to the contrary.

3. Specifications for Active GCCS

The EPA received a comment saying that proposed 40 CFR 60.769(a)(1) referenced the term “perimeter areas” and noted that this term was not well defined or explained. The EPA has removed this phrase to avoid confusion. The intent is that all wells installed in the boundary of the waste mass that are connected to the active GCCS should be operated according to 40 CFR 60.769. The final rule language is clearer on this point.

The EPA also added a phrase to 40 CFR 60.769(a)(1) based on public comment to ensure that GCCS design allows for the ability to isolate a well or section and still be able to operate the remainder of the active collection system.

4. Wellhead Pressure Monitoring

In response to public comments, we are clarifying the location and type of pressure required to be measured monthly at each wellhead to demonstrate whether the requirement to maintain negative pressure is being met.

5. Definition of Modification

In the 2014 proposed NSPS, the EPA included “mass or volume” in the definition of modification. Based on public comments, which correctly point out that mass can change based on the density of the waste received, we are finalizing the definition of modification consistent with the definition in subpart WWW, which is based on volume only. We also changed the reference to “horizontal” to “lateral” within the

modification definition to be consistent with the defined term “lateral expansion”.

6. Definition of Sludge and Solid Waste

We are updating the definitions of sludge and solid waste to reference the terms as defined in 40 CFR 258.2 for consistency with the terms as defined in RCRA.

7. Non-degradable Waste

The EPA is reaffirming that all the waste must be included in calculating the design capacity. Non-degradable waste cannot be subtracted from the permitted landfill design capacity. However, non-degradable waste can be subtracted from the mass of solid waste when calculating the NMOC emission rate because such waste would not produce NMOC emissions. Non-degradable waste is defined as waste that does not break down through chemical or microbiological activity. Examples include concrete, municipal waste combustor ash, and metals. Petroleum contaminated soils (PCS) and paper mill sludges likely contain organics that could be emitted as MSW LFG emissions. Therefore, emissions from PCS and sludges would need to be accounted for in the emission estimate only. The EPA is also reaffirming that documentation of the nature and amount of non-degradable waste needs to be maintained when subtracting the mass of non-degradable waste from the total mass of waste for NMOC emission rate calculations.

VII. Impacts of This Final Rule

For most NSPS, impacts are expressed 5 years after the effective date of the rule. However, for the landfills NSPS, impacts are expressed 10 years after the effective date (year 2025) because the landfills regulations require controls at a given landfill only after the NMOC emission rate reaches the level of the regulatory threshold, which may take a number of years. Further, once the NMOC emission rate is exceeded, the reporting and control timeframe allows 3 months to submit the first NMOC emission report and then 30 months after exceeding the NMOC emission threshold before the GCCS is required to be installed. Additionally, the regulations allow the collection and control devices to be capped or removed at each landfill after certain criteria are met, which includes having the GCCS operate a minimum of 15 years. Controls would not be required over the same time period for all landfills. The impacts are a direct result of control; therefore, the annualized impacts change from year to year. By 2025, over 80 percent

of the greenfield landfills and modified landfills affected by the NSPS are expected to have installed controls and thus, the EPA considered the impacts of the final rule relative to the baseline in 2025.

The landfills dataset used for estimating the impacts of the NSPS is discussed in detail in the August 27, 2015 supplemental proposal for the NSPS (80 FR 52163). The EPA made several significant edits to the dataset since the August 2015 supplemental proposal, based on public comments received; new data made available from the landfills reporting 2014 emissions to 40 CFR part 98, subpart HH of the GHGRP; and consultations with EPA regional offices, and state and local authorities to identify additional landfills expected to undergo a modification within the next 5 years. After incorporating all of the updates to the inventory and adding the landfills expected to modify, the revised dataset to analyze the impacts of the final rule now has 137 landfills that commenced construction, reconstruction, or modification after July 17, 2014.⁴⁶ A detailed discussion of updates made to the dataset is in the docketed memorandum, “Summary of Updated Landfill Dataset Used in the Cost and Emission Reduction Analysis of Landfills Regulations, 2016.”

The methodology used for estimating the impacts of the NSPS is discussed in detail in the August 27, 2015 supplemental proposal to the NSPS (80 FR 52163). The EPA made several significant edits to the dataset since the August 2015 supplemental proposal based on public comments and comments on a separate peer review of the EPA Landfill Gas Energy Cost (LFGcost) model.⁴⁷ Notably, the EPA adjusted its assumption of gas collection efficiency to an average of 85 percent. The impacts analysis at the proposal or supplemental proposal did not apply a collection efficiency assumption. However, in consideration of public comments received and EPA assumptions in subpart HH of the GHGRP, and analyses performed for marginal abatement cost curves, the EPA has included an 85 percent average

⁴⁶ July 17, 2014, is the proposed date of the revised NSPS for MSW landfills in 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX. A landfill opening or commencing construction on its modification after this date would become subject to this new subpart and would not be subject to the revised emission guidelines. The EPA cannot predict the exact month a model landfill will open so the analysis uses a cutoff year of 2014.

⁴⁷ See the docketed 2016 RIA for additional discussion of changes made on the methodology for estimating impacts as a result of the LFGcost peer review.

gas collection efficiency factor to reflect a more realistic indicator of GCCS performance.⁴⁸ In addition, Chapter 2.4 of the EPA AP-42 for MSW landfills cites a range of collection efficiencies for LFG between 60 and 85 percent, with an average of 75 percent. The EPA also adjusted electricity purchase price and anticipated revenue estimates using forecasted commercial retail electricity rate data and forecasted electricity

generation price data for different Energy Information Administration (EIA) Electricity Market Module regions.^{49 50}

A detailed discussion of the methodology and equations used to estimate the impacts of the final rule are available in the docketed memorandum “Updated Methodology for Estimating Cost and Emission Impacts of MSW Landfill Regulations, 2016.” The results

of applying this methodology to the population of new or modified landfills potentially subject to the final rule are in the docketed memorandum “Revised Cost and Emission Impacts Resulting from the Landfill NSPS Review, 2016.” Table 2 of this preamble summarizes the emission reductions and costs associated with the final rule.

TABLE 2—EMISSION REDUCTIONS AND COSTS FOR FINAL RULE IN YEAR 2025 AT NEW OR MODIFIED LANDFILLS [2012\$]

Option	No. of landfills affected ^b	No. of landfills controlling	No. of landfills reporting but not controlling ^c	Annual net cost (million \$2012)	Annual NMOC reductions (Mg/yr)	Annual methane reductions (million Mg/yr)	Annual CO ₂ e reductions (million mt/yr) ^d	NMOC cost effectiveness (\$/Mg)	Methane cost effectiveness (\$/Mg)	CO ₂ e cost effectiveness (\$/mt) ^d
Baseline (2.5 million Mg design capacity/ 50 Mg/yr NMOC)	128	103	25	90.4	10,520	1.7	41.4	8,600	54.6	2.2
Option (2.5 million Mg design capacity/34 Mg/yr NMOC)	0	12	-13	6.0 ^e	281	.04	1.1	21,470	136	5.5

^a Options in this table show the impacts of reducing the NMOC emission threshold below baseline levels for all landfills.
^b Landfills are affected by the landfills NSPS based on design capacity. Once affected, they calculate and report emissions until they exceed the NMOC threshold, which triggers control requirements. Since we are not changing the size threshold, there are no incremental landfills affected.
^c Since the number of landfills affected remains the same as the baseline, the number of landfills reporting NMOC (but not controlling) decreases since more landfills will control emissions under the final rule.
^d Results do not include secondary CO₂ impacts.
^e The annualized costs represent the costs compared to no changes to the current NSPS (i.e., baseline) and include \$11 million to install and operate a GCCS, as well as \$0.08 million to complete the corresponding testing and monitoring. These control costs are offset by \$5.1 million in revenue from electricity sales, which is incorporated into the net control costs for certain landfills that are expected to generate revenue by using the LFG to produce electricity.

A. What are the air quality impacts?

The EPA estimates that the final rule will achieve nearly an additional 3 percent reduction in NMOC from new, reconstructed, or modified landfills, or 281 Mg/yr, when compared to the baseline, as shown in Table 2 of this preamble. The final rule would also achieve 44,300 Mg/yr of methane reductions (1.1 million mtCO₂e/yr). These reductions are achieved by reducing the NMOC threshold from 50 Mg/yr to 34 Mg/yr.

B. What are the water quality and solid waste impacts?

Leachate is the liquid that passes through the landfilled waste and strips contaminants from the waste as the leachate percolates. Precipitation generates the vast majority of leachate volume. Installation of a gas collection system will generate additional liquid, in the form of gas condensate, and it will be routed to the same leachate treatment mechanisms in place for controlling precipitation-based leachate. Collected leachate can be treated on site or transported off site to wastewater treatment facilities. Some landfills have

received permits allowing for recirculation of leachate in the landfill, which may further reduce the volume of leachate requiring treatment. Additional liquid generated from gas condensate is not expected to be significant and insufficient data are available to estimate the increases in leachate resulting from expanded gas collection and control requirements.

The additional gas collection and control components required by this final rule have finite lifetimes (approximately 15 years) and these pipes and wells will be capped or disposed of at the end of their useful life. There are insufficient data to quantify the solid waste resulting from disposal of this control infrastructure.

Further, the incremental costs of control for the final rule of \$6.0 million in 2025 (7 percent discount, 2012\$) are not expected to have an appreciable market effect on the waste disposal costs, tipping fees, or the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills because the costs for gas collection represent a small portion of the overall costs to design, construct, and operate a landfill. The handling of waste by the private companies in the industry was

estimated to generate \$55 billion of revenue in 2011, of which landfilling contributed \$13 billion, while a more recent estimate shows the U.S. non-hazardous solid waste services industry generated about \$60 billion in annual revenues in 2015. These revenue estimates do not include activity related to publicly owned landfills. For more information, see the “Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Revisions to the Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources and the New Source Performance Standards in the Municipal Solid Waste Landfills Sector” (hereafter “2016 RIA”) included in the docket. There is also insufficient information to quantify the effect increased gas control costs might have on the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills versus other disposal mechanisms such as recycling, waste-to-energy, or composting. Note that elements of this final rule—notably lowering the NMOC threshold to 34 Mg/yr—provide additional incentives to separate waste.

C. What are the secondary air impacts?

Secondary air impacts may include grid emissions from purchasing electricity to operate the GCCS

⁴⁸ USEPA. Global Mitigation of Non-CO₂ Greenhouse Gases: 2010–2030. EPA-430-R-13-011.

⁴⁹ See the docketed 2016 RIA for additional discussion of changes made to electricity pricing assumptions.

⁵⁰ To map existing landfill sites to EIA’s Electricity Market Module regions, the sites’ geospatial coordinates were overlaid on a map of the EMM regions. The AEO Electricity Market Module regions are commensurate with the eGRID2012 primary regions for which a shapefile is

available at <https://www.epa.gov/energy/download-egrid2012-shapefiles>. For expected new landfills within a state the specific location is unknown, therefore the landfill is located at the state’s centroid for purposes of mapping the site to an EMM region.

components, by-product emissions from combustion of LFG in flares or energy recovery devices, and offsets to conventional grid emissions from new LFG energy supply.

The secondary air impacts are presented as net impacts, considering both the energy demand and energy supply resulting from the final rule. The methodology used to prepare the estimated secondary impacts for this preamble is discussed in the docketed memorandum "Revised Estimates of Secondary Impacts of the Landfills NSPS Review, 2016."

While we do expect NO_x and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emission changes as a result of these guidelines, we expect these changes to be small and these changes have not been estimated. The net impacts were computed for CO₂e. After considering the offsets from LFG electricity, the impacts of the final rule are expected to reduce CO₂ emissions by 26,000 metric tons per year. These CO₂ emission reductions are in addition to the methane emission reductions achieved from the direct destruction of methane in flares or engines presented in Table 2 of this preamble.

D. What are the energy impacts?

The final rule is expected to have a very minimal impact on energy supply and consumption. Active gas collection systems require energy to operate the blowers and pumps and the final rule will increase the volume of LFG collected. When the least cost control is a flare, energy may be purchased from the grid to operate the blowers of the LFG collection system. However, when the least cost control option is an engine, the engine may provide this energy to the gas control system and then sell the excess to the grid. Considering the balance of energy generated and demanded from the estimated least cost controls, the final rule is estimated to supply 0.07 million megawatt hours (MWh) of additional energy per year.

E. What are the cost impacts?

To meet the final rule emission thresholds, a landfill is expected to install the least cost control for combusting the LFG. The cost estimates evaluated each landfill to determine whether a gas collection and flare or a gas collection with flare and engine equipment would be least cost, after considering local power buyback rates and whether the quantity of LFG was sufficient to generate electricity. The control costs include the costs to install and operate gas collection infrastructure such as wells, header pipes, blowers, and an enclosed flare. For landfills for

which the least cost control option is an engine, the costs also include the cost to install and operate one or more reciprocating internal combustion engines to convert the LFG into electricity. Revenue from electricity sales was incorporated into the net control costs using forecasted electricity generation price data from EIA Electricity Market Module regions. Testing and monitoring costs at controlled landfills include the cost to conduct initial performance tests on the enclosed flare or engine control equipment, quarterly surface monitoring, continuous combustion monitoring, and monthly wellhead monitoring. At uncontrolled landfills, the testing and monitoring costs include calculation and reporting of NMOC emission rates.

The nationwide incremental annualized net cost for the final rule is \$6 million, when using a 7 percent discount rate (2012\$). The annualized costs represent the costs compared to no changes to the current NSPS (*i.e.*, baseline) and include \$11 million to install and operate a GCCS, as well as \$0.08 million to complete the corresponding testing and monitoring. These control costs are offset by \$5.1 million in revenue from electricity sales, which is incorporated into the net control costs for certain landfills that are expected to generate revenue by using the LFG to produce electricity.

F. What are the economic impacts?

Because of the relatively low net cost of the final rule compared to the overall size of the MSW industry, as well as the lack of appropriate economic parameters or model, the EPA is unable to estimate the impacts on the supply and demand for MSW landfill services. However, because of the relatively low incremental costs, the EPA does not believe the final rule would lead to substantial changes in supply and demand for landfill services or waste disposal costs, tipping fees, or the amount of waste disposed in landfills. Hence, the overall economic impact of the final rule should be minimal on the affected industries and their consumers.

G. What are the benefits?

This final action is expected to result in significant emissions reductions from new, reconstructed, or modified MSW landfills. By lowering the NMOC emissions threshold to 34 Mg/yr, the final NSPS would achieve reductions of 281 Mg/yr NMOC and 44,300 Mg/yr methane (1.1 million metric tons CO₂-Eq./yr). In addition, the final rulemaking is expected to result in the net reduction of 26,000 metric tons CO₂, due to

reduced demand for electricity from the grid as landfills generate electricity from LFG.

This rule is expected to result in significant health and welfare benefits resulting from the climate benefits due to anticipated methane and CO₂ reductions. Methane is a potent GHG that, once emitted into the atmosphere, absorbs terrestrial infrared radiation that contributes to increased global warming and continuing climate change. Methane reacts in the atmosphere to form tropospheric ozone and stratospheric water vapor, both of which also contribute to global warming. When accounting for the impacts of changing methane, tropospheric ozone, and stratospheric water vapor concentrations, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 5th Assessment Report (2013) found that historical emissions of methane accounted for about 30 percent of the total current warming influence (radiative forcing) due to historical emissions of greenhouse gases. Methane is therefore a major contributor to the climate change impacts described in section III.B of this preamble. The remainder of this section discusses the methane reductions expected from this proposed rule and the associated monetized benefits.

As discussed in section IV of this preamble, this rulemaking includes several changes to the NSPS for MSW landfills that will decrease methane emissions from this sector. Specifically, the final NSPS are expected to reduce methane emissions from all landfills annually by about 44,300 metric tons of methane.

We calculated the global social benefits of these methane emission reductions using estimates of the social cost of methane (SC-CH₄), a metric that estimates the monetary value of impacts associated with marginal changes in methane emissions in a given year. The SC-CH₄ estimates applied in this analysis were developed by Marten et al. (2014) and are discussed in greater detail below.

A similar metric, the social cost of CO₂ (SC-CO₂), provides important context for understanding the Marten et al. SC-CH₄ estimates.⁵¹ The SC-CO₂ is a metric that estimates the monetary value of impacts associated with marginal changes in CO₂ emissions in a given year. It includes a wide range of

⁵¹ Previous analyses have commonly referred to the social cost of carbon dioxide emissions as the social cost of carbon or SCC. To more easily facilitate the inclusion of non-CO₂ GHGs in the discussion and analysis the more specific SC-CO₂ nomenclature is used to refer to the social cost of CO₂ emissions.

anticipated climate impacts, such as net changes in agricultural productivity and human health, property damage from increased flood risk, and changes in energy system costs, such as reduced costs for heating and increased costs for air conditioning. Estimates of the SC-CO₂ have been used by the EPA and other federal agencies to value the impacts of CO₂ emissions changes in benefit cost analysis for GHG-related rulemakings since 2008.

The SC-CO₂ estimates were developed over many years, using the best science available, and with input from the public. Specifically, an interagency working group (IWG) that included the EPA and other executive branch agencies and offices used three integrated assessment models (IAMs) to develop the SC-CO₂ estimates and recommended four global values for use in regulatory analyses. The SC-CO₂ estimates were first released in February 2010 and updated in 2013 using new versions of each IAM.

The 2010 SC-CO₂ Technical Support Document (TSD) provides a complete discussion of the methods used to develop these estimates and the current SC-CO₂ TSD presents and discusses the 2013 update (including recent minor technical corrections to the estimates).⁵²

The SC-CO₂ TSDs discuss a number of limitations to the SC-CO₂ analysis, including the incomplete way in which the IAMs capture catastrophic and non-catastrophic impacts, their incomplete treatment of adaptation and technological change, uncertainty in the extrapolation of damages to high temperatures, and assumptions regarding risk aversion. Currently, IAMs do not assign value to all of the important physical, ecological, and economic impacts of climate change recognized in the climate change literature due to a lack of precise information on the nature of damages and because the science incorporated into these models understandably lags

behind the most recent research. Nonetheless, these estimates and the discussion of their limitations represent the best available information about the social benefits of CO₂ reductions to inform benefit-cost analysis. The EPA and other agencies continue to engage in research on modeling and valuation of climate impacts with the goal to improve these estimates, and continue to consider feedback on the SC-CO₂ estimates from stakeholders through a range of channels, including public comments received on Agency rulemakings, a separate Office of Management and Budget (OMB) public comment solicitation, and through regular interactions with stakeholders and research analysts implementing the SC-CO₂ methodology. See the docketed 2016 RIA for additional details.

A challenge particularly relevant to this rule is that the IWG did not estimate the social costs of non-CO₂ GHG emissions at the time the SC-CO₂ estimates were developed. In addition, the directly modeled estimates of the social costs of non-CO₂ GHG emissions previously found in the published literature were few in number and varied considerably in terms of the models and input assumptions they employed.⁵³ In the past, EPA has sought to understand the potential importance of monetizing non-CO₂ GHG emissions changes through sensitivity analysis using an estimate of the GWP of methane to convert emission impacts to CO₂ equivalents, which can then be valued using the SC-CO₂ estimates. This approach approximates the social cost of methane (SC-CH₄) using estimates of the SC-CO₂ and the GWP of methane.

The published literature documents a variety of reasons that directly modeled estimates of SC-CH₄ are an analytical improvement over the estimates from the GWP approximation approach. Specifically, several recent studies found that GWP-weighted benefit estimates for CH₄ are likely to be lower

than the estimates derived using directly modeled social cost estimates for these gases.⁵⁴ The GWP reflects only the relative integrated radiative forcing of a gas over 100 years in comparison to CO₂. The directly modeled social cost estimates differ from the GWP-scaled SC-CO₂ because the relative differences in timing and magnitude of the warming between gases are explicitly modeled, the non-linear effects of temperature change on economic damages are included, and rather than treating all impacts over a hundred years equally, the modeled damages over the time horizon considered (300 years in this case) are discounted to present value terms. A detailed discussion of the limitations of the GWP approach can be found in the RIA.

In general, the commenters on previous rulemakings strongly encouraged the EPA to incorporate the monetized value of non-CO₂ GHG impacts into the benefit cost analysis. However, they noted the challenges associated with the GWP approach, as discussed above, and encouraged the use of directly modeled estimates of the SC-CH₄ to overcome those challenges.

Since then, a paper by Marten et al. (2014) has provided the first set of published SC-CH₄ estimates in the peer-reviewed literature that are consistent with the modeling assumptions underlying the SC-CO₂ estimates.^{55 56} Specifically, the estimation approach of Marten et al. used the same set of three IAMs, five socioeconomic-emissions scenarios, equilibrium climate sensitivity distribution, three constant discount rates, and aggregation approach used by the IWG to develop the SC-CO₂ estimates.

The SC-CH₄ estimates from Marten, et al. (2014) are presented in Table 3 of this preamble. More detailed discussion of the methodology, results, and a comparison to other published estimates can be found in the RIA and in Marten, et al.

TABLE 3—SOCIAL COST OF CH₄, 2012–2050^a
[In 2012\$ per metric ton (Source: Marten et al., 2014^b)]

Year	SC-CH ₄			
	5% Average	3% Average	2.5% Average	3% 95th percentile
2012	\$430	\$1000	\$1400	\$2800

⁵² Both the 2010 SC-CO₂ TSD and the current TSD are available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/oir/social-cost-of-carbon>.

⁵³ U.S. EPA. 2012. Regulatory Impact Analysis Final New Source Performance Standards and Amendments to the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the Oil and Natural Gas Industry. Office of Air Quality Planning and

Standards, Health and Environmental Impacts Division. April. http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/oil_natural_gas_final_neshap_nsp_ria.pdf. Accessed April 7, 2016.

⁵⁴ See Waldhoff et al (2011); Marten and Newbold (2012); and Marten et al. (2014).

⁵⁵ Marten et al. (2014) also provided the first set of SC-N₂O estimates that are consistent with the assumptions underlying the IWG SC-CO₂ estimates.

⁵⁶ Marten, A.L., E.A. Kopits, C.W. Griffiths, S.C. Newbold & A. Wolverton (2014). Incremental CH₄ and N₂O mitigation benefits consistent with the U.S. Government's SC-CO₂ estimates, Climate Policy, DOI: 10.1080/14693062.2014.912981.

TABLE 3—SOCIAL COST OF CH₄, 2012–2050 ^a—Continued
 [In 2012\$ per metric ton (Source: Marten et al., 2014^b)]

Year	SC-CH ₄			
	5% Average	3% Average	2.5% Average	3% 95th percentile
2015	490	1100	1500	3000
2020	580	1300	1700	3500
2025	700	1500	1900	4000
2030	820	1700	2200	4500
2035	970	1900	2500	5300
2040	1100	2200	2800	5900
2045	1300	2500	3000	6600
2050	1400	2700	3300	7200

^a The values are emissions-year specific. Estimates using several discount rates are included because the literature shows that estimates of the SC-CO₂ (and SC-CH₄) are sensitive to assumptions about the discount rate, and because no consensus exists on the appropriate rate to use in an intergenerational context (where costs and benefits are incurred by different generations). The fourth value is the 95th percentile of the SC-CH₄ estimates across three models using a 3 percent discount rate. It is included to represent higher-than-expected impacts from temperature change further out in the tails of the SC-CH₄ distribution.

^b The estimates in this table have been adjusted to reflect recent minor technical corrections to the SC-CO₂ estimates. See the Corrigendum to Marten et al. (2014), <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14693062.2015.1070550>.

The application of these directly modeled SC-CH₄ estimates from Marten et al. (2014) in a benefit-cost analysis of a regulatory action is analogous to the use of the SC-CO₂ estimates. In addition, the limitations for the SC-CO₂ estimates discussed above likewise apply to the SC-CH₄ estimates, given the consistency in the methodology.

In early 2015, the EPA conducted a peer review of the application of the Marten, et al. (2014) non-CO₂ social cost estimates in regulatory analysis and received responses that supported this application. See the 2016 RIA for a detailed discussion.

The EPA also carefully considered the full range of public comments and associated technical issues on the Marten et al. SC-CH₄ estimates received

through this rulemaking. The comments addressed the technical details of the SC-CO₂ estimates and the Marten et al. SC-CH₄ estimates as well as their application to this rulemaking analysis. One comment letter also provided constructive recommendations to improve the SC-CO₂ and SC-CH₄ estimates in the future. Based on the evaluation of the public comments on this rulemaking, the favorable peer review of the Marten et al. application, and past comments urging the EPA to value non-CO₂ GHG impacts in its rulemakings, the agency has concluded that the estimates represent the best scientific information on the impacts of climate change available in a form appropriate for incorporating the

damages from incremental CH₄ emissions changes into regulatory analysis. The EPA has included those benefits in the main benefits analysis. See the Response to Comments document for the complete response to comments received on the SC-CH₄ as part of this rulemaking.

The CH₄ benefits based on Marten et al. (2014) are presented for the year 2025. Applying this approach to the methane reductions estimated for these NSPS, the 2025 methane benefits vary by discount rate and range from about \$31 million to approximately \$180 million; the mean SC-CH₄ at the 3-percent discount rate results in an estimate of about \$67 million in 2025, as presented in Table 4 of this preamble.

TABLE 4—ESTIMATED GLOBAL BENEFITS OF CH₄ REDUCTIONS IN 2025
 [In millions, 2012\$]

Million metric tons CH ₄	Discount rate and statistic			
	5% Average	3% Average	2.5% Average	3% 95th percentile
0.044	\$31	\$67	\$86	\$180

The vast majority of this action's climate-related benefits are associated with methane reductions. Additional climate-related benefits are expected from the NSPS secondary air impacts, specifically, a net reduction in CO₂ emissions. Monetizing the net CO₂ reductions with the SC-CO₂ estimates described in this section yields benefits of \$1.3 million in the year 2025 (average SC-CO₂, 3 percent discount rate, 2012\$). See the 2016 RIA for more details. The climate-related benefits associated with methane reductions plus the benefits

from the secondary air impact CO₂ reductions amount to about \$68 million in 2025 (average SC-CH₄ and average SC-CO₂, each at a 3 percent discount rate, 2012\$).

In addition to the limitation discussed above, and the referenced documents, there are additional impacts of individual GHGs that are not currently captured in the IAMs used in the directly modeled approach of Marten et al. (2014), and therefore are not quantified for the rule. For example, the NMOC portion of LFG can contain a

variety of air pollutants, including VOC and various organic HAP. VOC emissions are precursors to both PM_{2.5} and ozone formation, while methane is a GHG and a precursor to global ozone formation. These pollutants are associated with substantial health effects, welfare effects, and climate effects, which are discussed in section III.B of this preamble. The ozone generated by methane has important non-climate impacts on agriculture, ecosystems, and human health. The RIA describes the specific impacts of

methane as an ozone precursor in more detail and discusses studies that have estimated monetized benefits of these methane generated ozone effects. The EPA continues to monitor developments in this area of research.

Finally, these final NSPS will yield benefits from reductions in VOC and HAP emissions and from reductions in methane as a precursor to global background concentrations of tropospheric ozone.

Based on the monetized benefits and costs, the annual net benefits of the rule are estimated to be approximately \$62 million (\$2012) in 2025, based on the average SC-CH₄ at a 3 percent discount rate, average SC-CO₂ at a 3 percent discount rate, and costs at a 7 percent discount rate.

VIII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Additional information about these statutes and Executive Orders can be found at <http://www2.epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive-orders>.

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review

This action is an economically significant regulatory action that was submitted to OMB for review. Any changes made in response to OMB recommendations have been documented in the docket. The EPA prepared an analysis of the potential costs and benefits associated with this action. This analysis is documented in the 2016 RIA, which is available in docket EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0215 and is briefly summarized in section VII of this preamble.

B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved the information collection activities contained in this rule under the PRA and has assigned OMB control number 2060-0697. The Information Collection Request (ICR) document that the EPA prepared for the final NSPS has been assigned EPA ICR number 2498.03. You can find a copy of the ICR in the docket for this rule, and it is briefly summarized here.

The information required to be collected is necessary to identify the regulated entities subject to the final rule and to ensure their compliance with the final NSPS. The recordkeeping and reporting requirements are mandatory and are being established under authority of CAA section 114 (42 U.S.C. 7414). All information other than emissions data submitted as part of a report to the agency for which a claim

of confidentiality is made will be safeguarded according to CAA section 111(c) and the EPA's implementing regulations at 40 CFR part 2, subpart B.

Respondents/affected entities: MSW landfills that commence construction, reconstruction, or modification after July 17, 2014.

Respondent's obligation to respond: Mandatory (40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX).

Estimated number of respondents: 133 MSW landfills (per year) that commence construction, reconstruction, or modification after July 17, 2014.

Frequency of response: Initially, occasionally, and annually.

Total estimated burden: 91,087 hours (per year) for the responding facilities and 2,634 hours (per year) for the agency. These are estimates for the average annual burden for the first 3 years after the rule is final. Burden is defined at 5 CCFR 1320.3(b).

Total estimated cost: \$6,130,652 (per year), which includes annualized capital or operation and maintenance costs, for the responding facilities and \$169,978 (per year) for the agency. These are estimates for the average annual cost for the first 3 years after the rule is final.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for the EPA's regulations in 40 CFR are listed in 40 CFR part 9.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA. The small entities subject to the requirements of this final rule may include private small businesses and small governmental jurisdictions that own or operate landfills. Although it is unknown how many new landfills will be owned or operated by small entities, recent trends in the waste industry have been towards consolidated ownership among larger companies. The EPA has determined that approximately 10 percent of existing landfills subject to similar regulations (40 CFR part 60, subparts WWW and Cc or the corresponding state or federal plan) are small entities. It was determined that the July 2014 proposed NSPS and August 2015 supplemental to the proposed NSPS subpart would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Given the changes in the number of landfills anticipated to become subject to the new NSPS, the potential impact on small entities has been reanalyzed.

The EPA has determined that, with a size threshold of 2.5 million Mg and 2.5 million m³ and an NMOC emission rate of 34 Mg/yr, no small entities are expected to experience an impact of greater than 1 percent of revenues in 2025. Details of the analysis are presented in the 2016 RIA, located in Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0215.

Although not required by the RFA to convene a Small Business Advocacy Review Panel because the EPA has now determined that the final NSPS would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, the EPA originally convened a panel to obtain advice and recommendations from small entity representatives potentially subject to this rule's requirements. A copy of the "Summary of Small Entity Outreach" is included in Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0215.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)

This action does not contain any unfunded mandate of \$100 million or more as described in UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531-1538. This final NSPS applies to landfills that commence construction, reconstruction, or modification after July 17, 2014. Impacts resulting from the final NSPS are far below the applicable threshold. Thus, the final NSPS is not subject to the requirements of sections 202 or 205 of the UMRA. However, in developing the final NSPS, the EPA consulted with small governments pursuant to a plan established under section 203 of the UMRA to address impacts of regulatory requirements in the rule that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments. The EPA held meetings as discussed in section VIII.E of this preamble under Federalism consultations.

E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

The EPA has concluded that the final NSPS does not have Federalism implications. The final NSPS does not have substantial direct effects on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132. The final rule does not have impacts of \$25 million or more in any one year. Thus, Executive Order 13132 does not apply to the final NSPS.

Although section 6 of Executive Order 13132 does not apply to the final NSPS, the EPA consulted with state and local officials and representatives of state and local governments early in the process

of developing the final rules for MSW landfills (both the NSPS and Emission Guidelines) to permit them to have meaningful and timely input into its development.

The EPA conducted a Federalism Consultation Outreach Meeting on September 10, 2013. Due to interest in that meeting, additional outreach meetings were held on November 7, 2013, and November 14, 2014. An additional Federalism outreach meeting was conducted on April 15, 2015. Participants included the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Council of State Governments, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the International City/County Management Association, the National Association of Towns and Townships, the County Executives of America, the Environmental Council of States, the National Association of Clean Air Agencies, Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials, environmental agency representatives from 43 states, and approximately 60 representatives from city and county governments. Concerns raised during the consultations include: implementation concerns associated with shortening of gas collection system installation and/or expansion timeframes, concerns regarding significant lowering of the design capacity or emission thresholds, the need for clarifications associated with wellhead operating parameters, and the need for consistent, clear, and rigorous surface monitoring requirements. The EPA has addressed many of these concerns in the final rule.

F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This action does not have tribal implications as specified in Executive Order 13175. Based on methodology used to predict future landfills as outlined in the docketed memorandum "Summary of Updated Landfill Dataset Used in the Cost and Emission Reduction Analysis of Landfills Regulations, 2016," future tribal landfills are not anticipated to be large enough to become subject to the rulemaking. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this action.

G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

This action is subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) because it is a significant

regulatory action as defined by Executive Order 12866, and the EPA believes that the environmental health or safety risk addressed by this action has a disproportionate effect on children. Accordingly, the EPA has evaluated the environmental health and welfare effects of climate change on children.

Greenhouse gases including methane contribute to climate change and are emitted in significant quantities by the landfill sector. The EPA believes that the GHG emission reductions resulting from implementation of this final rule will further improve children's health.

The assessment literature cited in the EPA's 2009 Endangerment Finding concluded that certain populations and life stages, including children, the elderly, and the poor, are most vulnerable to climate-related health effects. The assessment literature since 2009 strengthens these conclusions by providing more detailed findings regarding these groups' vulnerabilities and the projected impacts they may experience.

These assessments describe how children's unique physiological and developmental factors contribute to making them particularly vulnerable to climate change. Impacts to children are expected from heat waves, air pollution, infectious and waterborne illnesses, and mental health effects resulting from extreme weather events. In addition, children are among those especially susceptible to most allergic diseases, as well as health effects associated with heat waves, storms, and floods. Additional health concerns may arise in low income households, especially those with children, if climate change reduces food availability and increases prices, leading to food insecurity within households.

More detailed information on the impacts of climate change to human health and welfare is provided in section III.B of this preamble.

H. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

This action is not a "significant energy action" because it is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. Further, we have concluded that this rule is not likely to have any adverse energy effects because there are a small number of new or modified landfills expected to be subject to control requirements under 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX in 2025. Further, the energy demanded to operate these control systems will be offset by

additional energy supply from LFG energy projects.

I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) and 1 CFR Part 51

The final NSPS involves technical standards. For the final NSPS, the EPA has decided to use EPA Methods 2, 2E, 3, 3A, 3C, 18, 21, 25, 25A, and 25C of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A.

The EPA identified 15 voluntary consensus standards (VCS) as being potentially applicable (ASTM D3154-00 (2006), ASTM D3464-96 (2007), ASTM D3796-90 (2001), ANSI/ASME PTC 19-10-1981 Part 10, ASME B133.9-1994 (2001), ISO 10396:1993 (2007), ISO 12039:2001, ISO 10780:1994, ASTM D5835-95 (2013), ASTM D6522-11, ASTM D6420-99 (2010), CAN/CSA Z223.2-M86 (1999), ASTM D6060-96 (2009), ISO 14965:2000(E), EN 12619 (1999)). The EPA determined that 14 of the 15 candidate VCS identified for measuring emissions of pollutants or their surrogates subject to emission standards in the rule would not be practical due to lack of equivalency, documentation, validation data, and other important technical and policy considerations. The agency identified no equivalent standards for Methods 2E, 21, and 25C. However, one voluntary consensus standard was identified as an acceptable alternative to EPA test method for the purposes of this rule.

The voluntary consensus standard ASTM D6522-11, "Standard Test Method for the Determination of Nitrogen Oxides, Carbon Monoxide, and Oxygen Concentrations in Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired Reciprocating Engines, Combustion Turbines, Boilers, and Process Heaters Using Portable Analyzers" is an acceptable alternative to Method 3A when used at the wellhead before combustion. It is advisable to know the flammability and check the Lower Explosive Limit of the flue gas constituents, prior to sampling, in order to avoid undesired ignition of the gas.

The EPA's review, including review of comments for these 15 methods, is documented in the memorandum, "Voluntary Consensus Standard Results for Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, 2016" in the docket for this rulemaking (EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0215).

In this rule, the EPA is finalizing regulatory text for 40 CFR part 60, subpart XXX that includes incorporation by reference in accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5. Specifically, the EPA is incorporating by reference ASTM D6522-11. You may obtain a copy from

American Society for Testing and Materials, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, Post Office Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428–2959 or <http://www.astm.org>.

J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

The EPA believes the human health or environmental risk addressed by this action will not have potential disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority, low-income, or indigenous populations. The EPA has determined this because the rulemaking increases the level of environmental protection for all affected populations without having any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on any population, including any minority, low-income, or indigenous populations. To the extent that any minority, low-income, or indigenous subpopulation is disproportionately impacted by hazardous air emissions due to the proximity of their homes to sources of these emissions, that subpopulation also stands to see increased environmental and health benefit from the emission reductions called for by this rule.

The EPA has provided meaningful participation opportunities for minority, low-income, indigenous populations and tribes during the rulemaking process by conducting and participating in community calls and webinars. Documentation of these activities can be found in the document titled, “2016 Environmental Justice Screening Report for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills,” a copy of which is available in the docket for this action (EPA–HQ–OAR–2003–0215).

K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

This rule is subject to the CRA, and the EPA will submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. This action is a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 60

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: July 14, 2016.

Gina McCarthy,
Administrator.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Environmental Protection Agency amends title 40, chapter I of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 60—STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 60 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

■ 2. Amend § 60.17(h)(185) by removing the period at the end of the paragraph and adding in its place “, 60.766(a).”

■ 3. Add subpart XXX to read as follows:

Subpart XXX—Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills That Commenced Construction, Reconstruction, or Modification After July 17, 2014

Sec.

60.760 Applicability, designation of affected source, and delegation of authority.

60.761 Definitions.

60.762 Standards for air emissions from municipal solid waste landfills.

60.763 Operational standards for collection and control systems.

60.764 Test methods and procedures.

60.765 Compliance provisions.

60.766 Monitoring of operations.

60.767 Reporting requirements.

60.768 Recordkeeping requirements.

60.769 Specifications for active collection systems.

Subpart XXX—Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills That Commenced Construction, Reconstruction, or Modification After July 17, 2014

§ 60.760 Applicability, designation of affected source, and delegation of authority.

(a) The provisions of this subpart apply to each municipal solid waste landfill that commenced construction, reconstruction, or modification after July 17, 2014. Physical or operational changes made to an MSW landfill solely to comply with subparts Cc, Cf, or WWW of this part are not considered construction, reconstruction, or modification for the purposes of this section.

(b) The following authorities are retained by the Administrator and are not transferred to the state: § 60.764(a)(5).

(c) Activities required by or conducted pursuant to a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), or state remedial action are not considered construction, reconstruction, or modification for purposes of this subpart.

§ 60.761 Definitions.

As used in this subpart, all terms not defined herein have the meaning given

them in the Act or in subpart A of this part.

Active collection system means a gas collection system that uses gas mover equipment.

Active landfill means a landfill in which solid waste is being placed or a landfill that is planned to accept waste in the future.

Closed area means a separately lined area of an MSW landfill in which solid waste is no longer being placed. If additional solid waste is placed in that area of the landfill, that landfill area is no longer closed. The area must be separately lined to ensure that the landfill gas does not migrate between open and closed areas.

Closed landfill means a landfill in which solid waste is no longer being placed, and in which no additional solid wastes will be placed without first filing a notification of modification as prescribed under § 60.7(a)(4). Once a notification of modification has been filed, and additional solid waste is placed in the landfill, the landfill is no longer closed.

Closure means that point in time when a landfill becomes a closed landfill.

Commercial solid waste means all types of solid waste generated by stores, offices, restaurants, warehouses, and other nonmanufacturing activities, excluding residential and industrial wastes.

Controlled landfill means any landfill at which collection and control systems are required under this subpart as a result of the nonmethane organic compounds emission rate. The landfill is considered controlled at the time a collection and control system design plan is submitted in compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(i).

Corrective action analysis means a description of all reasonable interim and long-term measures, if any, that are available, and an explanation of why the selected corrective action(s) is/are the best alternative(s), including, but not limited to, considerations of cost effectiveness, technical feasibility, safety, and secondary impacts.

Design capacity means the maximum amount of solid waste a landfill can accept, as indicated in terms of volume or mass in the most recent permit issued by the state, local, or tribal agency responsible for regulating the landfill, plus any in-place waste not accounted for in the most recent permit. If the owner or operator chooses to convert the design capacity from volume to mass or from mass to volume to demonstrate its design capacity is less than 2.5 million megagrams or 2.5 million cubic meters, the calculation

must include a site-specific density, which must be recalculated annually.

Disposal facility means all contiguous land and structures, other appurtenances, and improvements on the land used for the disposal of solid waste.

Emission rate cutoff means the threshold annual emission rate to which a landfill compares its estimated emission rate to determine if control under the regulation is required.

Enclosed combustor means an enclosed firebox which maintains a relatively constant limited peak temperature generally using a limited supply of combustion air. An enclosed flare is considered an enclosed combustor.

Flare means an open combustor without enclosure or shroud.

Gas mover equipment means the equipment (*i.e.*, fan, blower, compressor) used to transport landfill gas through the header system.

Gust means the highest instantaneous wind speed that occurs over a 3-second running average.

Household waste means any solid waste (including garbage, trash, and sanitary waste in septic tanks) derived from households (including, but not limited to, single and multiple residences, hotels and motels, bunkhouses, ranger stations, crew quarters, campgrounds, picnic grounds, and day-use recreation areas). Household waste does not include fully segregated yard waste. Segregated yard waste means vegetative matter resulting exclusively from the cutting of grass, the pruning and/or removal of bushes, shrubs, and trees, the weeding of gardens, and other landscaping maintenance activities. Household waste does not include construction, renovation, or demolition wastes, even if originating from a household.

Industrial solid waste means solid waste generated by manufacturing or industrial processes that is not a hazardous waste regulated under Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, parts 264 and 265 of this chapter. Such waste may include, but is not limited to, waste resulting from the following manufacturing processes: Electric power generation; fertilizer/agricultural chemicals; food and related products/by-products; inorganic chemicals; iron and steel manufacturing; leather and leather products; nonferrous metals manufacturing/foundries; organic chemicals; plastics and resins manufacturing; pulp and paper industry; rubber and miscellaneous plastic products; stone, glass, clay, and concrete products; textile

manufacturing; transportation equipment; and water treatment. This term does not include mining waste or oil and gas waste.

Interior well means any well or similar collection component located inside the perimeter of the landfill waste. A perimeter well located outside the landfilled waste is not an interior well.

Landfill means an area of land or an excavation in which wastes are placed for permanent disposal, and that is not a land application unit, surface impoundment, injection well, or waste pile as those terms are defined under § 257.2 of this title.

Lateral expansion means a horizontal expansion of the waste boundaries of an existing MSW landfill. A lateral expansion is not a modification unless it results in an increase in the design capacity of the landfill.

Leachate recirculation means the practice of taking the leachate collected from the landfill and reapplying it to the landfill by any of one of a variety of methods, including pre-wetting of the waste, direct discharge into the working face, spraying, infiltration ponds, vertical injection wells, horizontal gravity distribution systems, and pressure distribution systems.

Modification means an increase in the permitted volume design capacity of the landfill by either lateral or vertical expansion based on its permitted design capacity as of July 17, 2014. Modification does not occur until the owner or operator commences construction on the lateral or vertical expansion.

Municipal solid waste landfill or MSW landfill means an entire disposal facility in a contiguous geographical space where household waste is placed in or on land. An MSW landfill may also receive other types of RCRA Subtitle D wastes (§ 257.2 of this title) such as commercial solid waste, nonhazardous sludge, conditionally exempt small quantity generator waste, and industrial solid waste. Portions of an MSW landfill may be separated by access roads. An MSW landfill may be publicly or privately owned. An MSW landfill may be a new MSW landfill, an existing MSW landfill, or a lateral expansion.

Municipal solid waste landfill emissions or MSW landfill emissions means gas generated by the decomposition of organic waste deposited in an MSW landfill or derived from the evolution of organic compounds in the waste.

NMOC means nonmethane organic compounds, as measured according to the provisions of § 60.764.

Nondegradable waste means any waste that does not decompose through chemical breakdown or microbiological activity. Examples are, but are not limited to, concrete, municipal waste combustor ash, and metals.

Passive collection system means a gas collection system that solely uses positive pressure within the landfill to move the gas rather than using gas mover equipment.

Root cause analysis means an assessment conducted through a process of investigation to determine the primary cause, and any other contributing causes, of positive pressure at a wellhead.

Segregated yard waste means vegetative matter resulting exclusively from the cutting of grass, the pruning and/or removal of bushes, shrubs, and trees, the weeding of gardens, and other landscaping maintenance activities.

Sludge means the term sludge as defined in 40 CFR 258.2.

Solid waste means the term solid waste as defined in 40 CFR 258.2.

Sufficient density means any number, spacing, and combination of collection system components, including vertical wells, horizontal collectors, and surface collectors, necessary to maintain emission and migration control as determined by measures of performance set forth in this part.

Sufficient extraction rate means a rate sufficient to maintain a negative pressure at all wellheads in the collection system without causing air infiltration, including any wellheads connected to the system as a result of expansion or excess surface emissions, for the life of the blower.

Treated landfill gas means landfill gas processed in a treatment system as defined in this subpart.

Treatment system means a system that filters, de-waters, and compresses landfill gas for sale or beneficial use.

Untreated landfill gas means any landfill gas that is not treated landfill gas.

§ 60.762 Standards for air emissions from municipal solid waste landfills.

(a) Each owner or operator of an MSW landfill having a design capacity less than 2.5 million megagrams by mass or 2.5 million cubic meters by volume must submit an initial design capacity report to the Administrator as provided in § 60.767(a). The landfill may calculate design capacity in either megagrams or cubic meters for comparison with the exemption values. Any density conversions must be documented and submitted with the report. Submittal of the initial design capacity report fulfills the requirements

of this subpart except as provided for in paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) The owner or operator must submit to the Administrator an amended design capacity report, as provided for in § 60.767(a)(3).

(2) When an increase in the maximum design capacity of a landfill exempted from the provisions of § 60.762(b) through § 60.769 on the basis of the design capacity exemption in paragraph (a) of this section results in a revised maximum design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters, the owner or operator must comply with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section.

(b) Each owner or operator of an MSW landfill having a design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters, must either comply with paragraph (b)(2) of this section or calculate an NMOC emission rate for the landfill using the procedures specified in § 60.764. The NMOC emission rate must be recalculated annually, except as provided in § 60.767(b)(1)(ii). The owner or operator of an MSW landfill subject to this subpart with a design capacity greater than or equal to 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters is subject to part 70 or 71 permitting requirements.

(1) If the calculated NMOC emission rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, the owner or operator must:

(i) Submit an annual NMOC emission rate emission report to the Administrator, except as provided for in § 60.767(b)(1)(ii); and

(ii) Recalculate the NMOC emission rate annually using the procedures specified in § 60.764(a)(1) until such time as the calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year, or the landfill is closed.

(A) If the calculated NMOC emission rate, upon initial calculation or annual recalculation required in paragraph (b) of this section, is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year, the owner or operator must either: Comply with paragraph (b)(2) of this section; calculate NMOC emissions using the next higher tier in § 60.764; or conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration using the procedures specified in § 60.764(a)(6).

(B) If the landfill is permanently closed, a closure report must be submitted to the Administrator as provided for in § 60.767(e).

(2) If the calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year using Tier 1, 2, or

3 procedures, the owner or operator must either:

(i) *Calculated NMOC Emission Rate.* Submit a collection and control system design plan prepared by a professional engineer to the Administrator within 1 year as specified in § 60.767(c); calculate NMOC emissions using the next higher tier in § 60.764; or conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration using the procedures specified in § 60.764(a)(6). The collection and control system must meet the requirements in paragraphs (b)(2)(ii) and (iii) of this section.

(ii) *Collection system.* Install and start up a collection and control system that captures the gas generated within the landfill as required by paragraphs (b)(2)(ii)(C) or (D) and (b)(2)(iii) of this section within 30 months after:

(A) The first annual report in which the NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 megagrams per year, unless Tier 2 or Tier 3 sampling demonstrates that the NMOC emission rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, as specified in § 60.767(c)(4); or

(B) The most recent NMOC emission rate report in which the NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 megagrams per year based on Tier 2, if the Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring shows a surface methane emission concentration of 500 parts per million methane or greater as specified in § 60.767(c)(4)(iii).

(C) An active collection system must:

(1) Be designed to handle the maximum expected gas flow rate from the entire area of the landfill that warrants control over the intended use period of the gas control system equipment;

(2) Collect gas from each area, cell, or group of cells in the landfill in which the initial solid waste has been placed for a period of 5 years or more if active; or 2 years or more if closed or at final grade.

(3) Collect gas at a sufficient extraction rate;

(4) Be designed to minimize off-site migration of subsurface gas.

(D) A passive collection system must: (1) Comply with the provisions specified in paragraphs (b)(2)(ii)(C)(1), (2), and (3) of this section.

(2) Be installed with liners on the bottom and all sides in all areas in which gas is to be collected. The liners must be installed as required under 40 CFR 258.40.

(iii) *Control system.* Route all the collected gas to a control system that complies with the requirements in either paragraph (b)(2)(iii)(A), (B), or (C) of this section.

(A) A non-enclosed flare designed and operated in accordance with the parameters established in § 60.18 except as noted in § 60.764(e); or

(B) A control system designed and operated to reduce NMOC by 98 weight-percent, or, when an enclosed combustion device is used for control, to either reduce NMOC by 98 weight percent or reduce the outlet NMOC concentration to less than 20 parts per million by volume, dry basis as hexane at 3 percent oxygen. The reduction efficiency or parts per million by volume must be established by an initial performance test to be completed no later than 180 days after the initial startup of the approved control system using the test methods specified in § 60.764(d). The performance test is not required for boilers and process heaters with design heat input capacities equal to or greater than 44 megawatts that burn landfill gas for compliance with this subpart.

(1) If a boiler or process heater is used as the control device, the landfill gas stream must be introduced into the flame zone.

(2) The control device must be operated within the parameter ranges established during the initial or most recent performance test. The operating parameters to be monitored are specified in § 60.766;

(C) Route the collected gas to a treatment system that processes the collected gas for subsequent sale or beneficial use such as fuel for combustion, production of vehicle fuel, production of high-Btu gas for pipeline injection, or use as a raw material in a chemical manufacturing process. Venting of treated landfill gas to the ambient air is not allowed. If the treated landfill gas cannot be routed for subsequent sale or beneficial use, then the treated landfill gas must be controlled according to either paragraph (b)(2)(iii)(A) or (B) of this section.

(D) All emissions from any atmospheric vent from the gas treatment system are subject to the requirements of paragraph (b)(2)(iii)(A) or (B) of this section. For purposes of this subpart, atmospheric vents located on the condensate storage tank are not part of the treatment system and are exempt from the requirements of paragraph (b)(2)(iii)(A) or (B) of this section.

(iv) *Operation.* Operate the collection and control device installed to comply with this subpart in accordance with the provisions of §§ 60.763, 60.765 and 60.766.

(v) *Removal criteria.* The collection and control system may be capped, removed, or decommissioned if the following criteria are met:

(A) The landfill is a closed landfill (as defined in § 60.761). A closure report must be submitted to the Administrator as provided in § 60.767(e).

(B) The collection and control system has been in operation a minimum of 15 years or the landfill owner or operator demonstrates that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flow.

(C) Following the procedures specified in § 60.764(b), the calculated NMOC emission rate at the landfill is less than 34 megagrams per year on three successive test dates. The test dates must be no less than 90 days apart, and no more than 180 days apart.

(c) For purposes of obtaining an operating permit under title V of the Clean Air Act, the owner or operator of an MSW landfill subject to this subpart with a design capacity less than 2.5 million megagrams or 2.5 million cubic meters is not subject to the requirement to obtain an operating permit for the landfill under part 70 or 71 of this chapter, unless the landfill is otherwise subject to either part 70 or 71. For purposes of submitting a timely application for an operating permit under part 70 or 71, the owner or operator of an MSW landfill subject to this subpart with a design capacity greater than or equal to 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters, and not otherwise subject to either part 70 or 71, becomes subject to the requirements of § 70.5(a)(1)(i) or § 71.5(a)(1)(i) of this chapter, regardless of when the design capacity report is actually submitted, no later than:

(1) November 28, 2016 for MSW landfills that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction after July 17, 2014 but before August 29, 2016;

(2) Ninety days after the date of commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction for MSW landfills that commence construction, modification, or reconstruction after August 29, 2016.

(d) When an MSW landfill subject to this subpart is closed as defined in this subpart, the owner or operator is no longer subject to the requirement to maintain an operating permit under part 70 or 71 of this chapter for the landfill if the landfill is not otherwise subject to the requirements of either part 70 or 71 and if either of the following conditions are met:

(1) The landfill was never subject to the requirement for a control system under paragraph (b)(2) of this section; or

(2) The owner or operator meets the conditions for control system removal specified in paragraph (b)(2)(v) of this section.

§ 60.763 Operational standards for collection and control systems.

Each owner or operator of an MSW landfill with a gas collection and control system used to comply with the provisions of § 60.762(b)(2) must:

(a) Operate the collection system such that gas is collected from each area, cell, or group of cells in the MSW landfill in which solid waste has been in place for:

- (1) 5 years or more if active; or
- (2) 2 years or more if closed or at final grade;

(b) Operate the collection system with negative pressure at each wellhead except under the following conditions:

(1) A fire or increased well temperature. The owner or operator must record instances when positive pressure occurs in efforts to avoid a fire. These records must be submitted with the annual reports as provided in § 60.767(g)(1);

(2) Use of a geomembrane or synthetic cover. The owner or operator must develop acceptable pressure limits in the design plan;

(3) A decommissioned well. A well may experience a static positive pressure after shut down to accommodate for declining flows. All design changes must be approved by the Administrator as specified in § 60.767(c);

(c) Operate each interior wellhead in the collection system with a landfill gas temperature less than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit). The owner or operator may establish a higher operating temperature value at a particular well. A higher operating value demonstration must be submitted to the Administrator for approval and must include supporting data demonstrating that the elevated parameter neither causes fires nor significantly inhibits anaerobic decomposition by killing methanogens. The demonstration must satisfy both criteria in order to be approved (*i.e.*, neither causing fires nor killing methanogens is acceptable).

(d) Operate the collection system so that the methane concentration is less than 500 parts per million above background at the surface of the landfill. To determine if this level is exceeded, the owner or operator must conduct surface testing using an organic vapor analyzer, flame ionization detector, or other portable monitor meeting the specifications provided in § 60.765(d). The owner or operator must conduct surface testing around the perimeter of the collection area and along a pattern that traverses the landfill at no more than 30-meter intervals and where visual observations indicate elevated concentrations of landfill gas, such as

distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover and all cover penetrations. Thus, the owner or operator must monitor any openings that are within an area of the landfill where waste has been placed and a gas collection system is required. The owner or operator may establish an alternative traversing pattern that ensures equivalent coverage. A surface monitoring design plan must be developed that includes a topographical map with the monitoring route and the rationale for any site-specific deviations from the 30-meter intervals. Areas with steep slopes or other dangerous areas may be excluded from the surface testing.

(e) Operate the system such that all collected gases are vented to a control system designed and operated in compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii). In the event the collection or control system is not operating, the gas mover system must be shut down and all valves in the collection and control system contributing to venting of the gas to the atmosphere must be closed within 1 hour of the collection or control system not operating; and

(f) Operate the control system at all times when the collected gas is routed to the system.

(g) If monitoring demonstrates that the operational requirements in paragraphs (b), (c), or (d) of this section are not met, corrective action must be taken as specified in § 60.765(a)(3) and (5) or (c). If corrective actions are taken as specified in § 60.765, the monitored exceedance is not a violation of the operational requirements in this section.

§ 60.764 Test methods and procedures.

(a)(1) *NMOC Emission Rate.* The landfill owner or operator must calculate the NMOC emission rate using either Equation 1 provided in paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section or Equation 2 provided in paragraph (a)(1)(ii) of this section. Both Equation 1 and Equation 2 may be used if the actual year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate is known, as specified in paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section, for part of the life of the landfill and the actual year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate is unknown, as specified in paragraph (a)(1)(ii) of this section, for part of the life of the landfill. The values to be used in both Equation 1 and Equation 2 are 0.05 per year for k , 170 cubic meters per megagram for L_0 , and 4,000 parts per million by volume as hexane for the C_{NMOC} . For landfills located in geographical areas with a 30-year annual average precipitation of less than 25 inches, as measured at the nearest

representative official meteorologic site, the k value to be used is 0.02 per year.

(i)(A) Equation 1 must be used if the actual year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate is known.

$$M_{NMOC} = \sum_{i=1}^n 2 k L_o M_i (e^{-kt_i}) (C_{NMOC}) (3.6 \times 10^{-9})$$

(Eq. 1)

Where:

M_{NMOC} = Total NMOC emission rate from the landfill, megagrams per year.

k = Methane generation rate constant, year⁻¹.

L_o = Methane generation potential, cubic meters per megagram solid waste.

M_i = Mass of solid waste in the ith section, megagrams.

t_i = Age of the ith section, years.

C_{NMOC} = Concentration of NMOC, parts per million by volume as hexane.

3.6×10^{-9} = Conversion factor.

(B) The mass of nondegradable solid waste may be subtracted from the total mass of solid waste in a particular

section of the landfill when calculating the value for M_i if documentation of the nature and amount of such wastes is maintained.

(ii)(A) Equation 2 must be used if the actual year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate is unknown.

$$M_{NMOC} = 2L_oR (e^{-kc} - e^{-kt}) C_{NMOC} (3.6 \times 10^{-9})$$

(Eq. 2)

Where:

M_{NMOC} = Mass emission rate of NMOC, megagrams per year.

L_o = Methane generation potential, cubic meters per megagram solid waste.

R = Average annual acceptance rate, megagrams per year.

k = Methane generation rate constant, year⁻¹.

t = Age of landfill, years.

C_{NMOC} = Concentration of NMOC, parts per million by volume as hexane.

c = Time since closure, years; for active landfill c = 0 and $e^{-kc} = 1$.

3.6×10^{-9} = Conversion factor.

(B) The mass of nondegradable solid waste may be subtracted from the total mass of solid waste in a particular section of the landfill when calculating the value of R, if documentation of the nature and amount of such wastes is maintained.

(2) *Tier 1*. The owner or operator must compare the calculated NMOC mass emission rate to the standard of 34 megagrams per year.

(i) If the NMOC emission rate calculated in paragraph (a)(1) of this section is less than 34 megagrams per year, then the landfill owner or operator must submit an NMOC emission rate report according to § 60.767(b), and must recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate annually as required under § 60.762(b).

(ii) If the calculated NMOC emission rate as calculated in paragraph (a)(1) of this section is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year, then the landfill owner must either:

(A) Submit a gas collection and control system design plan within 1 year as specified in § 60.767(c) and install and operate a gas collection and control system within 30 months according to § 60.762(b)(2)(ii) and (iii);

(B) Determine a site-specific NMOC concentration and recalculate the

NMOC emission rate using the Tier 2 procedures provided in paragraph (a)(3) of this section; or

(C) Determine a site-specific methane generation rate constant and recalculate the NMOC emission rate using the Tier 3 procedures provided in paragraph (a)(4) of this section.

(3) *Tier 2*. The landfill owner or operator must determine the site-specific NMOC concentration using the following sampling procedure. The landfill owner or operator must install at least two sample probes per hectare, evenly distributed over the landfill surface that has retained waste for at least 2 years. If the landfill is larger than 25 hectares in area, only 50 samples are required. The probes should be evenly distributed across the sample area. The sample probes should be located to avoid known areas of nondegradable solid waste. The owner or operator must collect and analyze one sample of landfill gas from each probe to determine the NMOC concentration using Method 25 or 25C of appendix A of this part. Taking composite samples from different probes into a single cylinder is allowed; however, equal sample volumes must be taken from each probe. For each composite, the sampling rate, collection times, beginning and ending cylinder vacuums, or alternative volume measurements must be recorded to verify that composite volumes are equal. Composite sample volumes should not be less than one liter unless evidence can be provided to substantiate the accuracy of smaller volumes. Terminate compositing before the cylinder approaches ambient pressure where measurement accuracy diminishes. If more than the required number of samples are taken, all samples must be

used in the analysis. The landfill owner or operator must divide the NMOC concentration from Method 25 or 25C of appendix A of this part by six to convert from C_{NMOC} as carbon to C_{NMOC} as hexane. If the landfill has an active or passive gas removal system in place, Method 25 or 25C samples may be collected from these systems instead of surface probes provided the removal system can be shown to provide sampling as representative as the two sampling probe per hectare requirement. For active collection systems, samples may be collected from the common header pipe. The sample location on the common header pipe must be before any gas moving, condensate removal, or treatment system equipment. For active collection systems, a minimum of three samples must be collected from the header pipe.

(i) Within 60 days after the date of completing each performance test (as defined in § 60.8), the owner or operator must submit the results according to § 60.767(i)(1).

(ii) The landfill owner or operator must recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate using Equation 1 or Equation 2 provided in paragraph (a)(1)(i) or (a)(1)(ii) of this section and using the average site-specific NMOC concentration from the collected samples instead of the default value provided in paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

(iii) If the resulting NMOC mass emission rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, then the owner or operator must submit a periodic estimate of NMOC emissions in an NMOC emission rate report according to § 60.767(b)(1), and must recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate annually as required under § 60.762(b). The site-specific

NMOC concentration must be retested every 5 years using the methods specified in this section.

(iv) If the NMOC mass emission rate as calculated using the Tier 2 site-specific NMOC concentration is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year, the landfill owner or operator must either:

(A) Submit a gas collection and control system design plan within 1 year as specified in § 60.767(c) and install and operate a gas collection and control system within 30 months according to § 60.762(b)(2)(ii) and (iii);

(B) Determine a site-specific methane generation rate constant and recalculate the NMOC emission rate using the site-specific methane generation rate using the Tier 3 procedures specified in paragraph (a)(4) of this section; or

(C) Conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration using the Tier 4 procedures specified in paragraph (a)(6) of this section.

(4) *Tier 3.* The site-specific methane generation rate constant must be determined using the procedures provided in Method 2E of appendix A of this part. The landfill owner or operator must estimate the NMOC mass emission rate using Equation 1 or Equation 2 in paragraph (a)(1)(i) or (ii) of this section and using a site-specific methane generation rate constant, and the site-specific NMOC concentration as determined in paragraph (a)(3) of this section instead of the default values provided in paragraph (a)(1) of this section. The landfill owner or operator must compare the resulting NMOC mass emission rate to the standard of 34 megagrams per year.

(i) If the NMOC mass emission rate as calculated using the Tier 2 site-specific NMOC concentration and Tier 3 site-specific methane generation rate is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year, the owner or operator must either:

(A) Submit a gas collection and control system design plan within 1 year as specified in § 60.767(c) and install and operate a gas collection and control system within 30 months according to § 60.762(b)(2)(ii) and (iii); or

(B) Conduct a surface emission monitoring demonstration using the Tier 4 procedures specified in paragraph (a)(6) of this section.

(ii) If the NMOC mass emission rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, then the owner or operator must recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate annually using Equation 1 or Equation 2 in paragraph (a)(1) of this section and using the site-specific Tier 2 NMOC concentration and Tier 3 methane

generation rate constant and submit a periodic NMOC emission rate report as provided in § 60.767(b)(1). The calculation of the methane generation rate constant is performed only once, and the value obtained from this test must be used in all subsequent annual NMOC emission rate calculations.

(5) *Other methods.* The owner or operator may use other methods to determine the NMOC concentration or a site-specific methane generation rate constant as an alternative to the methods required in paragraphs (a)(3) and (4) of this section if the method has been approved by the Administrator.

(6) *Tier 4.* The landfill owner or operator must demonstrate that surface methane emissions are below 500 parts per million. Surface emission monitoring must be conducted on a quarterly basis using the following procedures. Tier 4 is allowed only if the landfill owner or operator can demonstrate that NMOC emissions are greater than or equal to 34 Mg/yr but less than 50 Mg/yr using Tier 1 or Tier 2. If both Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicate NMOC emissions are 50 Mg/yr or greater, then Tier 4 cannot be used. In addition, the landfill must meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(6)(viii) of this section.

(i) The owner or operator must measure surface concentrations of methane along the entire perimeter of the landfill and along a pattern that traverses the landfill at no more than 30-meter intervals using an organic vapor analyzer, flame ionization detector, or other portable monitor meeting the specifications provided in § 60.765(d).

(ii) The background concentration must be determined by moving the probe inlet upwind and downwind at least 30 meters from the waste mass boundary of the landfill.

(iii) Surface emission monitoring must be performed in accordance with section 8.3.1 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, except that the probe inlet must be placed no more than 5 centimeters above the landfill surface; the constant measurement of distance above the surface should be based on a mechanical device such as with a wheel on a pole, except as described in paragraph (a)(6)(iii)(A) of this section.

(A) The owner or operator must use a wind barrier, similar to a funnel, when onsite average wind speed exceeds 4 miles per hour or 2 meters per second or gust exceeding 10 miles per hour. Average on-site wind speed must also be determined in an open area at 5-minute intervals using an on-site anemometer with a continuous recorder and data logger for the entire duration of the monitoring event. The wind

barrier must surround the SEM monitor, and must be placed on the ground, to ensure wind turbulence is blocked. SEM cannot be conducted if average wind speed exceeds 25 miles per hour.

(B) Landfill surface areas where visual observations indicate elevated concentrations of landfill gas, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover, and all cover penetrations must also be monitored using a device meeting the specifications provided in § 60.765(d).

(iv) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with the Tier 4 provisions in paragraph (a)(6) of this section must maintain records of surface emission monitoring as provided in § 60.768(g) and submit a Tier 4 surface emissions report as provided in § 60.767(c)(4)(iii).

(v) If there is any measured concentration of methane of 500 parts per million or greater from the surface of the landfill, the owner or operator must submit a gas collection and control system design plan within 1 year of the first measured concentration of methane of 500 parts per million or greater from the surface of the landfill according to § 60.767(c) and install and operate a gas collection and control system according to § 60.762(b)(2)(ii) and (iii) within 30 months of the most recent NMOC emission rate report in which the NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 megagrams per year based on Tier 2.

(vi) If after four consecutive quarterly monitoring periods at a landfill, other than a closed landfill, there is no measured concentration of methane of 500 parts per million or greater from the surface of the landfill, the owner or operator must continue quarterly surface emission monitoring using the methods specified in this section.

(vii) If after four consecutive quarterly monitoring periods at a closed landfill there is no measured concentration of methane of 500 parts per million or greater from the surface of the landfill, the owner or operator must conduct annual surface emission monitoring using the methods specified in this section.

(viii) If a landfill has installed and operates a collection and control system that is not required by this subpart, then the collection and control system must meet the following criteria:

(A) The gas collection and control system must have operated for 6,570 out of 8,760 hours preceding the Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring demonstration.

(B) During the Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring demonstration, the gas collection and control system must operate as it normally would to

collect and control as much landfill gas as possible.

(b) After the installation and startup of a collection and control system in

compliance with this subpart, the owner or operator must calculate the NMOC emission rate for purposes of determining when the system can be

capped, removed or decommissioned as provided in § 60.762(b)(2)(v), using Equation 3:

$$M_{\text{NMOC}} = 1.89 \times 10^{-3} Q_{\text{LFG}} C_{\text{NMOC}} \quad (\text{Eq. 3})$$

Where:

M_{NMOC} = Mass emission rate of NMOC, megagrams per year.

Q_{LFG} = Flow rate of landfill gas, cubic meters per minute.

C_{NMOC} = NMOC concentration, parts per million by volume as hexane.

(1) The flow rate of landfill gas, Q_{LFG} , must be determined by measuring the total landfill gas flow rate at the common header pipe that leads to the control system using a gas flow measuring device calibrated according to the provisions of section 10 of Method 2E of appendix A of this part.

(2) The average NMOC concentration, C_{NMOC} , must be determined by collecting and analyzing landfill gas sampled from the common header pipe before the gas moving or condensate removal equipment using the procedures in Method 25 or Method 25C. The sample location on the common header pipe must be before any condensate removal or other gas refining units. The landfill owner or operator must divide the NMOC concentration from Method 25 or Method 25C of appendix A of this part by six to convert

from C_{NMOC} as carbon to C_{NMOC} as hexane.

(3) The owner or operator may use another method to determine landfill gas flow rate and NMOC concentration if the method has been approved by the Administrator.

(i) Within 60 days after the date of completing each performance test (as defined in § 60.8), the owner or operator must submit the results of the performance test, including any associated fuel analyses, according to § 60.767(i)(1).

(ii) [Reserved]

(c) When calculating emissions for Prevention of Significant Deterioration purposes, the owner or operator of each MSW landfill subject to the provisions of this subpart must estimate the NMOC emission rate for comparison to the Prevention of Significant Deterioration major source and significance levels in §§ 51.166 or 52.21 of this chapter using Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources (AP-42) or other approved measurement procedures.

(d) For the performance test required in § 60.762(b)(2)(iii)(B), Method 25 or

25C (Method 25C may be used at the inlet only) of appendix A of this part must be used to determine compliance with the 98 weight-percent efficiency or the 20 parts per million by volume outlet concentration level, unless another method to demonstrate compliance has been approved by the Administrator as provided by § 60.767(c)(2). Method 3, 3A, or 3C must be used to determine oxygen for correcting the NMOC concentration as hexane to 3 percent. In cases where the outlet concentration is less than 50 ppm NMOC as carbon (8 ppm NMOC as hexane), Method 25A should be used in place of Method 25. Method 18 may be used in conjunction with Method 25A on a limited basis (compound specific, e.g., methane) or Method 3C may be used to determine methane. The methane as carbon should be subtracted from the Method 25A total hydrocarbon value as carbon to give NMOC concentration as carbon. The landowner or operator must divide the NMOC concentration as carbon by 6 to convert from the C_{NMOC} as carbon to C_{NMOC} as hexane. Equation 4 must be used to calculate efficiency:

$$\text{Control Efficiency} = (\text{NMOC}_{\text{in}} - \text{NMOC}_{\text{out}}) / (\text{NMOC}_{\text{in}}) \quad (\text{Eq. 4})$$

Where:

NMOC_{in} = Mass of NMOC entering control device.

NMOC_{out} = Mass of NMOC exiting control device.

(e) For the performance test required in § 60.762(b)(2)(iii)(A), the net heating value of the combusted landfill gas as determined in § 60.18(f)(3) is calculated from the concentration of methane in the landfill gas as measured by Method 3C. A minimum of three 30-minute Method 3C samples are determined. The measurement of other organic components, hydrogen, and carbon monoxide is not applicable. Method 3C may be used to determine the landfill gas molecular weight for calculating the flare gas exit velocity under § 60.18(f)(4).

(1) Within 60 days after the date of completing each performance test (as defined in § 60.8), the owner or operator must submit the results of the performance tests, including any associated fuel analyses, required by § 60.764(b) or (d) according to § 60.767(i)(1).

(2) [Reserved]

§ 60.765 Compliance provisions.

(a) Except as provided in § 60.767(c)(2), the specified methods in paragraphs (a)(1) through (6) of this section must be used to determine whether the gas collection system is in compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(ii).

(1) For the purposes of calculating the maximum expected gas generation flow rate from the landfill to determine

compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(ii)(C)(1), either Equation 5 or Equation 6 must be used. The methane generation rate constant (k) and methane generation potential (L_0) kinetic factors should be those published in the most recent Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors (AP-42) or other site specific values demonstrated to be appropriate and approved by the Administrator. If k has been determined as specified in § 60.764(a)(4), the value of k determined from the test must be used. A value of no more than 15 years must be used for the intended use period of the gas mover equipment. The active life of the landfill is the age of the landfill plus the estimated number of years until closure.

(i) For sites with unknown year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate:

$$Q_m = 2L_oR (e^{-kc} - e^{-kt}) \quad (\text{Eq. 5})$$

Where:

Q_m = Maximum expected gas generation flow rate, cubic meters per year.

L_o = Methane generation potential, cubic meters per megagram solid waste.

R = Average annual acceptance rate, megagrams per year.

k = Methane generation rate constant, year⁻¹.

t = Age of the landfill at equipment installation plus the time the owner or operator intends to use the gas mover equipment or active life of the landfill, whichever is less. If the equipment is

installed after closure, t is the age of the landfill at installation, years.

c = Time since closure, years (for an active landfill $c = 0$ and $e^{-kc} = 1$).

(ii) For sites with known year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate:

$$Q_M = \sum_{i=1}^n 2kL_oM_i(e^{-kt_i}) \quad (\text{Eq. 6})$$

Where:

Q_M = Maximum expected gas generation flow rate, cubic meters per year.

k = Methane generation rate constant, year⁻¹.

L_o = Methane generation potential, cubic meters per megagram solid waste.

M_i = Mass of solid waste in the i^{th} section, megagrams.

t_i = Age of the i^{th} section, years.

(iii) If a collection and control system has been installed, actual flow data may be used to project the maximum expected gas generation flow rate instead of, or in conjunction with, Equation 5 or Equation 6 in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) and (ii) of this section. If the landfill is still accepting waste, the actual measured flow data will not equal the maximum expected gas generation rate, so calculations using Equation 5 or Equation 6 in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) or (ii) of this section or other methods must be used to predict the maximum expected gas generation rate over the intended period of use of the gas control system equipment.

(2) For the purposes of determining sufficient density of gas collectors for compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(ii)(C)(2), the owner or operator must design a system of vertical wells, horizontal collectors, or other collection devices, satisfactory to the Administrator, capable of controlling and extracting gas from all portions of the landfill sufficient to meet all operational and performance standards.

(3) For the purpose of demonstrating whether the gas collection system flow rate is sufficient to determine compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(ii)(C)(3), the owner or operator must measure gauge pressure in the gas collection header applied to each individual well, monthly. If a positive pressure exists, action must be initiated to correct the exceedance within 5 calendar days, except for the three conditions allowed under § 60.763(b). Any attempted corrective measure must not cause exceedances of other operational or performance standards.

(i) If negative pressure cannot be achieved without excess air infiltration

within 15 calendar days of the first measurement of positive pressure, the owner or operator must conduct a root cause analysis and correct the exceedance as soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days after positive pressure was first measured. The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.768(e)(3).

(ii) If corrective actions cannot be fully implemented within 60 days following the positive pressure measurement for which the root cause analysis was required, the owner or operator must also conduct a corrective action analysis and develop an implementation schedule to complete the corrective action(s) as soon as practicable, but no more than 120 days following the positive pressure measurement. The owner or operator must submit the items listed in § 60.767(g)(7) as part of the next annual report. The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.768(e)(4).

(iii) If corrective action is expected to take longer than 120 days to complete after the initial exceedance, the owner or operator must submit the root cause analysis, corrective action analysis, and corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator, according to § 60.767(g)(7) and § 60.767(j). The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.768(e)(5).

(4) [Reserved]

(5) For the purpose of identifying whether excess air infiltration into the landfill is occurring, the owner or operator must monitor each well monthly for temperature as provided in § 60.763(c). If a well exceeds the operating parameter for temperature, action must be initiated to correct the exceedance within 5 calendar days. Any attempted corrective measure must not cause exceedances of other operational or performance standards.

(i) If a landfill gas temperature less than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) cannot be achieved within 15 calendar days of the first measurement of landfill gas temperature

greater than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit), the owner or operator must conduct a root cause analysis and correct the exceedance as soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days after a landfill gas temperature greater than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) was first measured. The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.768(e)(3).

(ii) If corrective actions cannot be fully implemented within 60 days following the positive pressure measurement for which the root cause analysis was required, the owner or operator must also conduct a corrective action analysis and develop an implementation schedule to complete the corrective action(s) as soon as practicable, but no more than 120 days following the measurement of landfill gas temperature greater than 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit). The owner or operator must submit the items listed in § 60.767(g)(7) as part of the next annual report. The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.768(e)(4).

(iii) If corrective action is expected to take longer than 120 days to complete after the initial exceedance, the owner or operator must submit the root cause analysis, corrective action analysis, and corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator, according to § 60.767(g)(7) and § 60.767(j). The owner or operator must keep records according to § 60.768(e)(5).

(6) An owner or operator seeking to demonstrate compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(ii)(C)(4) through the use of a collection system not conforming to the specifications provided in § 60.769 must provide information satisfactory to the Administrator as specified in § 60.767(c)(3) demonstrating that off-site migration is being controlled.

(b) For purposes of compliance with § 60.763(a), each owner or operator of a controlled landfill must place each well or design component as specified in the approved design plan as provided in § 60.767(c). Each well must be installed

no later than 60 days after the date on which the initial solid waste has been in place for a period of:

- (1) Five (5) years or more if active; or
- (2) Two (2) years or more if closed or at final grade.

(c) The following procedures must be used for compliance with the surface methane operational standard as provided in § 60.763(d).

(1) After installation and startup of the gas collection system, the owner or operator must monitor surface concentrations of methane along the entire perimeter of the collection area and along a pattern that traverses the landfill at 30 meter intervals (or a site-specific established spacing) for each collection area on a quarterly basis using an organic vapor analyzer, flame ionization detector, or other portable monitor meeting the specifications provided in paragraph (d) of this section.

(2) The background concentration must be determined by moving the probe inlet upwind and downwind outside the boundary of the landfill at a distance of at least 30 meters from the perimeter wells.

(3) Surface emission monitoring must be performed in accordance with section 8.3.1 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, except that the probe inlet must be placed within 5 to 10 centimeters of the ground. Monitoring must be performed during typical meteorological conditions.

(4) Any reading of 500 parts per million or more above background at any location must be recorded as a monitored exceedance and the actions specified in paragraphs (c)(4)(i) through (v) of this section must be taken. As long as the specified actions are taken, the exceedance is not a violation of the operational requirements of § 60.763(d).

(i) The location of each monitored exceedance must be marked and the location and concentration recorded.

(ii) Cover maintenance or adjustments to the vacuum of the adjacent wells to increase the gas collection in the vicinity of each exceedance must be made and the location must be re-monitored within 10 calendar days of detecting the exceedance.

(iii) If the re-monitoring of the location shows a second exceedance, additional corrective action must be taken and the location must be monitored again within 10 days of the second exceedance. If the re-monitoring shows a third exceedance for the same location, the action specified in paragraph (c)(4)(v) of this section must be taken, and no further monitoring of that location is required until the action

specified in paragraph (c)(4)(v) of this section has been taken.

(iv) Any location that initially showed an exceedance but has a methane concentration less than 500 ppm methane above background at the 10-day re-monitoring specified in paragraph (c)(4)(ii) or (iii) of this section must be re-monitored 1 month from the initial exceedance. If the 1-month re-monitoring shows a concentration less than 500 parts per million above background, no further monitoring of that location is required until the next quarterly monitoring period. If the 1-month re-monitoring shows an exceedance, the actions specified in paragraph (c)(4)(iii) or (v) of this section must be taken.

(v) For any location where monitored methane concentration equals or exceeds 500 parts per million above background three times within a quarterly period, a new well or other collection device must be installed within 120 calendar days of the initial exceedance. An alternative remedy to the exceedance, such as upgrading the blower, header pipes or control device, and a corresponding timeline for installation may be submitted to the Administrator for approval.

(5) The owner or operator must implement a program to monitor for cover integrity and implement cover repairs as necessary on a monthly basis.

(d) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with the provisions in paragraph (c) of this section or § 60.764(a)(6) must comply with the following instrumentation specifications and procedures for surface emission monitoring devices:

(1) The portable analyzer must meet the instrument specifications provided in section 6 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, except that "methane" replaces all references to "VOC".

(2) The calibration gas must be methane, diluted to a nominal concentration of 500 parts per million in air.

(3) To meet the performance evaluation requirements in section 8.1 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, the instrument evaluation procedures of section 8.1 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part must be used.

(4) The calibration procedures provided in sections 8 and 10 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part must be followed immediately before commencing a surface monitoring survey.

(e) The provisions of this subpart apply at all times, including periods of startup, shutdown or malfunction. During periods of startup, shutdown, and malfunction, you must comply with

the work practice specified in § 60.763(e) in lieu of the compliance provisions in § 60.765.

§ 60.766 Monitoring of operations.

Except as provided in § 60.767(c)(2):

(a) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.762(b)(2)(ii)(C) for an active gas collection system must install a sampling port and a thermometer, other temperature measuring device, or an access port for temperature measurements at each wellhead and:

(1) Measure the gauge pressure in the gas collection header on a monthly basis as provided in § 60.765(a)(3); and

(2) Monitor nitrogen or oxygen concentration in the landfill gas on a monthly basis as follows:

(i) The nitrogen level must be determined using Method 3C, unless an alternative test method is established as allowed by § 60.767(c)(2).

(ii) Unless an alternative test method is established as allowed by § 60.767(c)(2), the oxygen level must be determined by an oxygen meter using Method 3A, 3C, or ASTM D6522–11 (incorporated by reference, see § 60.17). Determine the oxygen level by an oxygen meter using Method 3A, 3C, or ASTM D6522–11 (if sample location is prior to combustion) except that:

(A) The span must be set between 10 and 12 percent oxygen;

(B) A data recorder is not required;

(C) Only two calibration gases are required, a zero and span;

(D) A calibration error check is not required;

(E) The allowable sample bias, zero drift, and calibration drift are ± 10 percent.

(iii) A portable gas composition analyzer may be used to monitor the oxygen levels provided:

(A) The analyzer is calibrated; and

(B) The analyzer meets all quality assurance and quality control requirements for Method 3A or ASTM D6522–11 (incorporated by reference, see § 60.17).

(3) Monitor temperature of the landfill gas on a monthly basis as provided in § 60.765(a)(5). The temperature measuring device must be calibrated annually using the procedure in 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–1, Method 2, Section 10.3.

(b) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) using an enclosed combustor must calibrate, maintain, and operate according to the manufacturer's specifications, the following equipment:

(1) A temperature monitoring device equipped with a continuous recorder and having a minimum accuracy of ± 1 percent of the temperature being

measured expressed in degrees Celsius or ± 0.5 degrees Celsius, whichever is greater. A temperature monitoring device is not required for boilers or process heaters with design heat input capacity equal to or greater than 44 megawatts.

(2) A device that records flow to the control device and bypass of the control device (if applicable). The owner or operator must:

(i) Install, calibrate, and maintain a gas flow rate measuring device that must record the flow to the control device at least every 15 minutes; and

(ii) Secure the bypass line valve in the closed position with a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration. A visual inspection of the seal or closure mechanism must be performed at least once every month to ensure that the valve is maintained in the closed position and that the gas flow is not diverted through the bypass line.

(c) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) using a non-enclosed flare must install, calibrate, maintain, and operate according to the manufacturer's specifications the following equipment:

(1) A heat sensing device, such as an ultraviolet beam sensor or thermocouple, at the pilot light or the flame itself to indicate the continuous presence of a flame.

(2) A device that records flow to the flare and bypass of the flare (if applicable). The owner or operator must:

(i) Install, calibrate, and maintain a gas flow rate measuring device that records the flow to the control device at least every 15 minutes; and

(ii) Secure the bypass line valve in the closed position with a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration. A visual inspection of the seal or closure mechanism must be performed at least once every month to ensure that the valve is maintained in the closed position and that the gas flow is not diverted through the bypass line.

(d) Each owner or operator seeking to demonstrate compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) using a device other than a non-enclosed flare or an enclosed combustor or a treatment system must provide information satisfactory to the Administrator as provided in § 60.767(c)(2) describing the operation of the control device, the operating parameters that would indicate proper performance, and appropriate monitoring procedures. The Administrator must review the information and either approve it, or request that additional information be submitted. The Administrator may

specify additional appropriate monitoring procedures.

(e) Each owner or operator seeking to install a collection system that does not meet the specifications in § 60.769 or seeking to monitor alternative parameters to those required by §§ 60.763 through 60.766 must provide information satisfactory to the Administrator as provided in § 60.767(c)(2) and (3) describing the design and operation of the collection system, the operating parameters that would indicate proper performance, and appropriate monitoring procedures. The Administrator may specify additional appropriate monitoring procedures.

(f) Each owner or operator seeking to demonstrate compliance with the 500 parts per million surface methane operational standard in § 60.763(d) must monitor surface concentrations of methane according to the procedures in § 60.765(c) and the instrument specifications in § 60.765(d). Any closed landfill that has no monitored exceedances of the operational standard in three consecutive quarterly monitoring periods may skip to annual monitoring. Any methane reading of 500 ppm or more above background detected during the annual monitoring returns the frequency for that landfill to quarterly monitoring.

(g) Each owner or operator seeking to demonstrate compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) using a landfill gas treatment system must maintain and operate all monitoring systems associated with the treatment system in accordance with the site-specific treatment system monitoring plan required in § 60.768(b)(5)(ii) and must calibrate, maintain, and operate according to the manufacturer's specifications a device that records flow to the treatment system and bypass of the treatment system (if applicable). The owner or operator must:

(1) Install, calibrate, and maintain a gas flow rate measuring device that records the flow to the treatment system at least every 15 minutes; and

(2) Secure the bypass line valve in the closed position with a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration. A visual inspection of the seal or closure mechanism must be performed at least once every month to ensure that the valve is maintained in the closed position and that the gas flow is not diverted through the bypass line.

(h) The monitoring requirements of paragraphs (b), (c) (d) and (g) of this section apply at all times the affected source is operating, except for periods of monitoring system malfunctions, repairs associated with monitoring system malfunctions, and required monitoring

system quality assurance or quality control activities. A monitoring system malfunction is any sudden, infrequent, not reasonably preventable failure of the monitoring system to provide valid data. Monitoring system failures that are caused in part by poor maintenance or careless operation are not malfunctions. You are required to complete monitoring system repairs in response to monitoring system malfunctions and to return the monitoring system to operation as expeditiously as practicable.

§ 60.767 Reporting requirements.

(a) *Design capacity report.* Each owner or operator subject to the requirements of this subpart must submit an initial design capacity report to the Administrator.

(1) *Submission.* The initial design capacity report fulfills the requirements of the notification of the date construction is commenced as required by § 60.7(a)(1) and must be submitted no later than:

(i) November 28, 2016, for landfills that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction after July 17, 2014 but before August 29, 2016; or

(ii) Ninety days after the date of commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction for landfills that commence construction, modification, or reconstruction after August 29, 2016.

(2) *Initial design capacity report.* The initial design capacity report must contain the following information:

(i) A map or plot of the landfill, providing the size and location of the landfill, and identifying all areas where solid waste may be landfilled according to the permit issued by the state, local, or tribal agency responsible for regulating the landfill.

(ii) The maximum design capacity of the landfill. Where the maximum design capacity is specified in the permit issued by the state, local, or tribal agency responsible for regulating the landfill, a copy of the permit specifying the maximum design capacity may be submitted as part of the report. If the maximum design capacity of the landfill is not specified in the permit, the maximum design capacity must be calculated using good engineering practices. The calculations must be provided, along with the relevant parameters as part of the report. The landfill may calculate design capacity in either megagrams or cubic meters for comparison with the exemption values. If the owner or operator chooses to convert the design capacity from volume to mass or from mass to volume to demonstrate its design capacity is less

than 2.5 million megagrams or 2.5 million cubic meters, the calculation must include a site-specific density, which must be recalculated annually. Any density conversions must be documented and submitted with the design capacity report. The state, tribal, local agency or Administrator may request other reasonable information as may be necessary to verify the maximum design capacity of the landfill.

(3) *Amended design capacity report.* An amended design capacity report must be submitted to the Administrator providing notification of an increase in the design capacity of the landfill, within 90 days of an increase in the maximum design capacity of the landfill to meet or exceed 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters. This increase in design capacity may result from an increase in the permitted volume of the landfill or an increase in the density as documented in the annual recalculation required in § 60.768(f).

(b) *NMOC emission rate report.* Each owner or operator subject to the requirements of this subpart must submit an NMOC emission rate report following the procedure specified in paragraph (i)(2) of this section to the Administrator initially and annually thereafter, except as provided for in paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section. The Administrator may request such additional information as may be necessary to verify the reported NMOC emission rate.

(1) The NMOC emission rate report must contain an annual or 5-year estimate of the NMOC emission rate calculated using the formula and procedures provided in § 60.764(a) or (b), as applicable.

(i) The initial NMOC emission rate report may be combined with the initial design capacity report required in paragraph (a) of this section and must be submitted no later than indicated in paragraphs (b)(1)(i)(A) and (B) of this section. Subsequent NMOC emission rate reports must be submitted annually thereafter, except as provided for in paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section.

(A) November 28, 2016, for landfills that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction after July 17, 2014, but before August 29, 2016, or

(B) Ninety days after the date of commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction for landfills that commence construction, modification, or reconstruction after August 29, 2016.

(ii) If the estimated NMOC emission rate as reported in the annual report to the Administrator is less than 34

megagrams per year in each of the next 5 consecutive years, the owner or operator may elect to submit, following the procedure specified in paragraph (i)(2) of this section, an estimate of the NMOC emission rate for the next 5-year period in lieu of the annual report. This estimate must include the current amount of solid waste-in-place and the estimated waste acceptance rate for each year of the 5 years for which an NMOC emission rate is estimated. All data and calculations upon which this estimate is based must be provided to the Administrator. This estimate must be revised at least once every 5 years. If the actual waste acceptance rate exceeds the estimated waste acceptance rate in any year reported in the 5-year estimate, a revised 5-year estimate must be submitted to the Administrator. The revised estimate must cover the 5-year period beginning with the year in which the actual waste acceptance rate exceeded the estimated waste acceptance rate.

(2) The NMOC emission rate report must include all the data, calculations, sample reports and measurements used to estimate the annual or 5-year emissions.

(3) Each owner or operator subject to the requirements of this subpart is exempted from the requirements to submit an NMOC emission rate report, after installing a collection and control system that complies with § 60.762(b)(2), during such time as the collection and control system is in operation and in compliance with §§ 60.763 and 60.765.

(c) *Collection and control system design plan.* Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of § 60.762(b)(2) must submit a collection and control system design plan to the Administrator for approval according to the schedule in paragraph (c)(4) of this section. The collection and control system design plan must be prepared and approved by a professional engineer and must meet the following requirements:

(1) The collection and control system as described in the design plan must meet the design requirements in § 60.762(b)(2).

(2) The collection and control system design plan must include any alternatives to the operational standards, test methods, procedures, compliance measures, monitoring, recordkeeping or reporting provisions of §§ 60.763 through 60.768 proposed by the owner or operator.

(3) The collection and control system design plan must either conform with specifications for active collection systems in § 60.769 or include a

demonstration to the Administrator's satisfaction of the sufficiency of the alternative provisions to § 60.769.

(4) Each owner or operator of an MSW landfill having a design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters must submit a collection and control system design plan to the Administrator for approval within 1 year of the first NMOC emission rate report in which the NMOC emission rate equals or exceeds 34 megagrams per year, except as follows:

(i) If the owner or operator elects to recalculate the NMOC emission rate after Tier 2 NMOC sampling and analysis as provided in § 60.764(a)(3) and the resulting rate is less than 34 megagrams per year, annual periodic reporting must be resumed, using the Tier 2 determined site-specific NMOC concentration, until the calculated emission rate is equal to or greater than 34 megagrams per year or the landfill is closed. The revised NMOC emission rate report, with the recalculated emission rate based on NMOC sampling and analysis, must be submitted, following the procedures in paragraph (i)(2) of this section, within 180 days of the first calculated exceedance of 34 megagrams per year.

(ii) If the owner or operator elects to recalculate the NMOC emission rate after determining a site-specific methane generation rate constant k , as provided in Tier 3 in § 60.764(a)(4), and the resulting NMOC emission rate is less than 34 Mg/yr, annual periodic reporting must be resumed. The resulting site-specific methane generation rate constant k must be used in the emission rate calculation until such time as the emissions rate calculation results in an exceedance. The revised NMOC emission rate report based on the provisions of § 60.764(a)(4) and the resulting site-specific methane generation rate constant k must be submitted, following the procedure specified in paragraph (i)(2) of this section, to the Administrator within 1 year of the first calculated emission rate equaling or exceeding 34 megagrams per year.

(iii) If the owner or operator elects to demonstrate that site-specific surface methane emissions are below 500 parts per million methane, based on the provisions of § 60.764(a)(6), then the owner or operator must submit annually a Tier 4 surface emissions report as specified in this paragraph following the procedure specified in paragraph (i)(2) of this section until a surface emissions readings of 500 parts per million methane or greater is found. If the Tier 4 surface emissions report shows no

surface emissions readings of 500 parts per million methane or greater for four consecutive quarters at a closed landfill, then the landfill owner or operator may reduce Tier 4 monitoring from a quarterly to an annual frequency. The Administrator may request such additional information as may be necessary to verify the reported instantaneous surface emission readings. The Tier 4 surface emissions report must clearly identify the location, date and time (to nearest second), average wind speeds including wind gusts, and reading (in parts per million) of any value 500 parts per million methane or greater, other than non-repeatable, momentary readings. For location, you must determine the latitude and longitude coordinates using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 4 meters. The coordinates must be in decimal degrees with at least five decimal places. The Tier 4 surface emission report must also include the results of the most recent Tier 1 and Tier 2 results in order to verify that the landfill does not exceed 50 Mg/yr of NMOC.

(A) The initial Tier 4 surface emissions report must be submitted annually, starting within 30 days of completing the fourth quarter of Tier 4 surface emissions monitoring that demonstrates that site-specific surface methane emissions are below 500 parts per million methane, and following the procedure specified in paragraph (i)(2) of this section.

(B) The Tier 4 surface emissions report must be submitted within 1 year of the first measured surface exceedance of 500 parts per million methane, following the procedure specified in paragraph (i)(2) of this section.

(5) The landfill owner or operator must notify the Administrator that the design plan is completed and submit a copy of the plan's signature page. The Administrator has 90 days to decide whether the design plan should be submitted for review. If the Administrator chooses to review the plan, the approval process continues as described in paragraph (c)(6) of this section. However, if the Administrator indicates that submission is not required or does not respond within 90 days, the landfill owner or operator can continue to implement the plan with the recognition that the owner or operator is proceeding at their own risk. In the event that the design plan is required to be modified to obtain approval, the owner or operator must take any steps necessary to conform any prior actions to the approved design plan and any failure to do so could result in an enforcement action.

(6) Upon receipt of an initial or revised design plan, the Administrator must review the information submitted under paragraphs (c)(1) through (3) of this section and either approve it, disapprove it, or request that additional information be submitted. Because of the many site-specific factors involved with landfill gas system design, alternative systems may be necessary. A wide variety of system designs are possible, such as vertical wells, combination horizontal and vertical collection systems, or horizontal trenches only, leachate collection components, and passive systems. If the Administrator does not approve or disapprove the design plan, or does not request that additional information be submitted within 90 days of receipt, then the owner or operator may continue with implementation of the design plan, recognizing they would be proceeding at their own risk.

(7) If the owner or operator chooses to demonstrate compliance with the emission control requirements of this subpart using a treatment system as defined in this subpart, then the owner or operator must prepare a site-specific treatment system monitoring plan as specified in § 60.768(b)(5).

(d) *Revised design plan.* The owner or operator who has already been required to submit a design plan under paragraph (c) of this section must submit a revised design plan to the Administrator for approval as follows:

(1) At least 90 days before expanding operations to an area not covered by the previously approved design plan.

(2) Prior to installing or expanding the gas collection system in a way that is not consistent with the design plan that was submitted to the Administrator according to paragraph (c) of this section.

(e) *Closure report.* Each owner or operator of a controlled landfill must submit a closure report to the Administrator within 30 days of waste acceptance cessation. The Administrator may request additional information as may be necessary to verify that permanent closure has taken place in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 258.60. If a closure report has been submitted to the Administrator, no additional wastes may be placed into the landfill without filing a notification of modification as described under § 60.7(a)(4).

(f) *Equipment removal report.* Each owner or operator of a controlled landfill must submit an equipment removal report to the Administrator 30 days prior to removal or cessation of operation of the control equipment.

(1) The equipment removal report must contain all of the following items:

(i) A copy of the closure report submitted in accordance with paragraph (e) of this section;

(ii) A copy of the initial performance test report demonstrating that the 15-year minimum control period has expired, unless the report of the results of the performance test has been submitted to the EPA via the EPA's CDX, or information that demonstrates that the GCCS will be unable to operate for 15 years due to declining gas flows. In the equipment removal report, the process unit(s) tested, the pollutant(s) tested, and the date that such performance test was conducted may be submitted in lieu of the performance test report if the report has been previously submitted to the EPA's CDX; and

(iii) Dated copies of three successive NMOC emission rate reports demonstrating that the landfill is no longer producing 34 megagrams or greater of NMOC per year, unless the NMOC emission rate reports have been submitted to the EPA via the EPA's CDX. If the NMOC emission rate reports have been previously submitted to the EPA's CDX, a statement that the NMOC emission rate reports have been submitted electronically and the dates that the reports were submitted to the EPA's CDX may be submitted in the equipment removal report in lieu of the NMOC emission rate reports.

(2) The Administrator may request such additional information as may be necessary to verify that all of the conditions for removal in § 60.762(b)(2)(v) have been met.

(g) *Annual report.* The owner or operator of a landfill seeking to comply with § 60.762(b)(2) using an active collection system designed in accordance with § 60.762(b)(2)(ii) must submit to the Administrator, following the procedure specified in paragraph (i)(2) of this section, annual reports of the recorded information in paragraphs (g)(1) through (7) of this section. The initial annual report must be submitted within 180 days of installation and startup of the collection and control system, and must include the initial performance test report required under § 60.8, as applicable, unless the report of the results of the performance test has been submitted to the EPA via the EPA's CDX. In the initial annual report, the process unit(s) tested, the pollutant(s) tested, and the date that such performance test was conducted may be submitted in lieu of the performance test report if the report has been previously submitted to the EPA's CDX. For enclosed combustion devices and

flares, reportable exceedances are defined under § 60.768(c).

(1) Value and length of time for exceedance of applicable parameters monitored under § 60.766(a), (b), (c), (d), and (g).

(2) Description and duration of all periods when the gas stream was diverted from the control device or treatment system through a bypass line or the indication of bypass flow as specified under § 60.766.

(3) Description and duration of all periods when the control device or treatment system was not operating and length of time the control device or treatment system was not operating.

(4) All periods when the collection system was not operating.

(5) The location of each exceedance of the 500 parts per million methane concentration as provided in § 60.763(d) and the concentration recorded at each location for which an exceedance was recorded in the previous month. For location, you must determine the latitude and longitude coordinates using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 4 meters. The coordinates must be in decimal degrees with at least five decimal places.

(6) The date of installation and the location of each well or collection system expansion added pursuant to § 60.765(a)(3), (a)(5), (b), and (c)(4).

(7) For any corrective action analysis for which corrective actions are required in § 60.765(a)(3) or (5) and that take more than 60 days to correct the exceedance, the root cause analysis conducted, including a description of the recommended corrective action(s), the date for corrective action(s) already completed following the positive pressure reading, and, for action(s) not already completed, a schedule for implementation, including proposed commencement and completion dates.

(h) *Initial performance test report.* Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) must include the following information with the initial performance test report required under § 60.8:

(1) A diagram of the collection system showing collection system positioning including all wells, horizontal collectors, surface collectors, or other gas extraction devices, including the locations of any areas excluded from collection and the proposed sites for the future collection system expansion;

(2) The data upon which the sufficient density of wells, horizontal collectors, surface collectors, or other gas extraction devices and the gas mover equipment sizing are based;

(3) The documentation of the presence of asbestos or nondegradable

material for each area from which collection wells have been excluded based on the presence of asbestos or nondegradable material;

(4) The sum of the gas generation flow rates for all areas from which collection wells have been excluded based on nonproductivity and the calculations of gas generation flow rate for each excluded area; and

(5) The provisions for increasing gas mover equipment capacity with increased gas generation flow rate, if the present gas mover equipment is inadequate to move the maximum flow rate expected over the life of the landfill; and

(6) The provisions for the control of off-site migration.

(i) *Electronic reporting.* The owner or operator must submit reports electronically according to paragraphs (i)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) Within 60 days after the date of completing each performance test (as defined in § 60.8), the owner or operator must submit the results of each performance test according to the following procedures:

(i) For data collected using test methods supported by the EPA's Electronic Reporting Tool (ERT) as listed on the EPA's ERT Web site (https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ert/ert_info.html) at the time of the test, you must submit the results of the performance test to the EPA via the Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface (CEDRI). CEDRI can be accessed through the EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) (<https://cdx.epa.gov/>). Performance test data must be submitted in a file format generated through the use of the EPA's ERT or an alternative file format consistent with the extensible markup language (XML) schema listed on the EPA's ERT Web site, once the XML schema is available. If you claim that some of the performance test information being submitted is confidential business information (CBI), you must submit a complete file generated through the use of the EPA's ERT or an alternate electronic file consistent with the XML schema listed on the EPA's ERT Web site, including information claimed to be CBI, on a compact disc, flash drive or other commonly used electronic storage media to the EPA. The electronic media must be clearly marked as CBI and mailed to U.S. EPA/OAQPS/CORE CBI Office, Attention: Group Leader, Measurement Policy Group, MD C404-02, 4930 Old Page Rd., Durham, NC 27703. The same ERT or alternate file with the CBI omitted must be submitted

to the EPA via the EPA's CDX as described earlier in this paragraph.

(ii) For data collected using test methods that are not supported by the EPA's ERT as listed on the EPA's ERT Web site at the time of the test, you must submit the results of the performance test to the Administrator at the appropriate address listed in § 60.4.

(2) Each owner or operator required to submit reports following the procedure specified in this paragraph must submit reports to the EPA via the CEDRI. (CEDRI can be accessed through the EPA's CDX.) The owner or operator must use the appropriate electronic report in CEDRI for this subpart or an alternate electronic file format consistent with the XML schema listed on the CEDRI Web site (<https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/cedri/index.html>). If the reporting form specific to this subpart is not available in CEDRI at the time that the report is due, the owner or operator must submit the report to the Administrator at the appropriate address listed in § 60.4. Once the form has been available in CEDRI for 90 calendar days, the owner or operator must begin submitting all subsequent reports via CEDRI. The reports must be submitted by the deadlines specified in this subpart, regardless of the method in which the reports are submitted.

(j) *Corrective action and the corresponding timeline.* The owner or operator must submit according to paragraphs (j)(1) and (j)(2) of this section.

(1) For corrective action that is required according to § 60.765(a)(3)(iii) or (a)(5)(iii) and is expected to take longer than 120 days after the initial exceedance to complete, you must submit the root cause analysis, corrective action analysis, and corresponding implementation timeline to the Administrator as soon as practicable but no later than 75 days after the first measurement of positive pressure or temperature monitoring value of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit). The Administrator must approve the plan for corrective action and the corresponding timeline.

(2) For corrective action that is required according to § 60.765(a)(3)(iii) or (a)(5)(iii) and is not completed within 60 days after the initial exceedance, you must submit a notification to the Administrator as soon as practicable but no later than 75 days after the first measurement of positive pressure or temperature exceedance.

(k) *Liquids addition.* The owner or operator of an affected landfill with a design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million

cubic meters that has employed leachate recirculation or added liquids based on a Research, Development, and Demonstration permit (issued through Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, subtitle D, part 258) within the last 10 years must submit to the Administrator, annually, following the procedure specified in paragraph (i)(2) of this section, the following information:

(1) Volume of leachate recirculated (gallons per year) and the reported basis of those estimates (records or engineering estimates).

(2) Total volume of all other liquids added (gallons per year) and the reported basis of those estimates (records or engineering estimates).

(3) Surface area (acres) over which the leachate is recirculated (or otherwise applied).

(4) Surface area (acres) over which any other liquids are applied.

(5) The total waste disposed (megagrams) in the areas with recirculated leachate and/or added liquids based on on-site records to the extent data are available, or engineering estimates and the reported basis of those estimates.

(6) The annual waste acceptance rates (megagrams per year) in the areas with recirculated leachate and/or added liquids, based on on-site records to the extent data are available, or engineering estimates.

(7) The initial report must contain items in paragraph (k)(1) through (6) of this section per year for the initial annual reporting period as well as for each of the previous 10 years, to the extent historical data are available in on-site records, and the report must be submitted no later than:

(i) September 27, 2017, for landfills that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction after July 17, 2014 but before August 29, 2016 containing data for the first 12 months after August 29, 2016; or

(ii) Thirteen (13) months after the date of commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction for landfills that commence construction, modification, or reconstruction after August 29, 2016 containing data for the first 12 months after August 29, 2016.

(8) Subsequent annual reports must contain items in paragraph (k)(1) through (6) of this section for the 365-day period following the 365-day period included in the previous annual report, and the report must be submitted no later than 365 days after the date the previous report was submitted.

(9) Landfills may cease annual reporting of items in paragraphs (k)(1) through (7) of this section once they

have submitted the closure report in paragraph (e) of this section.

(1) *Tier 4 notification.* (1) The owner or operator of an affected landfill with a design capacity equal to or greater than 2.5 million megagrams and 2.5 million cubic meters must provide a notification of the date(s) upon which it intends to demonstrate site-specific surface methane emissions are below 500 parts per million methane, based on the Tier 4 provisions of § 60.764(a)(6). The landfill must also include a description of the wind barrier to be used during the SEM in the notification. Notification must be postmarked not less than 30 days prior to such date.

(2) If there is a delay to the scheduled Tier 4 SEM date due to weather conditions, including not meeting the wind requirements in § 60.764(a)(6)(iii)(A), the owner or operator of a landfill shall notify the Administrator by email or telephone no later than 48 hours before any delay or cancellation in the original test date, and arrange an updated date with the Administrator by mutual agreement.

§ 60.768 Recordkeeping requirements.

(a) Except as provided in § 60.767(c)(2), each owner or operator of an MSW landfill subject to the provisions of § 60.762(b)(2)(ii) and (iii) must keep for at least 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible, on-site records of the design capacity report that triggered § 60.762(b), the current amount of solid waste in-place, and the year-by-year waste acceptance rate. Off-site records may be maintained if they are retrievable within 4 hours. Either paper copy or electronic formats are acceptable.

(b) Except as provided in § 60.767(c)(2), each owner or operator of a controlled landfill must keep up-to-date, readily accessible records for the life of the control system equipment of the data listed in paragraphs (b)(1) through (5) of this section as measured during the initial performance test or compliance determination. Records of subsequent tests or monitoring must be maintained for a minimum of 5 years. Records of the control device vendor specifications must be maintained until removal.

(1) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(ii):

(i) The maximum expected gas generation flow rate as calculated in § 60.765(a)(1). The owner or operator may use another method to determine the maximum gas generation flow rate, if the method has been approved by the Administrator.

(ii) The density of wells, horizontal collectors, surface collectors, or other gas extraction devices determined using the procedures specified in § 60.769(a)(1).

(2) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) through use of an enclosed combustion device other than a boiler or process heater with a design heat input capacity equal to or greater than 44 megawatts:

(i) The average temperature measured at least every 15 minutes and averaged over the same time period of the performance test.

(ii) The percent reduction of NMOC determined as specified in § 60.762(b)(2)(iii)(B) achieved by the control device.

(3) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii)(B)(1) through use of a boiler or process heater of any size: A description of the location at which the collected gas vent stream is introduced into the boiler or process heater over the same time period of the performance testing.

(4) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii)(A) through use of a non-enclosed flare, the flare type (*i.e.*, steam-assisted, air-assisted, or nonassisted), all visible emission readings, heat content determination, flow rate or bypass flow rate measurements, and exit velocity determinations made during the performance test as specified in § 60.18; continuous records of the flare pilot flame or flare flame monitoring and records of all periods of operations during which the pilot flame of the flare flame is absent.

(5) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) through use of a landfill gas treatment system:

(i) *Bypass records.* Records of the flow of landfill gas to, and bypass of, the treatment system.

(ii) *Site-specific treatment monitoring plan,* to include:

(A) Monitoring records of parameters that are identified in the treatment system monitoring plan and that ensure the treatment system is operating properly for each intended end use of the treated landfill gas. At a minimum, records should include records of filtration, de-watering, and compression parameters that ensure the treatment system is operating properly for each

intended end use of the treated landfill gas.

(B) Monitoring methods, frequencies, and operating ranges for each monitored operating parameter based on manufacturer's recommendations or engineering analysis for each intended end use of the treated landfill gas.

(C) Documentation of the monitoring methods and ranges, along with justification for their use.

(D) Identify who is responsible (by job title) for data collection.

(E) Processes and methods used to collect the necessary data.

(F) Description of the procedures and methods that are used for quality assurance, maintenance, and repair of all continuous monitoring systems.

(c) Except as provided in § 60.767(c)(2), each owner or operator of a controlled landfill subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep for 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible continuous records of the equipment operating parameters specified to be monitored in § 60.766 as well as up-to-date, readily accessible records for periods of operation during which the parameter boundaries established during the most recent performance test are exceeded.

(1) The following constitute exceedances that must be recorded and reported under § 60.767(g):

(i) For enclosed combustors except for boilers and process heaters with design heat input capacity of 44 megawatts (150 million British thermal units per hour) or greater, all 3-hour periods of operation during which the average temperature was more than 28 degrees Celsius (82 degrees Fahrenheit) below the average combustion temperature during the most recent performance test at which compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) was determined.

(ii) For boilers or process heaters, whenever there is a change in the location at which the vent stream is introduced into the flame zone as required under paragraph (b)(3) of this section.

(2) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep up-to-date, readily accessible continuous records of the indication of flow to the control system and the indication of bypass flow or records of monthly inspections of car-seals or lock-and-key configurations used to seal bypass lines, specified under § 60.766.

(3) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart who uses a boiler or process heater with a design heat input capacity of 44 megawatts or greater to comply with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) must keep an up-to-date, readily accessible record of all periods of

operation of the boiler or process heater. (Examples of such records could include records of steam use, fuel use, or monitoring data collected pursuant to other state, local, tribal, or federal regulatory requirements.)

(4) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with the provisions of this subpart by use of a non-enclosed flare must keep up-to-date, readily accessible continuous records of the flame or flare pilot flame monitoring specified under § 60.766(c), and up-to-date, readily accessible records of all periods of operation in which the flame or flare pilot flame is absent.

(5) Each owner or operator of a landfill seeking to comply with § 60.762(b)(2) using an active collection system designed in accordance with § 60.762(b)(2)(ii) must keep records of periods when the collection system or control device is not operating.

(d) Except as provided in § 60.767(c)(2), each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep for the life of the collection system an up-to-date, readily accessible plot map showing each existing and planned collector in the system and providing a unique identification location label for each collector.

(1) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep up-to-date, readily accessible records of the installation date and location of all newly installed collectors as specified under § 60.765(b).

(2) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep readily accessible documentation of the nature, date of deposition, amount, and location of asbestos-containing or nondegradable waste excluded from collection as provided in § 60.769(a)(3)(i) as well as any nonproductive areas excluded from collection as provided in § 60.769(a)(3)(ii).

(e) Except as provided in § 60.767(c)(2), each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep for at least 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible records of the following:

(1) All collection and control system exceedances of the operational standards in § 60.763, the reading in the subsequent month whether or not the second reading is an exceedance, and the location of each exceedance.

(2) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must also keep records of each wellhead temperature monitoring value of 55 degrees Celsius (131 degrees Fahrenheit) or above, each wellhead nitrogen level at or above 20 percent, and each

wellhead oxygen level at or above 5 percent.

(3) For any root cause analysis for which corrective actions are required in § 60.765(a)(3)(i) or (a)(5)(i), keep a record of the root cause analysis conducted, including a description of the recommended corrective action(s) taken, and the date(s) the corrective action(s) were completed.

(4) For any root cause analysis for which corrective actions are required in § 60.765(a)(3)(ii) or (a)(5)(ii), keep a record of the root cause analysis conducted, the corrective action analysis, the date for corrective action(s) already completed following the positive pressure reading or high temperature reading, and, for action(s) not already completed, a schedule for implementation, including proposed commencement and completion dates.

(5) For any root cause analysis for which corrective actions are required in § 60.765(a)(3)(iii) or (a)(5)(iii), keep a record of the root cause analysis conducted, the corrective action analysis, the date for corrective action(s) already completed following the positive pressure reading or high temperature reading, for action(s) not already completed, a schedule for implementation, including proposed commencement and completion dates, and a copy of any comments or final approval on the corrective action analysis or schedule from the regulatory agency.

(f) Landfill owners or operators who convert design capacity from volume to mass or mass to volume to demonstrate that landfill design capacity is less than 2.5 million megagrams or 2.5 million cubic meters, as provided in the definition of "design capacity", must keep readily accessible, on-site records of the annual recalculation of site-specific density, design capacity, and the supporting documentation. Off-site records may be maintained if they are retrievable within 4 hours. Either paper copy or electronic formats are acceptable.

(g) Landfill owners or operators seeking to demonstrate that site-specific surface methane emissions are below 500 parts per million by conducting surface emission monitoring under the Tier 4 procedures specified in § 60.764(a)(6) must keep for at least 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible records of all surface emissions monitoring and information related to monitoring instrument calibrations conducted according to sections 8 and 10 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, including all of the following items:

(1) Calibration records:

(i) Date of calibration and initials of operator performing the calibration.

(ii) Calibration gas cylinder identification, certification date, and certified concentration.

(iii) Instrument scale(s) used.

(iv) A description of any corrective action taken if the meter readout could not be adjusted to correspond to the calibration gas value.

(v) If an owner or operator makes their own calibration gas, a description of the procedure used.

(2) Digital photographs of the instrument setup, including the wind barrier. The photographs must be time and date-stamped and taken at the first sampling location prior to sampling and at the last sampling location after sampling at the end of each sampling day, for the duration of the Tier 4 monitoring demonstration.

(3) Timestamp of each surface scan reading:

(i) Timestamp should be detailed to the nearest second, based on when the sample collection begins.

(ii) A log for the length of time each sample was taken using a stopwatch (e.g., the time the probe was held over the area).

(4) Location of each surface scan reading. The owner or operator must determine the coordinates using an instrument with an accuracy of at least 4 meters. Coordinates must be in decimal degrees with at least five decimal places.

(5) Monitored methane concentration (parts per million) of each reading.

(6) Background methane concentration (parts per million) after each instrument calibration test.

(7) Adjusted methane concentration using most recent calibration (parts per million).

(8) For readings taken at each surface penetration, the unique identification location label matching the label specified in paragraph (d) of this section.

(9) Records of the operating hours of the gas collection system for each destruction device.

(h) Except as provided in § 60.767(c)(2), each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart must keep for at least 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible records of all collection and control system monitoring data for parameters measured in § 60.766(a)(1), (2), and (3).

(i) Any records required to be maintained by this subpart that are submitted electronically via the EPA's CDX may be maintained in electronic format.

(j) For each owner or operator reporting leachate or other liquids addition under § 60.767(k), keep records of any engineering calculations or company records used to estimate the quantities of leachate or liquids added, the surface areas for which the leachate or liquids were applied, and the estimates of annual waste acceptance or total waste in place in the areas where leachate or liquids were applied.

§ 60.769 Specifications for active collection systems.

(a) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.762(b)(2)(i) must site active collection wells, horizontal collectors, surface collectors, or other extraction devices at a sufficient density throughout all gas producing areas using the following procedures unless alternative procedures have been approved by the Administrator as provided in § 60.767(c)(2) and (3):

(1) The collection devices within the interior must be certified to achieve comprehensive control of surface gas emissions by a professional engineer. The following issues must be addressed in the design: Depths of refuse, refuse gas generation rates and flow characteristics, cover properties, gas system expandability, leachate and condensate management, accessibility, compatibility with filling operations,

integration with closure end use, air intrusion control, corrosion resistance, fill settlement, resistance to the refuse decomposition heat, and ability to isolate individual components or sections for repair or troubleshooting without shutting down entire collection system.

(2) The sufficient density of gas collection devices determined in paragraph (a)(1) of this section must address landfill gas migration issues and augmentation of the collection system through the use of active or passive systems at the landfill perimeter or exterior.

(3) The placement of gas collection devices determined in paragraph (a)(1) of this section must control all gas producing areas, except as provided by paragraphs (a)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) Any segregated area of asbestos or nondegradable material may be excluded from collection if documented as provided under § 60.768(d). The documentation must provide the nature, date of deposition, location and amount of asbestos or nondegradable material deposited in the area, and must be provided to the Administrator upon request.

(ii) Any nonproductive area of the landfill may be excluded from control, provided that the total of all excluded areas can be shown to contribute less than 1 percent of the total amount of NMOC emissions from the landfill. The amount, location, and age of the material must be documented and provided to the Administrator upon request. A separate NMOC emissions estimate must be made for each section proposed for exclusion, and the sum of all such sections must be compared to the NMOC emissions estimate for the entire landfill.

(A) The NMOC emissions from each section proposed for exclusion must be computed using Equation 7:

$$Q_i = 2 k L_o M_i (e^{-kt_i}) (C_{NMOC}) (3.6 \times 10^{-9}) \quad (\text{Eq. 7})$$

Where:

Q_i = NMOC emission rate from the i^{th} section, megagrams per year.

k = Methane generation rate constant, year⁻¹.

L_o = Methane generation potential, cubic meters per megagram solid waste.

M_i = Mass of the degradable solid waste in the i^{th} section, megagram.

t_i = Age of the solid waste in the i^{th} section, years.

C_{NMOC} = Concentration of nonmethane organic compounds, parts per million by volume.

3.6×10^{-9} = Conversion factor.

(B) If the owner/operator is proposing to exclude, or cease gas collection and control from, nonproductive physically separated (e.g., separately lined) closed areas that already have gas collection systems, NMOC emissions from each physically separated closed area must be computed using either Equation 3 in § 60.764(b) or Equation 7 in paragraph (a)(3)(ii)(A) of this section.

(iii) The values for k and C_{NMOC} determined in field testing must be used

if field testing has been performed in determining the NMOC emission rate or the radii of influence (this distance from the well center to a point in the landfill where the pressure gradient applied by the blower or compressor approaches zero). If field testing has not been performed, the default values for k , L_o , and C_{NMOC} provided in § 60.764(a)(1) or the alternative values from § 60.764(a)(5) must be used. The mass of nondegradable solid waste contained

within the given section may be subtracted from the total mass of the section when estimating emissions provided the nature, location, age, and amount of the nondegradable material is documented as provided in paragraph (a)(3)(i) of this section.

(b) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.762(b)(2)(ii)(A) construct the gas collection devices using the following equipment or procedures:

(1) The landfill gas extraction components must be constructed of polyvinyl chloride (PVC), high density polyethylene (HDPE) pipe, fiberglass, stainless steel, or other nonporous corrosion resistant material of suitable dimensions to: Convey projected amounts of gases; withstand installation, static, and settlement forces; and withstand planned overburden or traffic loads. The collection system must extend as necessary to comply with emission and migration standards. Collection devices such as wells and horizontal collectors must be perforated to allow gas entry

without head loss sufficient to impair performance across the intended extent of control. Perforations must be situated with regard to the need to prevent excessive air infiltration.

(2) Vertical wells must be placed so as not to endanger underlying liners and must address the occurrence of water within the landfill. Holes and trenches constructed for piped wells and horizontal collectors must be of sufficient cross-section so as to allow for their proper construction and completion including, for example, centering of pipes and placement of gravel backfill. Collection devices must be designed so as not to allow indirect short circuiting of air into the cover or refuse into the collection system or gas into the air. Any gravel used around pipe perforations should be of a dimension so as not to penetrate or block perforations.

(3) Collection devices may be connected to the collection header pipes below or above the landfill surface. The connector assembly must include a positive closing throttle valve, any

necessary seals and couplings, access couplings and at least one sampling port. The collection devices must be constructed of PVC, HDPE, fiberglass, stainless steel, or other nonporous material of suitable thickness.

(c) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) must convey the landfill gas to a control system in compliance with § 60.762(b)(2)(iii) through the collection header pipe(s). The gas mover equipment must be sized to handle the maximum gas generation flow rate expected over the intended use period of the gas moving equipment using the following procedures:

(1) For existing collection systems, the flow data must be used to project the maximum flow rate. If no flow data exists, the procedures in paragraph (c)(2) of this section must be used.

(2) For new collection systems, the maximum flow rate must be in accordance with § 60.765(a)(1).

[FR Doc. 2016-17687 Filed 8-26-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P



FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 81

Friday,

No. 107

June 3, 2016

Part II

Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR Part 60

Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources; Final Rule

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 60**

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505; FRL-9944-75-OAR]

RIN 2060-AS30

Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action finalizes amendments to the current new source performance standards (NSPS) and establishes new standards. Amendments to the current standards will improve implementation of the current NSPS. The new standards for the oil and natural gas source category set standards for both greenhouse gases (GHGs) and volatile organic compounds (VOC). Except for the implementation improvements, and the new standards for GHGs, these requirements do not change the requirements for operations covered by the current standards.

DATES: This final rule is effective on August 2, 2016.

The incorporation by reference (IBR) of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of August 2, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., confidential business information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information concerning this action, contact Ms. Amy Hambrick, Sector Policies and Programs Division (E143-05), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number: (919) 541-0964; facsimile number: (919) 541-3470; email address: hambrick.amy@epa.gov or Ms. Lisa Thompson, Sector Policies and

Programs Division (E143-05), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number: (919) 541-9775; facsimile number: (919) 541-3470; email address: thompson.lisa@epa.gov. For other information concerning the EPA's Oil and Natural Gas Sector regulatory program, contact Mr. Bruce Moore, Sector Policies and Programs Division (E143-05), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number: (919) 541-5460; facsimile number: (919) 541-3470; email address: moore.bruce@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Outline.

The information presented in this preamble is presented as follows:

- I. Preamble Acronyms and Abbreviations
- II. General Information
 - A. Executive Summary
 - B. Does this action apply to me?
 - C. Where can I get a copy of this document?
 - D. Judicial Review
- III. Background
 - A. Statutory Background
 - B. Regulatory Background
 - C. Other Notable Events
 - D. Stakeholder Outreach and Public Hearings
 - E. Related State and Federal Regulatory Actions
- IV. Regulatory Authority
 - A. The Oil and Natural Gas Source Category Listing Under CAA Section 111(b)(1)(A)
 - B. Impacts of GHGs, VOC and SO₂ Emissions on Public Health and Welfare
 - C. GHGs, VOC and SO₂ Emissions From the Oil and Natural Gas Source Category
 - D. Establishing GHG Standards in the Form of Limitations on Methane Emissions
- V. Summary of Final Standards
 - A. Control of GHG and VOC Emissions in the Oil and Natural Gas Source Category—Overview
 - B. Centrifugal Compressors
 - C. Reciprocating Compressors
 - D. Pneumatic Controllers
 - E. Pneumatic Pumps
 - F. Well Completions
 - G. Fugitive Emissions From Well Sites and Compressor Stations
 - H. Equipment Leaks at Natural Gas Processing Plants
 - I. Liquids Unloading Operations
 - J. Recordkeeping and Reporting
 - K. Reconsideration Issues Being Addressed
 - L. Technical Corrections and Clarifications
 - M. Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Permitting
 - N. Final Standards Reflecting Next Generation Compliance and Rule Effectiveness
- VI. Significant Changes Since Proposal
 - A. Centrifugal Compressors
 - B. Reciprocating Compressors
 - C. Pneumatic Controllers
 - D. Pneumatic Pumps

- E. Well Completions
- F. Fugitive Emissions From Well Sites and Compressor Stations
- G. Equipment Leaks at Natural Gas Processing Plants
- H. Reconsideration Issues Being Addressed
- I. Technical Corrections and Clarifications
- J. Final Standards Reflecting Next Generation Compliance and Rule Effectiveness
- K. Provision for Equivalency Determinations
- VII. Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Permitting
 - A. Overview
 - B. Applicability of Tailoring Rule Thresholds Under the PSD Program
 - C. Implications for Title V Program
- VIII. Summary of Significant Comments and Responses
 - A. Major Comments Concerning Listing of the Oil and Natural Gas Source Category
 - B. Major Comments Concerning EPA's Authority To Establish GHG Standards in the Form of Limitations on Methane Emissions
 - C. Major Comments Concerning Compressors
 - D. Major Comments Concerning Pneumatic Controllers
 - E. Major Comments Concerning Pneumatic Pumps
 - F. Major Comments Concerning Well Completions
 - G. Major Comments Concerning Fugitive Emissions From Well Sites and Compressor Stations
 - H. Major Comments Concerning Final Standards Reflecting Next Generation Compliance and Rule Effectiveness Strategies
- IX. Impacts of the Final Amendments
 - A. What are the air impacts?
 - B. What are the energy impacts?
 - C. What are the compliance costs?
 - D. What are the economic and employment impacts?
 - E. What are the benefits of the final standards?
- X. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
 - A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review
 - B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
 - C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)
 - D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA)
 - E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
 - F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
 - G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks
 - H. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use
 - I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) and 1 CFR Part 51
 - J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

I. Preamble Acronyms and Abbreviations

Several acronyms and terms are included in this preamble. While this may not be an exhaustive list, to ease the reading of this preamble and for reference purposes, the following terms and acronyms are defined here:

API	American Petroleum Institute
bbl	Barrel
boe	Barrels of Oil Equivalent
BSER	Best System of Emissions Reduction
BTEX	Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylenes
CAA	Clean Air Act
CBI	Confidential Business Information
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO ₂ Eq.	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DCO	Document Control Officer
EIA	Energy Information Administration
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
GHGRP	Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program
GOR	Gas to Oil Ratio
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutants
LDAR	Leak Detection and Repair
Mcf	Thousand Cubic Feet
NEI	National Emissions Inventory
NEMS	National Energy Modeling System
NESHAP	National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NSPS	New Source Performance Standards
NTTAA	National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995
OAQPS	Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
OGI	Optical Gas Imaging
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
PRA	Paperwork Reduction Act
PTE	Potential to Emit
REC	Reduced Emissions Completion
RFA	Regulatory Flexibility Act
RIA	Regulatory Impact Analysis
scf	Standard Cubic Feet
scfh	Standard Cubic Feet per Hour
scfm	Standard Cubic Feet per Minute
SO ₂	Sulfur Dioxide
tpy	Tons per Year
TSD	Technical Support Document
TTN	Technology Transfer Network
UMRA	Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
VCS	Voluntary Consensus Standards
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds
VRU	Vapor Recovery Unit

II. General Information

A. Executive Summary

1. Purpose of This Regulatory Action

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed amendments to the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)

at subpart OOOO and proposed new standards at subpart OOOOa on September 18, 2015 (80 FR 56593). The purpose of this action is to finalize both the amendments and the new standards with appropriate adjustments after full consideration of the comments received on the proposal. Prior to proposal, we pursued a structured engagement process with states and stakeholders. Prior to that process, we issued draft white papers addressing a range of technical issues and then solicited comments on the white papers from expert reviewers and the public.

These rules are designed to complement other federal actions as well as state regulations. In particular, the EPA worked closely with the Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management (BLM) during development of this rulemaking in order to avoid conflicts in requirements between the NSPS and BLM's proposed rulemaking.¹ Additionally, we evaluated existing state and local programs when developing these federal standards and attempted, where possible, to limit potential conflicts with existing state and local requirements.

As discussed at proposal, prior to this final rule, the EPA had established standards for emissions of VOC and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) for several sources in the source category. In this action, the EPA finalizes standards at subpart OOOOa, based on our determination of the best system of emissions reduction (BSER) for reducing emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs), specifically methane, as well as VOC across a variety of additional emission sources in the oil and natural gas source category (*i.e.*, production, processing, transmission, and storage). The EPA includes requirements for methane emissions in this action because methane is one of the six well-mixed gases in the definition of GHGs and the oil and natural gas source category is one of the country's largest industrial emitters of methane. In 2009, the EPA found that by causing or contributing to climate change, GHGs endanger both the public health and the public welfare of current and future generations.

¹ 81 FR 6616, February 8, 2016, *Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation, Proposed Rule*.

In addition to finalizing standards for VOC and GHGs, the EPA is finalizing amendments to improve several aspects of the existing standards at 40 CFR part 60, subpart OOOO related to implementation. These improvements and the setting of standards for GHGs in the form of limitations on methane result from reconsideration of certain issues raised in petitions for reconsideration that were received by the Administrator on the August 16, 2012, NSPS (77 FR 49490) and on the September 13, 2013, amendments (78 FR 58416). These implementation improvements do not change the requirements for operations and equipment covered by the current standards at subpart OOOO.

2. Summary of 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOOOa Major Provisions

The final requirements include standards for GHG emissions (in the form of methane emission limitations) and standards for VOC emissions. The NSPS includes both VOC and GHG emission standards for certain new, modified, and reconstructed equipment, processes, and activities across the oil and natural gas source category. These emission sources include the following:

- Sources that are unregulated under the current NSPS at subpart OOOO (hydraulically fractured oil well completions, pneumatic pumps, and fugitive emissions from well sites and compressor stations);
- Sources that are currently regulated at subpart OOOO for VOC, but not for GHGs (hydraulically fractured gas well completions and equipment leaks at natural gas processing plants);
- Certain equipment that is used across the source category, for which the current NSPS at subpart OOOO regulates emissions of VOC from only a subset (pneumatic controllers, centrifugal compressors, and reciprocating compressors), with the exception of compressors located at well sites.

Table 1 below summarizes these sources and the final standards for GHGs (in the form of methane limitations) and VOC emissions. See sections V and VI of this preamble for further discussion.

TABLE 1—SUMMARY OF BSER AND FINAL SUBPART OOOOa STANDARDS FOR EMISSION SOURCES

Source	BSER	Final standards of performance for GHGs and VOC
Wet seal centrifugal compressors (except for those located at well sites) ² .	Capture and route to a control device	95 percent reduction.
Reciprocating compressors (except for those located at well sites) ² .	Regular replacement of rod packing (<i>i.e.</i> , approximately every 3 years).	Replace the rod packing on or before 26,000 hours of operation or 36 calendar months or route emissions from the rod packing to a process through a closed vent system under negative pressure.
Pneumatic controllers at natural gas processing plants.	Instrument air systems	Zero natural gas bleed rate.
Pneumatic controllers at locations other than natural gas processing plants.	Installation of low-bleed pneumatic controllers	Natural gas bleed rate no greater than 6 standard cubic feet per hour (scfh).
Pneumatic pumps at natural gas processing plants.	Instrument air systems in place of natural gas driven pumps.	Zero natural gas emissions.
Pneumatic pumps at well sites	Route to existing control device or process	95 percent control if there is an existing control or process on site. 95 percent control not required if (1) routed to an existing control that achieves less than 95 percent or (2) it is technically infeasible to route to the existing control device or process (non-greenfield sites only).
Well completions (subcategory 1: Non-wildcat and non-delineation wells).	Combination of Reduced Emission Completion (REC) and the use of a completion combustion device.	REC in combination with a completion combustion device; venting in lieu of combustion where combustion would present safety hazards. Initial flowback stage: Route to a storage vessel or completion vessel (frac tank, lined pit, or other vessel) and separator. Separation flowback stage: Route all salable gas from the separator to a flow line or collection system, re-inject the gas into the well or another well, use the gas as an on-site fuel source or use for another useful purpose that a purchased fuel or raw material would serve. If technically infeasible to route recovered gas as specified above, recovered gas must be combusted. All liquids must be routed to a storage vessel or well completion vessel, collection system, or be re-injected into the well or another well. The operator is required to have a separator onsite during the entire flowback period.
Well completions (subcategory 2: Exploratory and delineation wells and low pressure wells).	Use of a completion combustion device	The operator is not required to have a separator onsite. Either: (1) Route all flowback to a completion combustion device with a continuous pilot flame; or (2) Route all flowback into one or more well completion vessels and commence operation of a separator unless it is technically infeasible for a separator to function. Any gas present in the flowback before the separator can function is not subject to control under this section. Capture and direct recovered gas to a completion combustion device with a continuous pilot flame. For both options (1) and (2), combustion is not required in conditions that may result in a fire hazard or explosion, or where high heat emissions from a completion combustion device may negatively impact tundra, permafrost or waterways.
Fugitive emissions from well sites and compressor stations.	For well sites: Monitoring and repair based on semiannual monitoring using optical gas imaging (OGI) ³ . For compressor stations: Monitoring and repair based on quarterly monitoring using OGI.	Monitoring and repair of fugitive emission components using OGI with Method 21 as an alternative at 500 parts per million (ppm). A monitoring plan must be developed and implemented and repair of the sources of fugitive emissions must be completed within 30 days of finding fugitive emissions.

TABLE 1—SUMMARY OF BSER AND FINAL SUBPART OOOOa STANDARDS FOR EMISSION SOURCES—Continued

Source	BSER	Final standards of performance for GHGs and VOC
Equipment leaks at natural gas processing plants.	Leak detection and repair at 40 CFR part 60, subpart VVa level of control.	Follow requirements at NSPS part 60, subpart VVa level of control as in the 2012 NSPS.

Reconsideration issues being addressed. As fully detailed in sections V and VI of this preamble and the Response to Comment (RTC) document, the EPA granted reconsideration of several issues raised in the administrative reconsideration petitions submitted on the 2012 NSPS and subsequent amendments (subpart OOOO). In this final rule, in addition to the new standards described above, the EPA includes certain amendments to the 2012 NSPS at subpart OOOO based on reconsideration of those issues. The amendments to the subpart OOOO requirements are effective on August 2, 2016 and, therefore, do not affect compliance activities completed prior to that date.

These provisions are: Requirements for storage vessel control device monitoring and testing; initial compliance requirements for a bypass device that could divert an emission stream away from a control device; recordkeeping requirements for repair logs for control devices failing a visible emissions test; clarification of the due date for the initial annual report; flare design and operation standards; leak detection and repair (LDAR) for open-ended valves or lines; the compliance period for LDAR for newly affected units; exemption to the notification requirement for reconstruction; disposal of carbon from control devices; the definition of capital expenditure; and continuous control device monitoring requirements for storage vessels and centrifugal compressor affected facilities. We are finalizing changes to address these issues to clarify the current NSPS requirements, improve implementation, and update procedures.

3. Costs and Benefits

The EPA has carefully reviewed the comments and additional data submitted on the costs and benefits associated with this rule. Our conclusion and responses are summarized in section IX of the

² See sections VI and VIII of this preamble for detailed discussion on emission sources.

³ The final fugitive standards apply to low production wells. For the reasons discussed in section VI of the preamble, we are not finalizing the proposed exemption of low production wells from these requirements.

preamble and addressed in greater detail in the Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) and RTC. The measures finalized in this action achieve reductions of GHG and VOC emissions through direct regulation and reduction of hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions as a co-benefit of reducing VOC emissions. The data show that these are cost-effective measures to reduce emissions and the rule's benefits outweigh these costs.

The EPA has estimated emissions reductions, benefits, and costs for 2 years of analysis: 2020 and 2025. Therefore, the emissions reductions, benefits, and costs by 2020 and 2025 (*i.e.*, including all emissions reductions, costs, and benefits in all years from 2016 to 2025) would be potentially significantly greater than the estimated emissions reductions, benefits, and costs provided within this rule. Actions taken to comply with the final NSPS are anticipated to prevent significant new emissions in 2020, including 300,000 tons of methane; 150,000 tons of VOC; and 1,900 tons of HAP. The emission reductions anticipated in 2025 are 510,000 tons of methane; 210,000 tons of VOC; and 3,900 tons of HAP. Using a 100-year global warming potential (GWP) of 25, the carbon dioxide-equivalent (CO₂ Eq.) methane emission reductions are estimated to be 6.9 million metric tons CO₂ Eq. in 2020 and 11 million metric tons CO₂ Eq. in 2025. The methane-related monetized climate benefits are estimated to be \$360 million in 2020 and \$690 million in 2025 using a 3-percent discount rate (model average).⁴

While the only benefits monetized for this rule are GHG-related climate benefits from methane reductions, the rule will also yield benefits from reductions in VOC and HAP emissions and from reductions in methane as a precursor to global background concentrations of tropospheric ozone. The EPA was unable to monetize the

⁴ We estimate methane benefits associated with four different values of a 1 ton methane reduction (model average at 2.5-percent discount rate, 3 percent, and 5 percent; 95th percentile at 3 percent). For the purposes of this summary, we present the benefits associated with the model average at a 3-percent discount rate. However, we emphasize the importance and value of considering the full range of social cost of methane values. We provide estimates based on additional discount rates in preamble section IX and in the RIA.

benefits of VOC reductions due to the difficulties in modeling the impacts with the current data available. A detailed discussion of these unquantified benefits appears in section IX of this preamble, as well as in the RIA available in the docket.

Several VOC that are commonly emitted in the oil and natural gas source category are HAP listed under Clean Air Act (CAA) section 112(b), including benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylenes (this group is commonly referred to as "BTEX") and n-hexane. These pollutants and any other HAP included in the VOC emissions controlled under the NSPS, including requirements for additional sources being finalized in this action, are controlled to the same degree. The co-benefit HAP reductions for the final measures are discussed in the RIA and in the technical support document (TSD), which are included in the public docket for this action.

The HAP reductions from these standards will be meaningful in local communities, as members of these communities and other stakeholders across the country have reported significant concerns to the EPA regarding potential adverse health effects resulting from exposure to HAP emitted from oil and natural gas operations. Importantly, these communities include disadvantaged populations.

The EPA estimates the total capital cost of the final NSPS will be \$250 million in 2020 and \$360 million in 2025. The estimate of total annualized engineering costs of the final NSPS is \$390 million in 2020 and \$640 million in 2025 when using a 7-percent discount rate. When estimated revenues from additional natural gas are included, the annualized engineering costs of the final NSPS are estimated to be \$320 million in 2020 and \$530 million in 2025, assuming a wellhead natural gas price of \$4/thousand cubic feet (Mcf). These compliance cost estimates include revenues from recovered natural gas, as the EPA estimates that about 16 billion cubic feet in 2020 and 27 billion cubic feet in 2025 of natural gas will be recovered by implementing the NSPS.

Considering all the costs and benefits of this rule, including the revenues from

recovered natural gas that would otherwise be vented, this rule results in a net benefit. The quantified net benefits (the difference between monetized benefits and compliance costs) are

estimated to be \$35 million in 2020 and \$170 million in 2025 using a 3-percent discount rate (model average) for climate benefits in both years.⁵ All dollar amounts are in 2012 dollars.

B. Does this action apply to me?

Categories and entities potentially affected by this action include:

TABLE 2—INDUSTRIAL SOURCE CATEGORIES AFFECTED BY THIS ACTION

Category	NAICS code ¹	Examples of regulated entities
Industry	211111 211112 221210 486110 486210	Crude Petroleum and Natural Gas Extraction. Natural Gas Liquid Extraction. Natural Gas Distribution. Pipeline Distribution of Crude Oil. Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas.
Federal government		Not affected.
State/local/tribal government		Not affected.

¹ North American Industry Classification System.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be regulated by this action. This table lists the types of entities that the EPA is now aware could potentially be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be regulated. To determine whether your entity is regulated by this action, you should carefully examine the applicability criteria found in the final rule. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section, your air permitting authority, or your EPA Regional representative listed in 40 CFR 60.4 (General Provisions).

C. Where can I get a copy of this document?

In addition to being available in the docket, an electronic copy of the final action is available on the Internet through the Technology Transfer Network (TTN) Web site. Following signature by the Administrator, the EPA will post a copy of this final action at <http://www3.epa.gov/airquality/oilandgas/actions.html>. The TTN provides information and technology exchange in various areas of air pollution control. Additional information is also available at the same Web site.

D. Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, judicial review of this final rule is available only by filing a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by August 2, 2016. Moreover, under section 307(b)(2) of the CAA, the requirements established by this final rule may not be challenged separately in

any civil or criminal proceedings brought by the EPA to enforce these requirements. Section 307(d)(7)(B) of the CAA further provides that “[o]nly an objection to a rule or procedure which was raised with reasonable specificity during the period for public comment (including any public hearing) may be raised during judicial review.” This section also provides a mechanism for the EPA to convene a proceeding for reconsideration, “[i]f the person raising an objection can demonstrate to the EPA that it was impracticable to raise such objection within [the period for public comment] or if the grounds for such objection arose after the period for public comment (but within the time specified for judicial review) and if such objection is of central relevance to the outcome of the rule.” Any person seeking to make such a demonstration to us should submit a Petition for Reconsideration to the Office of the Administrator, U.S. EPA, Room 3000, EPA WJC, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460, with a copy to both the person(s) listed in the preceding **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section, and the Associate General Counsel for the Air and Radiation Law Office, Office of General Counsel (Mail Code 2344A), U.S. EPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460.

III. Background

A. Statutory Background

The EPA’s authority for this rule is CAA section 111, which requires the EPA to first establish a list of source categories to be regulated under that section and then establish emission standards for new sources in that source category. Specifically, CAA section 111(b)(1)(A) requires that a source category be included on the list if, “in

[the EPA Administrator’s] judgment it causes, or contributes significantly to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.” This determination is commonly referred to as an “endangerment finding” and that phrase encompasses both of the “causes or contributes significantly to” component and the “endanger public health or welfare” component of the determination. Once a source category is listed, CAA section 111(b)(1)(B) requires that the EPA propose and then promulgate “standards of performance” for new sources in such source category. Other than the endangerment finding for listing the source category, CAA section 111(b) gives no direction or enumerated criteria concerning what constitutes a source category or what emission sources or pollutants from a given source category should be the subject of standards. Therefore, as long as the EPA makes the requisite endangerment finding for the source category to be listed, CAA section 111 leaves the EPA with the authority and discretion to define the source category, determine the pollutants for which standards should be developed, and identify the emission sources within the source category for which standards of performance should be established.

CAA section 111(a)(1) defines “a standard of performance” as “a standard for emissions of air pollutants which reflects the degree of emission limitation achievable through the application of the best system of emission reduction which (taking into account the cost of achieving such reduction and any non-air quality health and environmental impact and energy requirement) the Administrator determines has been adequately demonstrated.” This definition makes

⁵ Figures may not sum due to rounding.

clear that the standard of performance must be based on controls that constitute “the best system of emission reduction . . . adequately demonstrated.”

In determining whether a given system of emission reduction qualifies as a BSER, CAA section 111(a)(1) requires that the EPA take into account, among other factors, “the cost of achieving such reduction.” As described in section VIII.A of the proposal preamble,⁶ in several cases the DC Circuit has elaborated on this cost factor and formulated the cost standard in various ways, stating that the EPA may not adopt a standard the cost of which would be “exorbitant,”⁷ “greater than the industry could bear and survive,”⁸ “excessive,”⁹ or “unreasonable.”¹⁰ For convenience, in this rulemaking, we use “reasonableness” to describe costs, which is well within the bounds established by this jurisprudence.

CAA Section 111(a) does not provide specific direction regarding what metric or metrics to use in considering costs, again affording the EPA considerable discretion in choosing a means of cost consideration.¹¹ In this rulemaking, we evaluated whether a control cost is reasonable under a number of approaches that we find appropriate for assessing the types of controls at issue. Specifically, we considered a control’s cost effectiveness under a “single pollutant cost-effectiveness” approach and a “multipollutant cost-effectiveness” approach.¹² We also evaluated costs on an industry basis by assessing the new capital expenditures (compared to overall capital expenditures) and the annual compliance costs (compared to overall annual revenue) if the rule were to require such control. For a detailed discussion of these cost approaches,

⁶ 80 FR 56593, 56616 (September 18, 2015).

⁷ *Lignite Energy Council v. EPA*, 198 F.3d 930, 933 (D.C. Cir. 1999).

⁸ *Portland Cement Ass’n v. EPA*, 513 F.2d 506, 508 (D.C. Cir. 1975).

⁹ *Sierra Club v. Costle*, 657 F.2d 298, 343 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

¹⁰ *Sierra Club v. Costle*, 657 F.2d 298, 343 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

¹¹ See, e.g., *Husqvarna AB v. EPA*, 254 F.3d 195, 200 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (where CAA section 213 does not mandate a specific method of cost analysis, the EPA may make a reasoned choice as to how to analyze costs).

¹² As discussed in the proposed rule preamble, we believe that both the single and multipollutant approaches are appropriate for assessing the reasonableness of the multipollutant controls considered in this action. The EPA has considered similar approaches in the past when considering multiple pollutants that are controlled by a given control option. See e.g., 73 FR 64079–64083 and EPA Document ID Nos. EPA–HQ–OAR–2004–0022–0622, EPA–HQ–OAR–2004–0022–0447, EPA–HQ–OAR–2004–0022–0448.

please see section VIII.A of the proposal preamble.

The standard that the EPA develops, based on the BSER, is commonly a numerical emissions limit, expressed as a performance level (in other words, a rate-based standard). As provided in CAA section 111(b)(5), the EPA does not prescribe a particular technological system that must be used to comply with a standard of performance. Rather, sources can select any measure or combination of measures that will achieve the emissions level of the standard.

CAA section 111(h)(1) authorizes the Administrator to promulgate “a design, equipment, work practice, or operational standard, or combination thereof” if in his or her judgment, “it is not feasible to prescribe or enforce a standard of performance.” CAA section 111(h)(2) provides the circumstances under which prescribing or enforcing a standard of performance is “not feasible”: Such as, when the pollutant cannot be emitted through a conveyance designed to emit or capture the pollutant, or when there is no practicable measurement methodology for the particular class of sources.

CAA section 111(b)(1)(B) requires the EPA to “at least every 8 years review and, if appropriate, revise” performance standards unless the “Administrator determines that such review is not appropriate in light of readily available information on the efficacy” of the standard. As mentioned above, once the EPA lists a source category under CAA section 111(b)(1)(A), CAA section 111(b)(1)(B) provides the EPA discretion to determine the pollutants and sources to be regulated. In addition, concurrent with the 8-year review (and though not a mandatory part of the 8-year review), EPA may examine whether to add standards for pollutants or emission sources not currently regulated for that source category.

B. Regulatory Background

In 1979, the EPA published a list of source categories, which include “crude oil and natural gas production,” for which the EPA would promulgate standards of performance under CAA section 111(b) of the CAA. See *Priority List and Additions to the List of Categories of Stationary Sources*, 44 FR 49222 (August 21, 1979) (“1979 Priority List”). That list included, in the order of priority for promulgating standards, source categories that the EPA Administrator had determined, pursuant to CAA section 111(b)(1)(A), contribute significantly to air pollution that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. See

44 FR at 49223, August 21, 1979; see also, 49 FR 2636–37, January 20, 1984.

On June 24, 1985 (50 FR 26122), the EPA promulgated an NSPS for the source category that addressed VOC emissions from leaking components at onshore natural gas processing plants (40 CFR part 60, subpart KKK). On October 1, 1985 (50 FR 40158), a second NSPS was promulgated for the source category that regulates SO₂ emissions from natural gas processing plants (40 CFR part 60, subpart LLL). In 2012, pursuant to its duty under CAA section 111(b)(1)(B) to review and, if appropriate, revise NSPS, the EPA published the final rule, “Standards of Performance for Crude Oil and Natural Gas Production, Transmission and Distribution” (40 CFR part 60, subpart OOOO) (“2012 NSPS”). The 2012 NSPS updated the SO₂ standards for sweetening units and VOC standards for equipment leaks at onshore natural gas processing plants. In addition, it established VOC standards for several oil and natural gas-related operations not covered by 40 CFR part 60, subparts KKK and LLL, including gas well completions, centrifugal and reciprocating compressors, natural gas-operated pneumatic controllers, and storage vessels. In 2013 and 2014, the EPA made certain amendments to the 2012 NSPS in order to improve implementation of the standards (78 FR 58416, September 23, 2013, and 79 FR 79018, December 31, 2014). The 2013 amendments focused on storage vessel implementation issues; the 2014 amendments provided clarification of well completion provisions which became fully effective on January 1, 2015. The EPA received petitions for both judicial review and administrative reconsiderations for the 2012 NSPS as well as the subsequent amendments in 2013 and 2014. The litigations are stayed pending the EPA’s reconsideration process.¹³

In this rulemaking, the EPA is addressing a number of issues raised in the administrative reconsideration petitions.¹⁴ In addition to addressing the petitions requesting we reconsider our decision to defer regulation of GHGs, these topics, which mostly address implementation in 40 CFR part 60, subpart OOOO, are: Storage vessel control device monitoring and testing provisions; initial compliance requirements for a bypass device that

¹³ In 2015, the EPA made further amendments to provisions relative to storage vessels and well completions (in particular low pressure wells). No judicial review or administrative reconsideration was sought for the 2015 amendments.

¹⁴ The EPA intends to complete its reconsideration process in a subsequent notice.

could divert an emission stream away from a control device; recordkeeping requirements for repair logs for control devices failing a visible emissions test; clarification of the due date for the initial annual report; emergency flare exemption from routine compliance tests; LDAR for open-ended valves or lines; compliance period for LDAR for newly affected process units; exemption to notification requirement for reconstruction of most types of facilities; and disposal of carbon from control devices.

C. Other Notable Events

To provide relevant context to this final rule, EPA will discuss several notable events. First, in 2009 the EPA found that six well-mixed GHGs—carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆)—endanger both the public health and the public welfare of current and future generations by causing or contributing to climate change. Oil and natural gas operations are significant emitters of methane. According to data from the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP), oil and natural gas operations are the second largest stationary source of GHG emissions in the United States (when including both methane emissions and combustion-related GHG emissions at oil and natural gas facilities), second only to fossil fuel electricity generation. See section IV of this preamble which discusses, among other issues, this endangerment finding in more detail.

Second, on August 16, 2012, the EPA published the 2012 NSPS (77 FR 49490). The 2012 NSPS included VOC standards for a number of emission sources in the oil and natural gas source category. Using information available at the time, the EPA also evaluated methane emissions and reductions during the 2012 NSPS rulemaking as a potential co-benefit of regulating VOC. Although information at the time indicated that methane emissions could be significant, the EPA did not take final action in the 2012 NSPS with respect to the regulation of GHG emissions; the EPA noted the impending collection of a large amount of GHG emissions data for this industry through the GHGRP (40 CFR part 98) and expressed its intent to continue its evaluation of methane. As stated previously, the 2012 NSPS was the subject of a number of petitions for judicial review and administrative reconsideration. Litigation is currently stayed pending the EPA's reconsideration process. Controlling methane emissions is an

issue raised in several of the administrative petitions for the EPA's reconsideration.

Third, in June 2013, President Obama issued his Climate Action Plan, which included direction to the EPA and five other federal agencies to develop a comprehensive interagency strategy to reduce methane emissions. The plan recognized that methane emissions constitute a significant percentage of domestic GHG emissions, highlighted reductions in methane emissions since 1990, and outlined specific actions that could be taken to achieve additional progress.

Fourth, as a follow-up to the 2013 *Climate Action Plan*, the Administration issued the *Climate Action Plan: Strategy to Reduce Methane Emissions* (the Methane Strategy) in March 2014. The focus on reducing methane emissions reflects the fact that methane is a potent GHG with a 100-year GWP that is 28–36 times greater than that of carbon dioxide.¹⁵ The GWP is a measure of how much additional energy the earth will absorb over 100 years as a result of emissions of a given gas, in relation to carbon dioxide. Methane has an atmospheric life of about 12 years, and because of its potency as a GHG and its atmospheric life, reducing methane emissions is an important step that can be taken to achieve a near-term beneficial impact in mitigating global climate change. The Methane Strategy instructed the EPA to release a series of white papers on several potentially significant sources of methane in the oil and natural gas sector and to solicit input from independent experts. The white papers were released in April 2014 and are discussed in more detail in section III.D of this preamble.^{16 17}

Finally, following the *Climate Action Plan* and the Methane Strategy, in January 2015, the Administration

¹⁵ IPCC, 2013: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1535 pp. For the analysis supporting this regulation, we used the methane 100-year GWP of 25 to be consistent with and comparable to key Agency emission quantification programs such as the Inventory of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks (GHG Inventory), and the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP). For more information see Preamble section Methane Emissions in the United States and from the Oil and Natural Gas Industry.

¹⁶ <http://www.epa.gov/airquality/oilandgas/methane.html>.

¹⁷ Public comments on the white papers are available in the EPA's nonregulatory docket at <http://www.regulations.gov>, Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0557.

announced a new goal to cut methane emissions from the oil and gas sector by 40 to 45 percent from 2012 levels by 2025 and steps to put the United States on a path to achieve this ambitious goal. These actions encompass both commonsense standards and cooperative engagement with states, tribes, and industry. Building on prior actions by the Administration and leadership in states and industry, the announcement laid out a plan for the EPA to address, and if appropriate, propose and set standards for methane and ozone-forming emissions from new and modified sources and to issue Control Technique Guidelines (CTG) to assist states in reducing ozone-forming pollutants from existing oil and natural gas systems in areas that do not meet the health-based standard for ozone.

D. Stakeholder Outreach and Public Hearings

1. White Papers

As mentioned, the Methane Strategy was released in March 2014, as a follow-up to the 2013 *Climate Action Plan*, and directed the EPA to release a series of white papers on several potentially significant sources of methane in the oil and natural gas sector and solicit input from independent experts. The papers were released in April 2014, and the peer review process was completed on June 16, 2014.

The peer review, consisting of 26 sets of comments and more than 43,000 public comment submissions on the white papers, included additional technical information that further clarified our understanding of the emission sources and emission control options.¹⁸ The comments also provided additional data on emissions and the number of sources and pointed out newly published studies that further informed our emission rate estimates. Where appropriate, we used the information and data provided to adjust the control options considered and the impacts estimates that are presented in the TSD to this final rule.

2. Outreach to State, Local and Tribal Governments

Throughout the rulemaking process, the EPA collaborated with state, local, and tribal governments to hear how they have managed regulatory issues and to receive feedback that would help us develop the rule. As discussed in the

¹⁸ The comments received from the peer reviewers are available on the EPA's oil and natural gas white paper Web site (<http://www.epa.gov/airquality/oilandgas/methane.html>). Public comments on the white papers are available in the EPA's nonregulatory docket at www.regulations.gov, docket ID #EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0557.

proposal, 12 states, three tribes, and several local air districts participated in several teleconferences in March and April 2015. The EPA hosted additional teleconferences in September 2015 with the same group of states, tribes, and air districts that the EPA spoke with earlier in the year. In September 2015, the EPA also hosted a webinar series with states, tribes, and interested communities to provide an overview of the proposed rule and an opportunity to ask clarifying questions on the proposal.¹⁹

The EPA specifically consulted with tribal officials under the “EPA Policy on Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribes” early in the process of developing this regulation to provide them with the opportunity to have meaningful and timely input into its development. Additionally, the EPA spoke with tribal stakeholders throughout the rulemaking process and updated the National Tribal Air Association on the Methane Strategy. Consistent with previous actions affecting the oil and natural gas sector, significant tribal interest exists because of the growth of oil and natural gas production in Indian country.

3. Public Hearings

The EPA hosted three public hearings on the proposed rule in September 2015.²⁰ The public hearings addressed this rule’s proposal and two related actions.²¹ All combined, approximately 329 people gave verbal testimony. The transcripts and written comments collected at the hearings are in the public docket for this final rule.²²

E. Related State and Federal Regulatory Actions

As mentioned, these rules are designed to complement current state and other federal regulations. We carefully evaluated existing state and local programs when developing these federal standards and attempted, where possible, to limit potential conflicts with existing state and local requirements. We recognize that, in some cases, these federal rules may be more stringent than existing programs and, in other cases, may be less stringent than existing programs. We received over 900,000 comments on the proposed rule. After careful

consideration of the comments, we are finalizing the standards with revisions where appropriate to reduce emissions of harmful air pollutants, promote gas capture and beneficial use, and provide opportunity for flexibility and expanded transparency in order to yield a consistent and accountable national program that provides a clear path for states and other federal agencies to further align their programs.

During development of these NSPS requirements, we were mindful that some facilities that will be subject to the standards will also be subject to current or future requirements of the Department of Interior’s Bureau of Land Management (BLM) rules covering production of natural gas on federal lands.²³ To minimize confusion and unnecessary burden on the part of owners and operators, the EPA and the BLM have maintained an ongoing dialogue during development of this action to identify opportunities for aligning requirements and will continue to coordinate through BLM’s final rulemaking and through the agencies’ implementation of their respective rules. While we intend for our rule to complement the BLM’s action, it is important to recognize that the EPA and the BLM are each operating under different statutory authorities and mandates in developing and implementing their respective rules.

In addition to this final rule, the EPA is working to finalize other related actions. The EPA will finalize the Source Determination for Certain Emissions Units in the Oil and Natural Gas Sector rule, which will clarify the EPA’s air permitting rules as they apply to the oil and natural gas industry. Additionally, the EPA plans to finalize the federal implementation plan for the EPA’s Indian Country Minor New Source Review (NSR) program for oil and natural gas production sources and natural gas processing sources, which will require compliance with various federal regulations and streamline the permitting process for this rapidly growing industry in Indian country. Lastly, the EPA will also issue Control Techniques Guidelines (CTG) for reducing VOC emissions from existing oil and gas sources in certain ozone nonattainment areas and states in the Ozone Transport Region. This suite of requirements together will help combat climate change, reduce air pollution that harms public health, and provide greater certainty about CAA permitting requirements for the oil and natural gas industry.

Other related programs include the EPA’s GHGRP, which requires annual reporting of GHG data and other relevant information from large sources and suppliers in the United States. On October 30, 2009, the EPA published 40 CFR part 98 for collecting information regarding GHG emissions from a broad range of industry sectors (74 FR 56260). Although reporting requirements for petroleum and natural gas systems (40 CFR part 98, subpart W) were originally proposed to be part of 40 CFR part 98 (75 FR 16448, April 10, 2009), the final October 2009 rule did not include the petroleum and natural gas systems source category as one of the 29 source categories for which reporting requirements were finalized. The EPA repropounded subpart W in 2010 (79 FR 18608, April 12, 2010), and a subsequent final rule was published on November 30, 2010, with the requirements for the petroleum and natural gas systems source category at 40 CFR part 98, subpart W (75 FR 74458). Following promulgation, the EPA finalized actions revising subpart W (76 FR 22825, April 25, 2011; 76 FR 59533, September 27, 2011; 76 FR 80554, December 23, 2011; 77 FR 51477, August 24, 2012; 78 FR 25392, May 1, 2013; 78 FR 71904, November 29, 2013; 79 FR 63750, October 24, 2014; 79 FR 70352, November 25, 2014; 80 FR 64262, October 22, 2015).

40 CFR part 98, subpart W includes a wide range of operations and equipment, from wells to processing facilities, to transmission and storage and through to distribution pipelines. Subpart W consists of emission sources in the following segments of the petroleum and natural gas industry: Onshore petroleum and natural gas production, offshore petroleum and natural gas production, onshore petroleum and natural gas gathering and boosting, onshore natural gas processing plants, onshore natural gas transmission compression, onshore natural gas transmission pipeline, underground natural gas storage, liquefied natural gas storage, liquefied natural gas import and export equipment, and natural gas distribution.

On March 10, 2016, the EPA announced the next step in reducing emissions of GHGs, specifically methane, from the oil and natural gas industry: Moving to regulate emissions from existing sources. The Agency will begin with a formal process to require companies operating existing oil and gas sources to provide information to assist in the development of comprehensive

¹⁹ See 80 FR 56609, September 18, 2015.

²⁰ See 80 FR 51991, August 27, 2015.

²¹ Source Determination for Certain Emission Units in the Oil and Natural Gas Sector; Review of New Sources and Modifications in Indian Country: Federal Implementation Plan for Managing Air Emissions from True Minor Sources Engaged in Oil and Natural Gas Production in Indian Country.

²² See EPA Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505.

²³ See 81 FR 6616, February 8, 2016.

regulations to reduce GHG emissions.²⁴ An Information Collection Request (ICR) will enable the EPA to gather important information on existing sources of GHG emissions, technologies to reduce those emissions, and the costs of those technologies in the production, gathering, processing, and transmission and storage segments of the oil and natural gas sector. There are hundreds of thousands of existing oil and natural gas sources across the country; some emit small amounts of GHGs, but others emit very large quantities. Through the ICR, the EPA will be seeking a broad range of information that will help us determine how to effectively reduce emissions, including information such as how equipment and emissions controls are, or can be, configured, and what installing those controls entails. The EPA will also be seeking information that will help the Agency identify sources with high emissions and the factors that contribute to those emissions. The ICR will likely apply to the same types of sources covered by the 40 CFR part 60, subparts OOOO and OOOOa, as well as additional sources.

IV. Regulatory Authority

In this section, we describe our authority under CAA section 111(b) to regulate emissions from operations and equipment used across the oil and natural gas industry.

A. The Oil and Natural Gas Source Category Listing Under CAA Section 111(b)(1)(A)

In 1979, the EPA published a list of source categories, including “crude oil and natural gas production,” for which the EPA would promulgate standards of performance under section 111(b) of the CAA. *Priority List and Additions to the List of Categories of Stationary Sources*, 44 FR 49222 (August 21, 1979) (“1979 Priority List”). The EPA published the 1979 Priority List as directed by a then new section 111(f) under the CAA amendments of 1977. Clean Air Act section 111(f) set a schedule for the EPA to promulgate regulations under CAA section 111(b)(1)(A); listing “categories of major stationary sources” and establishing standards of performance for the listed source categories in the order of priority as determined by the criteria set forth in CAA section 111(f). The 1979 Priority List included, in the order of priority for promulgating standards, source categories that the EPA Administrator had determined, pursuant to CAA section 111(b)(1)(A), to contribute significantly to air pollution

that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. See 44 FR 49222, August 21, 1979; see also 49 FR 2636–37, January 20, 1984. In developing the 1979 Priority List, the EPA first analyzed the data to identify “major source categories” and then ranked them in the order of priority for setting standards. *Id.* Although the EPA defined a “major source category” in that listing action as “those categories for which an average size plant has the potential to emit 100 tons or more per year of any one pollutant,”²⁵ the EPA provided notice in that action that “certain new sources of smaller than average size within these categories may have less than a 100 ton per year emission potential.” 43 FR 38872, 38873 (August 31, 1978). The EPA thus made clear that sources included within the listed source categories in the 1979 Priority List were not limited to sources that emit at or above the 100 ton level. The EPA’s decision to not exclude smaller sources in the 1979 Priority List was consistent with CAA section 111(b), the statutory authority for that listing action and the required standard setting to follow. In requiring that the EPA list source categories and establish standards for the new sources within the listed source categories, CAA section 111(b) does not distinguish between “major” or other sources. Similarly, as an example, CAA section 111(e), which prohibits violation of an applicable standard upon its effective date, applies to “any new source,” not just major new sources.

As mentioned above, one of the source categories listed in that 1979 Priority List generally covers the oil and natural gas industry. Specifically, with respect to the natural gas industry, it includes production, processing, transmission, and storage. The 1979 Priority List broadly covered the natural gas industry,²⁶ which was evident in the EPA’s analysis at the time of listing.²⁷ For example, the priority list analysis indicated that the EPA evaluated emissions from various segments of the natural gas industry, such as production and processing. The analysis also showed that the EPA evaluated equipment, such as stationary pipeline

²⁵ 44 FR 49222, August 21, 1979.

²⁶ The process of producing natural gas for distribution involves operations in the various segments of the natural gas industry described above. In contrast, oil production involves drilling/extracting oil, which is immediately followed by distribution offsite to be made into different products.

²⁷ See Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources, 43 FR 38872 (August 31, 1978) and Priority List and Additions to the List of Categories of Stationary Sources, 44 FR 49222 (August 21, 1979).

compressor engines that are used in various segments of the natural gas industry. The scope of the 1979 Priority List is further demonstrated by the Agency’s pronouncements during the NSPS rulemaking that followed the listing. Specifically, in its description of this listed source category in the 1984 preamble to the proposed NSPS for equipment leaks at natural gas processing plants, the EPA described the major emission points of this source category to include process, storage, and equipment leaks; these emissions can be found throughout the various segments of the natural gas industry. 49 FR 2637, January 20, 1984. In addition, the EPA identified emission points not covered by that rulemaking, such as “well systems field oil and gas separators, wash tanks, settling tanks and other sources.” *Id.* The EPA explained in that action that it could not regulate these emissions at that time because “best demonstrated control technology has not been identified.” *Id.*

The inclusion of various segments of the natural gas industry into the source category listed in 1979 is consistent with this industry’s operations and equipment. Operations at production, processing, transmission, and storage facilities are a sequence of functions that are interrelated and necessary for getting the recovered gas ready for distribution.²⁸ Because they are interrelated, segments that follow others are faced with increases in throughput caused by growth in throughput of the segments preceding (*i.e.*, feeding) them. For example, the relatively recent substantial increases in natural gas production brought about by hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling result in increases in the amount of natural gas needing to be processed and moved to market or stored. These increases in production and throughput can cause increases in emissions across the entire natural gas industry. We also note that some equipment (*e.g.*, storage vessels, pneumatic pumps, compressors) are used across the oil and natural gas industry, which further supports considering the industry as one source category. For the reasons stated above, the 1979 Priority List broadly includes the various segments of the natural gas

²⁸ The crude oil production segment of the source category, which includes the well and extends to the point of custody transfer to the crude oil transmission pipeline, is more limited in scope than the segments of the natural gas value chain included in the source category. However, increases in production at the well and/or increases in the number of wells coming on line, in turn increase throughput and resultant emissions, similarly to the natural gas segments in the source category.

²⁴ <https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/oilandgas/pdfs/20160310fs.pdf>.

industry (production, processing, transmission, and storage).

Since issuing the 1979 Priority List, which broadly covers the oil and natural gas industry as explained above, the EPA has promulgated performance standards to regulate SO₂ emissions from natural gas processing and VOC emissions from certain operations and equipment in this industry. In this action, the EPA is regulating an additional pollutant (*i.e.*, GHGs) as well as additional sources from this industry.

As explained above, the EPA, in 1979, determined under section 111(b)(1)(A) that the listed oil and natural gas source category contributes significantly to air pollution that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. Therefore, the 1979 listing of this source category provides sufficient authority for this action. The listed oil and natural gas source category includes oil²⁹ and natural gas production, processing, transmission, and storage. For the reasons stated above, the EPA believes that the 1979 listing of this source category provides sufficient authority for this action. However, to the extent that there is any ambiguity in the prior listing, the EPA hereby finalizes, as an alternative, its proposed revision of the category listing to broadly include the oil and natural gas industry. As revised, the listed oil and natural gas source category includes oil³⁰ and natural gas production, processing, transmission, and storage. In support, the EPA has included in this action the requisite finding under section 111(b)(1)(A) that, in the Administrator's judgment, this source category, as defined above, contributes significantly to air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.

To be clear, the EPA's view is that no revision is required for the standards established in this final rule. But even assuming it is, for the reason stated below, there is ample evidence that this source category as a whole (oil and natural gas production, processing, transmission, and storage) contributes significantly to air pollution that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare.

First, through the 1979 Priority List, the EPA determined that the oil and natural gas industry contributes significantly to air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. To the extent that the EPA's 1979 determination

looked only at certain emissions sources in the industry, clearly the much greater emissions from the broader source category, as defined under a revised listing, would provide even more support for a conclusion that emissions from this category endanger public health or welfare. In addition, the EPA has included immediately below information and analyses regarding public health and welfare impacts from GHGs, VOC, and SO₂ emissions, three of the primary pollutants emitted from the oil and natural gas industry, and the estimated emissions of these pollutants from the oil and natural gas source category. It is evident from this information and analyses that the oil and natural gas source category contributes significantly to air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare. Therefore, to the extent such a finding were necessary, pursuant to section 111(b)(1)(A), the Administrator hereby determines that, in her judgment, this source category, as defined above, contributes significantly to air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.

Provided below are the supporting information and analyses referenced above. Specifically, section IV.B of this preamble describes the public health and welfare impacts from GHGs, VOC and SO₂. Section IV.C of this preamble analyzes the emission contribution of these three pollutants by the oil and natural gas industry.

B. Impacts of GHGs, VOC and SO₂ Emissions on Public Health and Welfare

The oil and natural gas industry emits a wide range of pollutants, including GHGs (such as methane and CO₂), VOC, SO₂, nitrogen oxides (NO_x), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), carbon disulfide (CS₂) and carbonyl sulfide (COS). See 49 FR 2636, 2637 (January 20, 1984). Although all of these pollutants have significant impacts on public health and welfare, an analysis of every one of these pollutants is not necessary for the Administrator to make a determination under CAA section 111(b)(1)(A); as shown below, the EPA's analysis of GHGs, VOC, and SO₂, three of the primary emissions from the oil and natural gas source category, is sufficient for the Administrator to determine under CAA section 111(b)(1)(A) that the oil and natural gas source category contributes significantly to air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare.³¹

1. Climate Change Impacts From GHG Emissions

In 2009, based on a large body of robust and compelling scientific evidence, the EPA Administrator issued the Endangerment Finding under CAA section 202(a)(1).³² In the 2009 Endangerment Finding, the Administrator found that the current, elevated concentrations of GHGs in the atmosphere—already at levels unprecedented in human history—may reasonably be anticipated to endanger the public health and welfare of current and future generations in the United States. We summarize these adverse effects on public health and welfare briefly here.

a. Public Health Impacts Detailed in the 2009 Endangerment Finding

Climate change caused by manmade emissions of GHGs threatens the health of Americans in multiple ways. By raising average temperatures, climate change increases the likelihood of heat waves, which are associated with increased deaths and illnesses. While climate change also increases the likelihood of reductions in cold-related mortality, evidence indicates that the increases in heat mortality will be larger than the decreases in cold mortality in the United States. Compared to a future without climate change, climate change is expected to increase ozone pollution over broad areas of the United States, especially on the highest ozone days and in the largest metropolitan areas with the worst ozone problems, and thereby increase the risk of morbidity and mortality. Climate change is also expected to cause more intense hurricanes and more frequent and intense storms and heavy precipitation, with impacts on other areas of public health, such as the potential for increased deaths, injuries, infectious and waterborne diseases, and stress-related disorders. Children, the elderly, and the poor are among the most vulnerable to these climate-related health effects.

b. Public Welfare Impacts Detailed in the 2009 Endangerment Finding

Climate change impacts touch nearly every aspect of public welfare. Among the multiple threats caused by manmade emissions of GHGs, climate changes are

authority to promulgate standards that would apply to other pollutants emitted from the oil and natural gas source category, if the EPA determines in the future that such action is appropriate.

³² "Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act," 74 FR 66496 (December 15, 2009) ("2009 Endangerment Finding").

²⁹ For the oil industry, the listing includes production, as explained above in footnote 27.

³⁰ For the oil industry, the listing includes production, as explained above in footnote 27.

³¹ We note that the EPA's focus on GHG (in particular methane), VOC, and SO₂ in these analyses, does not in any way limit the EPA's

expected to place large areas of the country at serious risk of reduced water supplies, increased water pollution, and increased occurrence of extreme events such as floods and droughts. Coastal areas are expected to face a multitude of increased risks, particularly from rising sea level and increases in the severity of storms. These communities face storm and flooding damage to property, or even loss of land due to inundation, erosion, wetland submergence, and habitat loss.

Impacts of climate change on public welfare also include threats to social and ecosystem services. Climate change is expected to result in an increase in peak electricity demand. Extreme weather from climate change threatens energy, transportation, and water resource infrastructure. Climate change may also exacerbate ongoing environmental pressures in certain settlements, particularly in Alaskan indigenous communities, and is very likely to fundamentally rearrange United States ecosystems over the 21st century. Though some benefits may help balance adverse effects on agriculture and forestry in the next few decades, the body of evidence points towards increasing risks of net adverse impacts on United States food production, agriculture, and forest productivity as temperatures continue to rise. These impacts are global and may exacerbate problems outside the United States that raise humanitarian, trade, and national security issues for the United States.

c. New Scientific Assessments and Observations

Since the administrative record concerning the 2009 Endangerment Finding closed following the EPA's 2010 Reconsideration Denial, the climate has continued to change, with new records being set for a number of climate indicators such as global average surface temperatures, Arctic sea ice retreat, methane and other GHG concentrations, and sea level rise. Additionally, a number of major scientific assessments have been released that improve understanding of the climate system and strengthen the case that GHGs endanger public health and welfare both for current and future generations. These assessments, from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), United States Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), and National Research Council (NRC), include: IPCC's 2012 *Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation* (SREX) and the 2013–2014 Fifth Assessment Report

(AR5), USGCRP's 2014 National Climate Assessment, *Climate Change Impacts in the United States* (NCA3), and the NRC's 2010 *Ocean Acidification: A National Strategy to Meet the Challenges of a Changing Ocean* (Ocean Acidification), 2011 *Report on Climate Stabilization Targets: Emissions, Concentrations, and Impacts over Decades to Millennia* (Climate Stabilization Targets), 2011 *National Security Implications for U.S. Naval Forces* (National Security Implications), 2011 *Understanding Earth's Deep Past: Lessons for Our Climate Future* (Understanding Earth's Deep Past), 2012 *Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future*, 2012 *Climate and Social Stress: Implications for Security Analysis* (Climate and Social Stress), and 2013 *Abrupt Impacts of Climate Change* (Abrupt Impacts) assessments.

The EPA has carefully reviewed these recent assessments in keeping with the same approach outlined in section VIII.A of the 2009 Endangerment Finding, which was to rely primarily upon the major assessments by the USGCRP, IPCC, and the NRC to provide the technical and scientific information to inform the Administrator's judgment regarding the question of whether GHGs endanger public health and welfare. These assessments addressed the scientific issues that the EPA was required to examine, were comprehensive in their coverage of the GHG and climate change issues, and underwent rigorous and exacting peer review by the expert community, as well as rigorous levels of United States government review.

The findings of the recent scientific assessments confirm and strengthen the conclusion that GHGs endanger public health, now and in the future. The NCA3 indicates that human health in the United States will be impacted by "increased extreme weather events, wildfire, decreased air quality, threats to mental health, and illnesses transmitted by food, water, and disease-carriers such as mosquitoes and ticks." The most recent assessments now have greater confidence that climate change will influence production of pollen that exacerbates asthma and other allergic respiratory diseases such as allergic rhinitis, as well as effects on conjunctivitis and dermatitis. Both the NCA3 and the IPCC AR5 found that increased temperature lengthens the allergenic pollen season for ragweed and that increased CO₂ by itself elevates production of plant-based allergens.

The NCA3 also finds that climate change, in addition to chronic stresses

such as extreme poverty, is negatively affecting indigenous peoples' health in the United States through impacts such as reduced access to traditional foods, decreased water quality, and increasing exposure to health and safety hazards. The IPCC AR5 finds that climate change-induced warming in the Arctic and resultant changes in environment (e.g., permafrost thaw, effects on traditional food sources) have significant impacts, observed now and projected, on the health and well-being of Arctic residents, especially indigenous peoples. Small, remote, predominantly indigenous communities are especially vulnerable given their "strong dependence on the environment for food, culture, and way of life; their political and economic marginalization; existing social, health, and poverty disparities; as well as their frequent close proximity to exposed locations along ocean, lake, or river shorelines."³³ In addition, increasing temperatures and loss of Arctic sea ice increases the risk of drowning for those engaged in traditional hunting and fishing.

The NCA3 also finds that children's unique physiology and developing bodies contribute to making them particularly vulnerable to climate change. Impacts on children are expected from heat waves, air pollution, infectious and waterborne illnesses, and mental health effects resulting from extreme weather events. The IPCC AR5 indicates that children are among those especially susceptible to most allergic diseases, as well as health effects associated with heat waves, storms, and floods. The IPCC finds that additional health concerns may arise in low income households, especially those with children, if climate change reduces food availability and increases prices, leading to food insecurity within households.

Both the NCA3 and IPCC AR5 conclude that climate change will increase health risks that the elderly will face. Older people are at much higher risk of mortality during extreme heat events. Pre-existing health conditions also make older adults more susceptible to cardiac and respiratory impacts of air pollution and to more severe consequences from infectious

³³ IPCC, 2014: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part B: Regional Aspects*. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Barros, V.R., C.B. Field, D.J. Dokken, M.D. Mastrandrea, K.J. Mach, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 1581.

and waterborne diseases. Limited mobility among older adults can also increase health risks associated with extreme weather and floods.

The new assessments also confirm and strengthen the conclusion that GHGs endanger public welfare and emphasize the urgency of reducing GHG emissions due to their projections that show GHG concentrations climbing to ever-increasing levels in the absence of mitigation. The NRC assessment, *Understanding Earth's Deep Past*, stated that "the magnitude and rate of the present GHG increase place the climate system in what could be one of the most severe increases in radiative forcing of the global climate system in Earth history."³⁴ Because of these unprecedented changes, several assessments state that we may be approaching critical, poorly understood thresholds. As stated in the NRC assessment, *Understanding Earth's Deep Past*, "[a]s Earth continues to warm, it may be approaching a critical climate threshold beyond which rapid and potentially permanent—at least on a human timescale—changes not anticipated by climate models tuned to modern conditions may occur." The NRC *Abrupt Impacts* report analyzed abrupt climate change in the physical climate system and abrupt impacts of ongoing changes that, when thresholds are crossed, can cause abrupt impacts for society and ecosystems. The report considered destabilization of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet (which could cause 3 to 4 meters (m) of potential sea level rise) as an abrupt climate impact with unknown but low probability of occurring this century. The report categorized a decrease in ocean oxygen content (with attendant threats to aerobic marine life); increase in intensity, frequency, and duration of heat waves; and increase in frequency and intensity of extreme weather events (droughts, floods, hurricanes, and major storms) as climate impacts with moderate risk of an abrupt change within this century. The NRC *Abrupt Impacts* report also analyzed the threat of rapid state changes in ecosystems and species extinctions as examples of an irreversible impact that is expected to be exacerbated by climate change. Species at most risk include those whose migration potential is limited, whether because they live on mountaintops or fragmented habitats with barriers to movement, or because climatic conditions are changing more rapidly than the species can move or adapt. While the NRC determined that it is not

presently possible to place exact probabilities on the added contribution of climate change to extinction, they did find that there was substantial risk that impacts from climate change could, within a few decades, drop the populations in many species below sustainable levels, thereby committing the species to extinction. Species within tropical and subtropical rainforests, such as the Amazon, and species living in coral reef ecosystems were identified by the NRC as being particularly vulnerable to extinction over the next 30 to 80 years, as were species in high latitude and high elevation regions. Moreover, due to the time lags inherent in the Earth's climate, the NRC Climate Stabilization Targets assessment notes that the full warming from increased GHG concentrations will not be fully realized for several centuries, underscoring that emission activities today carry with them climate commitments far into the future.

Future temperature changes will depend on what emission path the world follows. In its high emission scenario, the IPCC AR5 projects that global temperatures by the end of the century will likely be 2.6 °Celsius to 4.8 °Celsius (4.7° to 8.6 °F) warmer than today. Temperatures on land and in northern latitudes will likely warm even faster than the global average. However, according to the NCA3, significant reductions in emissions would lead to noticeably less future warming beyond mid-century and, therefore, less impact to public health and welfare.

While the amount of rainfall may not change significantly when looked at from the standpoint of global and annual averages, there are expected to be substantial shifts in where and when that precipitation falls. According to the NCA3, regions closer to the poles will see more precipitation while the dry subtropics are expected to expand (colloquially, this has been summarized as wet areas getting wetter and dry regions getting drier). In particular, the NCA3 notes that the western United States, and especially the Southwest, is expected to become drier. This projection is consistent with the recent observed drought trend in the West. At the time of publication of the NCA3, even before the last 2 years of extreme drought in California, tree ring data were already indicating that the region might be experiencing its driest period in 800 years. Similarly, the NCA3 projects that heavy downpours are expected to increase in many regions, with precipitation events in general becoming less frequent but more intense. This trend has already been observed in regions such as the

Midwest, Northeast, and upper Great Plains. Meanwhile, the NRC Climate Stabilization Targets assessment found that the area burned by wildfire is expected to grow by 2 to 4 times for 1 °Celsius (1.8 °Fahrenheit) of warming. For 3 °Celsius of warming, the assessment found that nine out of 10 summers would be warmer than all but the 5 percent of warmest summers today; leading to increased frequency, duration, and intensity of heat waves. Extrapolations by the NCA3 also indicate that Arctic sea ice in summer may essentially disappear by mid-century. Retreating snow and ice, and emissions of carbon dioxide and methane released from thawing permafrost, will also amplify future warming.

Since the 2009 Endangerment Finding, the USGCRP NCA3, and multiple NRC assessments have projected future rates of sea level rise that are 40 percent larger to more than twice as large as the previous estimates from the 2007 IPCC 4th Assessment Report. This is due, in part, to improved understanding of the future rate of melt of the Antarctic and Greenland ice sheets. The NRC Sea Level Rise assessment projects a global sea level rise of 0.5 to 1.4 meters (1.6 to 4.6 feet) by 2100. An NRC national security implications assessment suggests that "the Department of the Navy should expect roughly 0.4 to 2 meters (1.3 to 6.6 feet) global average sea-level rise by 2100,"³⁵ and the NRC Climate Stabilization Targets assessment states that an increase of 3 °Celsius will lead to a sea level rise of 0.5 to 1 meter (1.6 to 3.3 feet) by 2100. These assessments continue to recognize that there is uncertainty inherent in accounting for ice sheet processes: It is possible that the ice sheets could melt more quickly than expected, leading to more sea level rise than currently projected. Additionally, local sea level rise can differ from the global total depending on various factors: The east coast of the United States in particular is expected to see higher rates of sea level rise than the global average. For comparison, the NCA3 states that "five million Americans and hundreds of billions of dollars of property are located in areas that are less than four feet above the local high-tide level," and the NCA3 finds that "[c]oastal infrastructure, including roads, rail lines, energy infrastructure, airports, port facilities, and military bases, are increasingly at risk from sea level rise and damaging

³⁴ National Research Council, *Understanding Earth's Deep Past*, p. 138.

³⁵ NRC, 2011: *National Security Implications of Climate Change for U.S. Naval Forces*. The National Academies Press, p. 28.

storm surges.”³⁶ Also, because of the inertia of the oceans, sea level rise will continue for centuries after GHG concentrations have stabilized (though reducing GHG emissions will slow the rate of sea level rise and, therefore, reduce the associated risks and impacts). Additionally, there is a threshold temperature above which the Greenland ice sheet will be committed to inevitable melting: According to the NCA3, some recent research has suggested that even present day CO₂ levels could be sufficient to exceed that threshold.

In general, climate change impacts are expected to be unevenly distributed across different regions of the United States and have a greater impact on certain populations, such as indigenous peoples and the poor. The NCA3 finds climate change impacts such as the rapid pace of temperature rise, coastal erosion, and inundation related to sea level rise and storms, ice and snow melt, and permafrost thaw are affecting indigenous people in the United States. Particularly in Alaska, critical infrastructure and traditional livelihoods are threatened by climate change and, “[i]n parts of Alaska, Louisiana, the Pacific Islands, and other coastal locations, climate change impacts (through erosion and inundation) are so severe that some communities are already relocating from historical homelands to which their traditions and cultural identities are tied.”³⁷ The IPCC AR5 notes, “Climate-related hazards exacerbate other stressors, often with negative outcomes for livelihoods, especially for people living in poverty (high confidence). Climate-related hazards affect poor people’s lives directly through impacts on livelihoods, reductions in crop yields, or destruction of homes and indirectly through, for example, increased food prices and food insecurity.”³⁸

³⁶ Melillo, Jerry M., Terese (T.C.) Richmond, and Gary W. Yohe, Eds., 2014: *Climate Change Impacts in the United States: The Third National Climate Assessment*. United States Global Change Research Program, p. 9.

³⁷ Melillo, Jerry M., Terese (T.C.) Richmond, and Gary W. Yohe, Eds., 2014: *Climate Change Impacts in the United States: The Third National Climate Assessment*. United States Global Change Research Program, p. 17.

³⁸ IPCC, 2014: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects*. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, p. 796.

The impacts of climate change outside the United States, as also pointed out in the 2009 Endangerment Finding, will also have relevant consequences on the United States and our citizens. The NRC Climate and Social Stress assessment concluded that it is prudent to expect that some climate events “will produce consequences that exceed the capacity of the affected societies or global systems to manage and that have global security implications serious enough to compel international response.” The NRC National Security Implications assessment recommends preparing for increased needs for humanitarian aid; responding to the effects of climate change in geopolitical hotspots, including possible mass migrations; and addressing changing security needs in the Arctic as sea ice retreats.

In addition to future impacts, the NCA3 emphasizes that climate change driven by manmade emissions of GHGs is already happening now and that it is currently having effects in the United States. According to the IPCC AR5 and the NCA3, there are a number of climate-related changes that have been observed recently, and these changes are projected to accelerate in the future. The planet warmed about 0.85 °Celsius (1.5 °Fahrenheit) from 1880 to 2012. It is extremely likely (greater than 95-percent probability) that human influence was the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century, and likely (greater than 66-percent probability) that human influence has more than doubled the probability of occurrence of heat waves in some locations. In the Northern Hemisphere, the last 30 years were likely the warmest 30 year period of the last 1,400 years. United States average temperatures have similarly increased by 1.3° to 1.9 °F since 1895, with most of that increase occurring since 1970. Global sea levels rose 0.19 meters (7.5 inches) from 1901 to 2010. Contributing to this rise was the warming of the oceans and melting of land ice. It is likely that 275 gigatons per year of ice melted from land glaciers (not including ice sheets) since 1993, and that the rate of loss of ice from the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets increased substantially in recent years, to 215 gigatons per year and 147 gigatons per year, respectively, since 2002. For context, 360 gigatons of ice melt is sufficient to cause global sea levels to rise 1 millimeter (mm). Annual mean Arctic sea ice has been declining at 3.5 to 4.1 percent per decade, and Northern Hemisphere snow cover extent has decreased at about 1.6 percent per decade for March and 11.7 percent per decade for June. Permafrost

temperatures have increased in most regions since the 1980s by up to 3 °Celsius (5.4 °Fahrenheit) in parts of northern Alaska. Winter storm frequency and intensity have both increased in the Northern Hemisphere. The NCA3 states that the increases in the severity or frequency of some types of extreme weather and climate events in recent decades can affect energy production and delivery, causing supply disruptions, and compromise other essential infrastructure such as water and transportation systems.

In addition to the changes documented in the assessment literature, there have been other climate milestones of note. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), atmospheric methane concentrations in 2014 were about 1,823 parts per billion, 150 percent higher than methane concentrations were in the year 1750. After a few years of nearly stable concentrations from 1999 to 2006, methane concentrations have resumed increasing at about 5 parts per billion per year. Concentrations today are likely higher than they have been for at least the past 800,000 years. Arctic sea ice has continued to decline, with September of 2012 marking a new record low in terms of Arctic sea ice extent, 40 percent below the 1979 to 2000 median. Sea level has continued to rise at a rate of 3.2 mm per year (1.3 inches/decade) since satellite observations started in 1993, more than twice the average rate of rise in the 20th century prior to 1993.³⁹ Also, 2015 was the warmest year globally in the modern global surface temperature record, going back to 1880, breaking the record previously held by 2014; this now means that the last 15 years have been 15 of the 16 warmest years on record.⁴⁰

These assessments and observed changes make it clear that reducing emissions of GHGs across the globe is necessary in order to avoid the worst impacts of climate change and underscore the urgency of reducing emissions now. The NRC Committee on America’s Climate Choices listed a number of reasons “why it is imprudent to delay actions that at least begin the process of substantially reducing emissions.”⁴¹ For example:

- The faster emissions are reduced, the lower the risks posed by climate change. Delays in reducing emissions could commit the planet to a wide range

³⁹ Blunden, J., and D.S. Arndt, Eds., 2015: *State of the Climate in 2014*. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 96 (7), S1–S267.

⁴⁰ <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/sotc/global/201513>.

⁴¹ NRC, 2011: *America’s Climate Choices*, The National Academies Press.

of adverse impacts, especially if the sensitivity of the climate to GHGs is on the higher end of the estimated range.

- Waiting for unacceptable impacts to occur before taking action is imprudent because the effects of GHG emissions do not fully manifest themselves for decades and, once manifested, many of these changes will persist for hundreds or even thousands of years.

- In the committee's judgment, the risks associated with doing business as usual are a much greater concern than the risks associated with engaging in strong response efforts.

Methane is also a precursor to ground-level ozone, which can cause a number of harmful effects on health and the environment (see section IV.B.2 of this preamble). Additionally, ozone is a short-lived climate forcer that contributes to global warming. In remote areas, methane is a dominant precursor to tropospheric ozone formation.⁴² Approximately 50 percent of the global annual mean ozone increase since preindustrial times is believed to be due to anthropogenic methane.⁴³ Projections of future emissions also indicate that methane is likely to be a key contributor to ozone concentrations in the future.⁴⁴ Unlike NO_x and VOC, which affect ozone concentrations regionally and at hourly time scales, methane emissions affect ozone concentrations globally and on decadal time scales given methane's relatively long atmospheric lifetime compared to these other ozone precursors.⁴⁵ Reducing methane emissions, therefore, will contribute to efforts to reduce global background ozone concentrations that contribute to the incidence of ozone-related health effects.^{46 47 48} The benefits of such

reductions are global and occur in both urban and rural areas.

2. VOC

Many VOC can be classified as HAP (e.g., benzene⁴⁹) which can lead to a variety of health concerns such as cancer and noncancer illnesses (e.g., respiratory, neurological). Further, VOC are one of the key precursors in the formation of ozone. Tropospheric, or ground-level, ozone is formed through reactions of VOC and NO_x in the presence of sunlight. Ozone formation can be controlled to some extent through reductions in emissions of ozone precursors VOC and NO_x. A significantly expanded body of scientific evidence shows that ozone can cause a number of harmful effects on health and the environment. Exposure to ozone can cause respiratory system effects such as difficulty breathing and airway inflammation. For people with lung diseases such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), these effects can lead to emergency room visits and hospital admissions. Studies have also found that ozone exposure is likely to cause premature death from lung or heart diseases. In addition, evidence indicates that long-term exposure to ozone is likely to result in harmful respiratory effects, including respiratory symptoms and the development of asthma. People most at risk from breathing air containing ozone include: Children; people with asthma and other respiratory diseases; older adults; and people who are active outdoors, especially outdoor workers. An estimated 25.9 million people have asthma in the United States, including almost 7.1 million children. Asthma disproportionately affects children, families with lower incomes, and minorities, including Puerto Ricans, Native Americans/Alaska Natives, and African-Americans.⁵⁰

Scientific evidence also shows that repeated exposure to ozone can reduce growth and have other harmful effects on sensitive plants and trees. These types of effects have the potential to impact ecosystems and the benefits they provide.

3. SO₂

Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO₂, ranging

from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing).

Studies also show an association between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

SO₂ in the air can also damage the leaves of plants, decrease their ability to produce food—photosynthesis—and decrease their growth. In addition to directly affecting plants, SO₂, when deposited on land and in estuaries, lakes, and streams, can acidify sensitive ecosystems resulting in a range of harmful indirect effects on plants, soils, water quality, and fish and wildlife (e.g., changes in biodiversity and loss of habitat, reduced tree growth, loss of fish species). Sulfur deposition to waterways also plays a causal role in the methylation of mercury.⁵¹

C. GHGs, VOC and SO₂ Emissions From the Oil and Natural Gas Source Category

The previous section explains how GHGs, VOCs, and SO₂ emissions are “air pollution” that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare. This section provides estimated emissions of these substances from the oil and natural gas source category.

1. Methane Emissions in the United States and From the Oil and Natural Gas Industry

The GHGs addressed by the 2009 Endangerment Finding consist of six well-mixed gases, including methane. For the analysis supporting this regulation, we used the methane 100-year GWP of 25 to be consistent with and comparable to key Agency emission quantification programs such as the Inventory of United States Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks (GHG Inventory), and the GHGRP.⁵² The use of the 100-year GWP of 25 for methane value is currently required by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for reporting of national inventories, such as the United States GHG Inventory.

⁴² U.S. EPA. 2013. “Integrated Science Assessment for Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants (Final Report).” EPA-600-R-10-076F. National Center for Environmental Assessment—RTP Division. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/ncea/isa/>.

⁴³ Myhre, G., D. Shindell, F.-M. Bréon, W. Collins, J. Fuglestedt, J. Huang, D. Koch, J.-F. Lamarque, D. Lee, B. Mendoza, T. Nakajima, A. Robock, G. Stephens, T. Takemura and H. Zhang, 2013: Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA. Pg. 680.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ West, J.J., Fiore, A.M. 2005. “Management of tropospheric ozone by reducing methane emissions.” *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 39:4685–4691.

⁴⁷ Anenberg, S.C., et al. 2009. “Intercontinental impacts of ozone pollution on human mortality.” *Environ. Sci. & Technol.* 43: 6482–6487.

⁴⁸ Sarofim, M.C., Waldhoff, S.T., Anenberg, S.C. 2015. “Valuing the Ozone-Related Health Benefits

of Methane Emission Controls,” *Environ. Resource Econ.* DOI 10.1007/s10640-015-9937-6.

⁴⁹ Benzene IRIS Assessment: https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/iris2/chemicalLanding.cfm?substance_nmbr=276.

⁵⁰ National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) Data, 2011. <http://www.cdc.gov/asthma/nhis/2011/data.htm>.

⁵¹ U.S. EPA. Intergrated Science Assessment (ISA) for Oxides of Nitrogen and Sulfur Ecological Criteria (2008 Final Report). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, EPA/600/R-08/082F, 2008.

⁵² See, for example, Table A–1 to subpart A of 40 CFR part 98.

Updated estimates for methane GWP have been developed by IPCC (2013).⁵³ The most recent 100-year GWP estimates for methane range from 28 to 36. In discussing the science and impacts of methane emissions generally, here we use the GWP range of 28 to 36. When presenting emissions estimates, we use the GWP of 25 for consistency

and comparability with other emissions estimates in the United States and internationally. Methane has an atmospheric life of about 12 years.

Official United States estimates of national level GHG emissions and sinks are developed by the EPA for the United States GHG Inventory to comply with commitments under the UNFCCC. The United States GHG Inventory, which

includes recent trends, is organized by industrial sectors. Natural gas and petroleum systems are the largest emitters of methane in the United States. These systems emit 32 percent of United States anthropogenic methane.

Table 3 below presents total United States anthropogenic methane emissions for the years 1990, 2005, and 2014.

TABLE 3—UNITED STATES METHANE EMISSIONS BY SECTOR
[Million metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MMT CO₂ Eq.)]

Sector	1990	2005	2014
Oil and Natural Gas Production, and Natural Gas Processing and Transmission	201	203	232
Landfills	180	154	148
Enteric Fermentation	164	169	164
Coal Mining	96	64	68
Manure Management	37	56	61
Other Methane Sources ⁵⁴	95	71	57
Total Methane Emissions	774	717	731

Emissions from the Inventory of United States Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2014 (published April 15, 2016), calculated using GWP of 25. Note: Totals may not sum due to rounding.

Oil and natural gas production and natural gas processing and transmission systems encompass wells, natural gas gathering and processing facilities, storage, and transmission pipelines. These components are all important aspects of the natural gas cycle—the process of getting natural gas out of the ground and to the end user. In the oil industry, some underground crude oil contains natural gas that is entrained in the oil at high reservoir pressures. When oil is removed from the reservoir, associated natural gas is produced.

Methane emissions occur throughout the natural gas industry. They primarily result from normal operations, routine

maintenance, fugitive leaks, and system upsets. As gas moves through the system, emissions occur through intentional venting and unintentional leaks. Venting can occur through equipment design or operational practices, such as the continuous bleed of gas from pneumatic controllers (that control gas flows, levels, temperatures, and pressures in the equipment), or venting from well completions during production. In addition to vented emissions, methane losses can occur from leaks (also referred to as fugitive emissions) in all parts of the infrastructure, from connections

between pipes and vessels, to valves and equipment.

In petroleum systems, methane emissions result primarily from field production operations, such as venting of associated gas from oil wells, oil storage tanks, and production-related equipment such as gas dehydrators, pig traps, and pneumatic devices.

Tables 4 (a) and (b) below present total methane emissions from natural gas and petroleum systems, and the associated segments of the sector, for years 1990, 2005, and 2014, in MMT CO₂ Eq. (Table 4 (a)) and kilotons (or thousand metric tons) of methane (Table 4 (b)).

TABLE 4(a)—UNITED STATES METHANE EMISSIONS FROM NATURAL GAS AND PETROLEUM SYSTEMS
[MMT CO₂]

Sector	1990	2005	2014
Oil and Natural Gas Production and Natural Gas Processing and Transmission (<i>Total</i>)	201	203	232
Natural Gas Production	83	108	109
Natural Gas Processing	21	16	24
Natural Gas Transmission and Storage	59	31	32
Petroleum Production	38	48	67

Emissions from the Inventory of United States Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2014 (published April 15, 2016), calculated using GWP of 25. Note: Totals may not sum due to rounding.

⁵³ IPCC, 2013: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex

and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1535pp.

⁵⁴ Other sources include remaining natural gas distribution, petroleum transport and petroleum

refineries, forest land, wastewater treatment, rice cultivation, stationary combustion, abandoned coal mines, petrochemical production, mobile combustion, composting, and several sources emitting less than 1 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 2013.

TABLE 4(b)—UNITED STATES METHANE EMISSIONS FROM NATURAL GAS AND PETROLEUM SYSTEMS
[kt CH₄]

Sector	1990	2005	2014
Oil and Natural Gas Production and Natural Gas Processing and Transmission (<i>Total</i>)	8,049	8,131	9,295
Natural Gas Production	3,335	4,326	4,359
Natural Gas Processing	852	655	960
Natural Gas Transmission and Storage	2,343	1,230	1,282
Petroleum Production	1,519	1,921	2,694

Emissions from the Inventory of United States Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2014 (published April 15, 2016), in kt (1,000 tons) of CH₄. Note: Totals may not sum due to rounding.

2. United States Oil and Natural Gas Production and Natural Gas Processing and Transmission GHG Emissions Relative to Total United States GHG Emissions

Relying on data from the United States GHG Inventory, we compared

United States oil and natural gas production and natural gas processing and transmission GHG emissions to total United States GHG emissions as an indication of the role this source plays in the total domestic contribution to the air pollution that is causing climate

change. In 2014, total United States GHG emissions from all sources were 6,871 MMT CO₂ Eq.

TABLE 5—COMPARISONS OF UNITED STATES OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION AND NATURAL GAS PROCESSING AND TRANSMISSION CH₄ EMISSIONS TO TOTAL UNITED STATES GHG EMISSIONS

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Total U.S. Oil & Gas Production and Natural Gas Processing & Transmission methane Emissions (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	207.0	214.3	218.8	228.0	232.4
Share of Total U.S. GHG Inventory	3.0%	3.1%	3.3%	3.4%	3.4%
Total U.S. GHG Emissions (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	6,985	6,865	6,643	6,800	6,870

Emissions from the Inventory of United States Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2014 (published April 15, 2016), calculated using CH₄ GWP of 25. Note: Totals may not sum due to rounding.

In 2014, emissions from oil and natural gas production sources and natural gas processing and transmission sources accounted for 232.4 MMT CO₂ Eq. methane emissions (using a GWP of 25 for methane), accounting for 3.4 percent of total United States domestic GHG emissions. The natural gas and petroleum systems source is the largest emitter of methane in the United States.

The sector also emitted 43 MMT of CO₂, mainly from acid gas removal during natural gas processing (24 MMT) and flaring in oil and natural gas production (18 MMT). In total, these emissions (CH₄ and CO₂) account for 4.0 percent of total United States domestic GHG emissions.

Methane is emitted in significant quantities from the oil and natural gas production sources and natural gas

processing and transmission sources that are being addressed within this rule.

3. United States Oil and Natural Gas Production and Natural Gas Processing and Transmission GHG Emissions Relative to Total Global GHG Emissions

TABLE 6—COMPARISONS OF UNITED STATES OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION AND NATURAL GAS PROCESSING AND TRANSMISSION CH₄ EMISSIONS TO TOTAL GLOBAL GHG EMISSIONS

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Total U.S. Oil & Gas Production and Natural Gas Processing & Transmission methane Emissions (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	207.0	214.3	218.8	228.0	232.4
Share of Total U.S. GHG Inventory	3.0%	3.1%	3.3%	3.4%	3.4%
Total U.S. GHG Emissions (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	6,985	6,865	6,643	6,800	6,870

Emissions from the Inventory of United States Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2014 (published April 15, 2016), calculated using CH₄ GWP of 25.

For additional background information and context, we used 2012 World Resources Institute/Climate Analysis Indicators Tool (WRI/CAIT) and International Energy Agency (IEA) data to make comparisons between United States oil and natural gas production and natural gas processing and transmission emissions and the emissions inventories of entire countries

and regions. Though the United States methane emissions from oil and natural gas production and natural gas processing and transmission are a seemingly small fraction (0.5 percent) of total global emissions of all GHG from all sources, ranking United States emissions of methane from oil and natural gas production and natural gas processing and transmission against

total GHG emissions for entire countries (using 2012 WRI/CAIT data), shows that these emissions are comparatively large as they exceed the national-level emissions totals for all GHG and all anthropogenic sources for Greece, the Czech Republic, Chile, Belgium, and

about 150 other countries.⁵⁵ Furthermore, United States emissions of methane from oil and natural gas

production and natural gas processing and transmission are greater than the sum of total emissions of 54 of the

lowest-emitting countries, using the 2012 WRI/CAIT data set.⁵⁶
4. Global GHG Emissions

TABLE 7—COMPARISONS OF UNITED STATES OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION AND NATURAL GAS PROCESSING AND TRANSMISSION CH₄ EMISSIONS TO TOTAL GLOBAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IN 2012

	2012 (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	Total U.S. oil and natural gas production and natural gas processing and transmission share (%)
Total Global GHG Emissions	44,816	0.5

As illustrated by the domestic and global GHG comparison data summarized above, the collective GHG emissions from the oil and natural gas source category are significant, whether the comparison is domestic (where this sector is the largest source of methane emissions, accounting for 32 percent of United States methane and 3.4 percent of total United States emissions of all GHG), global (where this sector, while accounting for 0.5 percent of all global GHG emissions, emits more than the total national emissions of over 150 countries, and combined emissions of over 50 countries), or when both the domestic and global GHG emissions comparisons are viewed in combination. Consideration of the global context is important. GHG emissions from United States oil and natural gas production and natural gas processing and transmission will become globally well-mixed in the atmosphere, and thus will have an effect on the United States regional climate, as well as the global climate as a whole for years and indeed many decades to come.

As was the case in 2009, no single GHG source category dominates on the global scale. While the oil and natural gas source category, like many (if not all) individual GHG source categories, could appear small in comparison to total emissions, in fact, it is a very important contributor in terms of both absolute emissions, and in comparison to other source categories globally or within the United States.

5. VOC Emissions

The EPA National Emissions Inventory (NEI) estimated total VOC emissions from the oil and natural gas sector to be 2,729,942 tons in 2011. This ranks second of all the sectors estimated by the NEI and first of all the

anthropogenic sectors in the NEI. These facts only serve to further the notion that emissions from the oil and natural gas sector contribute significantly to harmful air pollution.

6. SO₂ Emissions

The NEI estimated total SO₂ emissions from the oil and natural gas sector to be 74,266 tons in 2011. This ranks 13th of the sectors estimated by the NEI. Again, it is clear that emissions from the oil and natural gas sector contribute significantly to dangerous air pollution.

7. Conclusion

In summary, the 1979 Priority List broadly covers the oil and natural gas industry, including the production, processing, transmission, and storage of natural gas. As such, the 1979 Priority List covers all segments that we are regulating in this rule. To the extent that there is any ambiguity in the prior listing, the EPA hereby finalizes as an alternative its proposed revision of the category listing to broadly include the oil and natural gas industry. As revised, the listed oil and natural gas source category includes oil⁵⁷ and natural gas production, processing, transmission, and storage. Pursuant to CAA section 111(b)(1)(A), the Administrator has determined that, in her judgment, this source category, as defined above, contributes significantly to air pollution that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. In support, the EPA notes its previous determination under CAA section 111(b)(1)(A) for the oil and natural gas source category. In addition, the EPA provides in this section information and analyses detailing the public health and welfare impacts of GHG, VOC and SO₂ emissions and the amount of these

emission from the oil and natural gas source category (in particular from the various segments of the natural gas industry). Although the EPA does not believe the revision to the category listing is required for the standards we are promulgating in this action, even assuming it is, the revision is well justified.

D. Establishing GHG Standards in the Form of Limitations on Methane Emissions

A petition for reconsideration of the 2012 NSPS urged that “EPA must reconsider its failure to adopt standards for the methane pollution released by the oil and gas sector.”⁵⁸ Upon reconsidering the issue, and with the benefit of additional information now available to us, the EPA is establishing GHG standards, in the form of limitations on methane emissions, throughout the oil and natural gas source category.

During the 2012 oil and natural gas NSPS rulemaking, we had a considerable amount of data and a good understanding of VOC emissions from the oil and natural gas industry and the available control options, but data on methane emissions were just emerging at that time. In light of the rapid expansion of this industry and the growing concern with the associated emissions, the EPA proceeded to establish a number of VOC standards in the 2012 NSPS, while indicating in the 2012 rulemaking an intent to revisit methane at a later date when additional information was available from the GHGRP.

We have since received and evaluated considerable additional data, which confirms that the oil and natural gas industry is one of the largest emitters of methane in the United States. As

⁵⁵ WRI CAIT Climate Data Explorer. <http://cait.wri.org/>. Accessed March 30, 2016.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ For the oil industry, the listing includes production, as explained above in footnote 27.

⁵⁸ Sierra Club et al., Petition for Reconsideration, In the Matter of: Final Rule Published at 77 FR 49490 (August 16, 2012), titled “Oil and Gas Sector:

New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Reviews: Final Rule,” Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505, RIN 2060-AP76 (2012).

discussed in more detail in section IV.C of this preamble above, the current methane emissions from this industry contribute substantially to nationwide GHG emissions. And these emissions are expected to increase as a result of the rapid growth of this industry.

While the controls used to meet the VOC standards in the 2012 NSPS also reduce methane emissions incidentally, in light of the current and projected future GHG emissions from the oil and natural gas industry, reducing GHG emissions from this source category should not be treated simply as an incidental benefit to VOC reduction; rather, it is something that should be directly addressed through GHG standards in the form of limits on methane emissions under CAA section 111(b) based on direct evaluation of the extent and impact of GHG emissions from this source category and the emission reductions that can be achieved through the best system for their reduction. The standards detailed in this final action will achieve meaningful GHG reductions and will be an important step towards mitigating the impact of GHG emissions on climate change.

In addition, while many of the currently regulated emission sources are equipment used throughout the oil and natural gas industry (*e.g.*, pneumatic controllers, compressors) that emit both VOCs and methane, the VOC standards established in the 2012 NSPS apply only to the equipment located in the production and processing segments. As explained in the 2012 final rule, while our analysis suggested that the remaining pieces of equipment (*i.e.*, those in the transmission and storage segments) are also important to regulate, given the large number of these pieces of equipment and the relatively low level of VOC from individual equipment, the EPA decided that further evaluation is appropriate before taking final action. 77 FR 49490, 49521–2 (August 16, 2012). Based on its analyses in the current rulemaking, the EPA is taking final action to regulate VOC emitted from these remaining pieces of equipment. In addition, the EPA is setting GHG standards (by setting limitations on methane) for these pieces of equipment across the industry. As shown in the TSD, there are cost-effective controls that can simultaneously reduce both methane and VOC emissions from these equipment across the industry, and in many instances, they are cost effective even if all the costs are attributed to

methane reduction.⁵⁹ Moreover, in addition to the reductions to be achieved, establishing both GHG and VOC standards for equipment across the industry will also promote consistency by providing the same regulatory regime for this equipment throughout the oil and natural gas source category for both VOC and GHG, thereby facilitating implementation and enforcement.⁶⁰ Therefore, based on the EPA's evaluation of methane reduction to address the impact of GHGs on climate change in conjunction with VOC reduction, the oil and gas NSPS, as finalized in this action, includes both VOC and GHG standards (in the form of limitations on methane) for a number of equipment across the oil and natural gas industry. It also includes VOC and GHG standards for a number of previously unregulated sources (*i.e.*, oil well completions, fugitive emissions at well sites and compressor stations, and pneumatic pumps).

With respect to the GHG standards contained in this final rule, the EPA identifies the air pollutant as the pollutant GHGs. However, the standards in this rule that are specific to GHGs are expressed in the form of limits on emissions of methane, and not the other constituent gases of the air pollutant GHGs.⁶¹ In this action, we are not establishing a limit on aggregate GHGs or separate emission limits for other GHGs that are not methane. This rule focuses on methane because, among other reasons, it is a GHG that is emitted in large quantities from the oil and gas industry, as explained above in section IV.C of this preamble. Notwithstanding this form of the standard, consistent

⁵⁹ In this action, we evaluated the controls under different approaches, including a single pollutant approach and a multi-pollutant approach, which are described in detail in the preamble to the proposed rule and the final TSD. Under a single pollutant approach, we attribute all costs to one pollutant and zero to the other.

⁶⁰ While this final rule will result in additional reductions, as specified in sections II and IX of this preamble, the EPA often revises standards even where the revision will not lead to any additional reductions of a pollutant because another standard regulates a different pollutant using the same control equipment. For example, in 2014, the EPA revised the Kraft Pulp Mill NSPS in 40 CFR part 60 subpart BB published at 70 FR 18952 (April 4, 2014) to align the NSPS standards with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) standards for those sources in 40 CFR part 63, subpart S. Although no previously unregulated sources were added to the Kraft Pulp Mill NSPS, several emission limits were adjusted downward. The revised NSPS did not achieve additional reductions beyond those achieved by the NESHAP, but aligning the NSPS with the NESHAP eased the compliance burden for the sources.

⁶¹ In the 2009 GHG Endangerment Finding, the EPA defined the relevant "air pollution" as the atmospheric mix of six long-lived and directly emitted GHGs: CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆. 74 FR 66497, December 15, 2009.

with other EPA regulations addressing GHGs, the air pollutant regulated in this rule is GHGs; methane is limited as a constituent of the regulated pollutant, GHGs, not as a separate pollutant. This approach is consistent with the approach EPA followed in setting limits for new electric generating units.⁶² Additional regulatory language has been added to 40 CFR 60.5360a to clarify and confirm that GHGs is the regulated pollutant.

The EPA's authority for regulating GHGs in this rule is CAA section 111(b)(1). As discussed above, under the statutory structure of CAA section 111(b), the Administrator first lists source categories pursuant to CAA section 111(b)(1)(A), and then promulgates, under CAA section 111(b)(1)(B), "standards of performance for new sources within such category."

In this rule, the EPA is establishing standards under CAA section 111(b)(1)(B) for a source category that it has previously listed and regulated for other pollutants and which now is being regulated for an additional pollutant.⁶³ Because of this, there are two aspects of CAA section 111(b)(1) that warrant particular discussion.

First, because the EPA is not listing a new source category in this rule,⁶⁴ the EPA is not required to make a new endangerment finding with regard to the oil and natural gas source category in order to establish standards of performance for an additional pollutant from those sources. Under the plain language of CAA section 111(b)(1)(A), an endangerment finding is required only to list a source category. Though the endangerment finding is based on determinations as to the health or welfare impacts of the pollution to which the source category's pollutants contribute, and as to the significance of the amount of such contribution, the statute is clear that the endangerment

⁶² See 80 FR 64510 (October 23, 2015).

⁶³ As explained in more detail in section IV.A of this preamble, the EPA interprets the 1979 category listing to broadly cover the oil and natural gas industry. Thus, this discussion focuses on EPA's authority to regulate an additional pollutant (specifically GHG) emitted from a previously listed source category. However, to the extent that any ambiguity exists in the 1979 listing, and as also explained above, EPA is finalizing its alternative proposal to revise the category listing to broadly cover the oil and natural gas industry. In support, the Administrator has determined in this action, pursuant to CAA section 111(b)(1)(A), that the listed source category, as defined in the revision, contributes significantly to air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. Therefore, the category listing and the Administrator's determination (to the extent they are necessary) provide authority for standards we are promulgating in this final rule, including the standards for GHG.

⁶⁴ See section IV.A of this preamble.

finding is made with respect to the source category; CAA section 111(b)(1)(A) does not provide that an endangerment finding is made as to specific pollutants. This contrasts with other CAA provisions that do require the EPA to make endangerment findings for each particular pollutant that the EPA regulates under those provisions (e.g., CAA sections 202(a)(1), 211(c)(1), 231(a)(2)(A)). See *American Electric Power v. Connecticut*, 131 S. Ct. 2527, 2539 (2011) (“the Clean Air Act directs EPA to establish emissions standards for categories of stationary sources that, ‘in [the Administrator’s] judgment,’ ‘caus[e], or contribut[e] significantly to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.’ § 7411(b)(1)(A).”) (emphasis added).

Second, once a source category is listed, the CAA does not specify what pollutants should be the subject of standards from that source category. The statute, in CAA section 111(b)(1)(B) simply directs the EPA to propose and then promulgate regulations “establishing Federal standards of performance for new sources within such category.” In the absence of specific direction or enumerated criteria in the statute concerning what pollutants from a given source category should be the subject of standards, it is appropriate for the EPA to exercise its authority to adopt a reasonable interpretation of this provision. *Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. NRDC*, 467 U.S. 837, 843–44 (1984).⁶⁵

The EPA has previously interpreted this provision as granting it the discretion to determine which pollutants should be regulated. See *Standards of Performance for Petroleum Refineries*, 73 FR 35838, 35858 (June 24, 2008) (concluding the statute provides “the Administrator with significant flexibility in determining which pollutants are appropriate for regulation under section 111(b)(1)(B)” and citing cases). Further, in directing the Administrator to propose and promulgate regulations under CAA section 111(b)(1)(B), Congress provided that the Administrator should take comment and then finalize the standards with such modifications “as [s]he deems appropriate.” The D.C. Circuit has considered similar statutory phrasing from CAA section 231(a)(3)

⁶⁵ In *Chevron*, the United States Supreme Court held that an agency must, at Step 1, determine whether Congress’s intent as to the specific matter at issue is clear, and, if so, the agency must give effect to that intent. If Congressional intent is not clear, then, at Step 2, the agency has discretion to fashion an interpretation that is a reasonable construction of the statute.

and concluded that “[t]his delegation of authority is both explicit and extraordinarily broad.” *National Assoc. of Clean Air Agencies v. EPA*, 489 F.3d 1221, 1229 (D.C. Cir. 2007).

In exercising its discretion with respect to which pollutants are appropriate for regulation under CAA section 111(b)(1)(B), the EPA has in the past provided a rational basis for its decisions. See *National Lime Assoc. v. EPA*, 627 F.2d 416, 426 & n.27 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (court discussed, but did not review, the EPA’s reasons for not promulgating standards for NO_x, SO₂, and CO from lime plants); *Standards of Performance for Petroleum Refineries*, 73 FR 35859–60 (June 24, 2008) (providing reasons why the EPA was not promulgating GHG standards for petroleum refineries as part of that rule). Though these previous examples involved the EPA providing a rational basis for not setting standards for a given pollutant, a similar approach is appropriate where the EPA determines that it should set a standard for an additional pollutant for a source category that was previously listed and regulated for other pollutants. The EPA took this approach in setting limits for new electric generating units.⁶⁶ The EPA interprets CAA section 111(b)(1)(B) to provide authority to establish a standard for performance for any pollutant emitted by that source category as long as the EPA has a rational basis for setting a standard for the pollutant. In making such determination, we have generally considered a number of factors to help inform our decision. These include the amount of the pollutant that is being emitted from the source category, the availability of technically feasible control options, and the costs of those control options.⁶⁷

In this rulemaking, the EPA has a rational basis for concluding that GHGs from the oil and natural gas source category, which is a large category of sources of GHG emissions, merit regulation under CAA section 111. In making this determination, the EPA focuses on methane emissions from this category. The information summarized here and discussed in other sections of this preamble provides the rational basis for the GHG standards, expressed as limitations on methane, established in this action.⁶⁸

In 2009, the EPA made a finding that GHG air pollution may reasonably be

⁶⁶ 80 FR 64510, 64529–30, October 23, 2015.

⁶⁷ See 80 FR 56593, 56600–09. (section VI of the proposed rule) and 56616–45, September 18, 2015 (section VIII of the proposed rule).

⁶⁸ Specifically, Sections IV.B and C, V, and VI of this final rule.

anticipated to endanger public health or welfare under section 202(a) of the CAA⁶⁹ and, in 2010, the EPA denied petitions to reconsider that finding. The EPA extensively reviewed the available science concerning GHG pollution and its impacts in taking those actions. In 2012, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld the finding and the denial of petitions to reconsider.⁷⁰ In addition, assessments released by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the USGCRP, and the NRC, and other organizations published after 2010 lend further credence to the validity of the 2009 Endangerment Finding. No information that commenters have presented or that the EPA has reviewed provides a basis for reaching a different conclusion for purposes of this action. Indeed, current and evolving science discussed in detail in sections IV.B and C of this preamble is confirming and enhancing our understanding of the near- and longer-term impacts that elevated concentrations of GHGs, including methane, are having on Earth’s climate and the adverse public health, welfare, and economic consequences that are occurring and are projected to occur as a result.

Moreover, the high quantities of methane emissions from the oil and natural gas source category demonstrate that it is rational for the EPA to set methane limitations to regulate GHG emissions from this sector. The oil and natural gas source category is the largest emitter of methane in the United States, contributing about 29 percent of total United States methane emissions. The methane that this source category emits accounts for 3 percent of all United States GHG emissions. As shown in Tables 4 and 5 in this preamble, oil and gas sources are very large emitters of methane: In fact, GWP-weighted emissions of methane from these sources are larger than emissions of all GHGs from about 150 countries. Methane is a GHG with a global warming potential 28 to 36 times greater than that of CO₂.⁷¹ When considered in

⁶⁹ 74 FR 66496 (December 15, 2009).

⁷⁰ *Coalition for Responsible Regulation v. EPA*, 684 F.3d 102, 119–126 (D.C. Circuit 2012).

⁷¹ IPCC, 2013: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1535 pp. Note that for purposes of inventories and reporting, GWP values from the 4th Assessment Report may be used. For the purposes of calculating GHG emissions, the GWP value

total, the facts presented in sections IV.B and C of this preamble, along with prior EPA analysis, including that found in the 2009 Endangerment Finding, provide a rational basis for regulating GHG emissions from affected oil and gas sources by expressing GHG limitations in the form of limits on methane emissions.

To reiterate, the “air pollution” defined in the 2009 Endangerment Finding is the atmospheric mix of six long-lived and directly emitted GHGs: CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆.⁷² This is the same pollutant that is regulated by this rule. However, the standards of performance adopted in the present rulemaking address only one constituent gas of this air pollution: Methane. This is reasonable, given that methane is the constituent gas emitted in the largest volume by the source category and for which there are available controls that are technically feasible and cost effective. There is no requirement that standards of performance address each component of an air pollutant. Clean Air Act section 111(b)(1)(B) requires the EPA to establish “standards of performance” for listed source categories, and the definition of “standard of performance” in CAA section 111(a)(1) does not specify which air pollutants must be controlled. So, while the limitations in this rule are expressed as limits on methane, the pollutant regulated is GHGs.

Some commenters have argued that the EPA is required to make a new endangerment finding before it may set limitations for methane from the oil and natural gas source category. We disagree, for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, even if CAA section 111 required the EPA to make an endangerment finding as a prerequisite for this rulemaking, then, the information and conclusions described above in sections IV.B and C of this preamble should be considered to constitute the requisite finding (which includes a finding of endangerment as well as a cause-or-contribute significantly finding). The same facts that support our rational basis determination would support such a finding. The EPA’s rational basis for regulating GHGs, by setting methane limitations, under CAA section 111 is based primarily on the analysis and conclusions in the EPA’s 2009 Endangerment Finding and 2010 denial of petitions to reconsider that Finding, coupled with the subsequent

assessments from the IPCC, USGCRP, and NRC that describe scientific developments since those EPA actions and other facts contained herein.

More specifically, our approach here—reflected in the information and conclusions described above—is substantially similar to that reflected in the 2009 Endangerment Finding and the 2010 denial of petitions to reconsider. The D.C. Circuit upheld that approach in *Coalition for Responsible Regulation v. EPA*, 684 F.3d 102, 117–123 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (noting, among other things, the “substantial . . . body of scientific evidence marshaled by EPA in support of the Endangerment Finding” (id. at 120); the “substantial record evidence that anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases very likely caused warming of the climate over the last several decades” (id. at 121); “substantial scientific evidence . . . that anthropogenically induced climate change threatens both public health and public welfare . . . [through] extreme weather events, changes in air quality, increases in food- and water-borne pathogens, and increases in temperatures” (id.); and “substantial evidence . . . that the warming resulting from the greenhouse gas emissions could be expected to create risks to water resources and in general to coastal areas. . . .” (id.)). The facts, unfortunately, have only grown stronger and the potential adverse consequences of GHG to public health and the environment more dire in the interim.⁷³ The facts also demonstrate

⁷³ Nor does the EPA consider the cost of potential standards of performance in making this finding. Like the endangerment finding under section 202(a) at issue in *State of Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497 (2007), the pertinent issue is a scientific inquiry as to whether an endangerment to public health or welfare from the relevant air pollution may reasonably be anticipated. Where, as here, the scientific inquiry conducted by the EPA indicates that these statutory criteria are met, the Administrator does not have discretion to decline to make a positive endangerment finding to serve other policy grounds. Id. at 532–35. In this regard, an endangerment finding is analogous to setting national ambient air quality standards under CAA section 109(b), which similarly call on the Administrator to set standards that in her “judgment” are “requisite to protect the public health”. The EPA is not permitted to consider potential costs of implementation in setting these standards. *Whitman v. American Trucking Assn’s*, 531 U.S. 457, 466 (2001); see also *Michigan v. EPA*, U.S. (no. 14–46, June 29, 2015) slip op. pp. 10–11 (reiterating *Whitman* holding). The EPA notes further that section 111(b)(1) contains no terms such as “necessary and appropriate” which could suggest (or, in some contexts, require) that costs may be considered as part of the finding. Compare CAA section 112(n)(1)(A); see *State of Michigan*, slip op. pp. 7–8. The EPA, of course, must consider costs in determining whether a best system of emission reduction is adequately demonstrated and so can form the basis for a section 111(b) standard of performance, and the EPA has carefully

that the current methane emissions from oil and natural gas production sources and natural gas processing and transmission sources contribute substantially to nationwide GHG emissions.

The EPA also reviewed comments presenting other scientific information to determine whether that information has any meaningful impact on our analysis and conclusions. For both the rational basis analysis and for any endangerment finding, assuming for the sake of argument that one would be necessary for this final rule, the EPA focused on public health and welfare impacts within the United States, as it did in the 2009 Endangerment Finding. The impacts in other world regions strengthen the case because impacts in other world regions can in turn adversely affect the United States and its citizens.⁷⁴

Lastly, EPA identified technically feasible and cost effective controls that can be applied nationally to reduce methane emissions and, thus, GHG emissions, from the oil and natural gas source category.

The EPA considered whether the costs (e.g., capital costs, operating costs) are reasonable considering the emission reductions achieved through application of the controls required. For a detailed discussion on how we evaluated control costs and our cost analysis for individual emission sources, please see the proposal and the final TSD in the public docket.

V. Summary of Final Standards

This section presents a summary of the specific standards we are finalizing for various types of equipment and emission points. More details of the rationale for these standards and requirements, including alternative compliance options and exemptions to the standards, are provided in sections VI, VII, and VIII of this preamble, the TSD, and the RTC document in the public docket.

A. Control of GHG and VOC Emissions in the Oil and Natural Gas Source Category—Overview

In this action, the EPA is finalizing emission standards for GHG, in the form of limitations on methane, and VOC

considered costs here and found them to be reasonable. See sections V and VI below. The EPA also has found that the rule’s quantifiable benefits exceed regulatory costs under a range of assumptions were new capacity to be built. See RIA. Accordingly, this endangerment finding would be justified if (against our view) it is both required, and (again, against our view) costs are to be considered as part of the finding.

⁷⁴ See 74 FR 66514 and 66535, December 15, 2009.

published on Table A–1 to subpart A of 40 CFR part 98 should still be used.

⁷² See 74 FR 66496, 66497 (December 15, 2009).

emissions, for certain new, modified and reconstructed emission sources across the oil and natural gas source category at subpart OOOOa. For some of these sources, there are VOC requirements currently in place that were established in the 2012 NSPS, and we are now establishing GHG limitations for those emission points. For others, for which there are no current requirements, we are finalizing both GHG and VOC standards. We are also finalizing improvements to enhance implementation of the current standards at subpart OOOO. For the reasons explained in the previous section, the EPA believes that GHG standards, in the form of limitations on methane, are warranted, even for those already subject to VOC standards under the 2012 NSPS. Further, as shown in the final TSD, there are cost effective controls that achieve simultaneous reductions of GHG and VOC emissions.

Pursuant to CAA section 111(b), we are both amending subpart OOOO and adding a new subpart, OOOOa. We are amending subpart OOOO, which applies to facilities constructed, modified or reconstructed after August 23, 2011, (*i.e.*, the original proposal date of subpart OOOO) and on or before September 18, 2015 (*i.e.*, the proposal date of the new subpart OOOOa), and is amended only to include the revisions reflecting implementation improvements in response to issues raised in petitions for reconsideration. We are adding subpart OOOOa, which will apply to facilities constructed, modified or reconstructed after September 18, 2015, to include current VOC requirements already provided in subpart OOOO (as updated) as well as new provisions for GHGs and VOCs across the oil and natural gas source category as highlighted below in this section.

As the purpose of this action is to control and limit emissions of GHG and VOC, EPA seeks to confirm that all regulatory standards are met. Any owner or operator claiming technical infeasibility, nonapplicability, or exemption from the regulation has the burden to demonstrate the claim is reasonable based on the relevant information. In any subsequent review of a technical infeasibility or nonapplicability determination, or a claimed exemption, EPA will independently assess the basis for the claim to ensure flaring is limited and emissions are minimized, in compliance with the rule. Well-designed rules ensure fairness among industry competitors and are essential to the success of future enforcement efforts.

B. Centrifugal Compressors

We are finalizing amendments to the 2012 NSPS, and adding new requirements to establish both VOC and GHG standards (in the form of limitations on methane emissions) for new, modified or reconstructed wet seal centrifugal compressors located across the oil and natural gas source category. Specifically, the final rule adds GHG standards to the current VOC standards for wet seal centrifugal compressors, as well as establishing GHG and VOC standards for those that are currently unregulated, with one exception. We are not establishing requirements for centrifugal compressors at well sites. As finalized, the standards require a 95 percent reduction of the emissions from each wet seal centrifugal compressor affected facility. The standard can be achieved by capturing and routing the emissions, using a cover and closed vent system, to a control device that achieves an emission reduction of 95 percent, or routing to a process.

C. Reciprocating Compressors

We are finalizing amendments to the 2012 NSPS and adding new requirements to establish both VOC and GHG standards (in the form of limitations on methane emissions) for new, modified, or reconstructed reciprocating compressors located across the oil and natural gas source category. Specifically, the final rule adds GHG standards to the current VOC standards for reciprocating compressors, as well as establishing GHG and VOC standards for those that are currently unregulated, with one exception. We are not establishing requirements for reciprocating compressors at well sites. The standards, which are operational standards, require either replacement of the rod packing based on usage or routing of rod packing emissions to a process via a closed vent system under negative pressure. The owner or operator of a reciprocating compressor affected facility is required to monitor the duration (in hours) that the compressor is operated, beginning on the date of initial startup of the reciprocating compressor affected facility. On or before 26,000 hours of operation, the owner or operator is required to change the rod packing. Owners or operators can elect to change the rod packing every 36 months in lieu of monitoring compressor operating hours. As an alternative to rod packing replacement, owners and operators may route the rod packing emissions to a process via a closed vent system operated at negative pressure.

D. Pneumatic Controllers

We are finalizing amendments to the 2012 NSPS and adding new requirements to establish both VOC and GHG standards (in the form of limitations on methane emissions) for new, modified, or reconstructed pneumatic controllers located across the oil and natural gas source category. Specifically, the final rule adds GHG standards to the current VOC standards for pneumatic controllers and establishes GHG and VOC standards for those that are currently unregulated. We are finalizing GHG (in the form of limitations on methane emissions) and VOC standards to control emissions by requiring use of low-bleed controllers in place of high-bleed controllers (*i.e.*, natural gas bleed rate not to exceed 6 standard cubic feet per hour (scfh)) at all locations within the source category except for natural gas processing plants. For natural gas processing plants, we are finalizing standards to control GHG and VOC emissions by requiring that pneumatic controllers have a zero natural gas bleed rate (*i.e.*, they are operated by means other than natural gas, such as being driven by compressed instrument air). These standards apply to each newly installed, modified or reconstructed pneumatic controller (including replacement of an existing controller). The finalized standards provide exemptions for certain critical applications based on functional considerations.

E. Pneumatic Pumps

We are finalizing standards for natural gas-driven diaphragm pumps.⁷⁵ The standards require that GHGs (in the form of limitations on methane emissions) and VOC emissions from new, modified and reconstructed natural gas-driven diaphragm pumps located at well sites be reduced by 95 percent if either a control device or the ability to route to a process is already available onsite, unless it is technically infeasible at sites other than new developments (*i.e.*, greenfield sites). In setting this requirement, the EPA recognizes that there may not be a control device or process available onsite. Our analysis shows that it is not cost-effective to require the owner or operator of a pneumatic pump affected facility to install a new control device or process onsite to capture emissions. If a control device or ability to route to a process is not available onsite, the pneumatic pump affected facility is not

⁷⁵ A lean glycol circulation pump that relies on energy exchange with the rich glycol from the contactor is not considered a diaphragm pump. For more details, please see section VI.

subject to the emission reduction provisions of the final rule. In other instances, there may be a control device available onsite, but it may not be capable of achieving a 95 percent reduction. In those cases, we are not requiring the owner or operator to install a new control device onsite or to retrofit the existing control device, however, we are requiring the owner or operator of a pneumatic pump affected facility at a well site to route the emissions to an existing control device even if it achieves a level of emissions reduction less than 95 percent. In those instances, the owner or operator must maintain records demonstrating the percentage reduction that the control device is designed to achieve. In this way, the final rule will achieve emission reductions with regard to pneumatic pump affected facilities even if the only available control device cannot achieve a 95 percent reduction. For pneumatic pumps located at natural gas processing plants, the standards require that GHG and VOC emissions from natural gas-driven diaphragm pumps be zero.

F. Well Completions

We are finalizing GHG standards (in the form of limiting methane emissions) for well completions of hydraulically fractured (or refractured) gas wells as well as GHG and VOC standards for well completions of hydraulically fractured (or refractured) oil wells. As explained in the proposal preamble, the BSER for these emission reductions are the same as the BSER for reducing VOC emissions from hydraulically fractured gas wells. Therefore, the operational standards finalized in this action are essentially the same as the VOC standards for hydraulically fractured gas wells promulgated in the 2012 NSPS. For the reason stated above, the well completion standards in this final rule apply to both gas and oil well completions.

As with gas wells, for well completions of hydraulically fractured (or refractured) oil wells, we identified two subcategories of hydraulically fractured wells for which well completions are conducted: (1) Non-wildcat and non-delineation wells (subcategory 1 wells); and (2) wildcat and delineation wells (subcategory 2 wells). A wildcat well, also referred to as an exploratory well, is a well drilled outside known fields or is the first well drilled in an oil or gas field where no other oil and gas production exists. A delineation well is a well drilled to determine the boundary of a field or producing reservoir.

We are finalizing operational standards for subcategory 1 wells that

require a combination of reduced emissions completion (REC) and combustion. Compared to combustion alone, the combination of REC and combustion will maximize gas recovery and minimize venting to the atmosphere. The finalized standards for subcategory 2 wells require combustion.

For subcategory 1 wells, we define the flowback period of a well completion as consisting of two distinct stages, the “initial flowback stage” and the “separation flowback stage.” The initial flowback stage begins with the onset of flowback and ends when the flowback is routed to a separator. Routing of the flowback to a separator is required as soon as a separator is able to function (*i.e.*, the operator must route the flowback to a separator unless it is technically infeasible for a separator to function). Any gas in the flowback prior to the point at which a separator begins functioning is not subject to control. The point at which the separator can function marks the beginning of the separation flowback stage. During this stage, the operator must do the following, unless technically infeasible to do so as discussed below: (1) Route all salable quality gas from the separator to a gas flow line or collection system; (2) re-inject the gas into the well or another well; (3) use the gas as an onsite fuel source; or (4) use the gas for another useful purpose that a purchased fuel or raw material would serve. If the operator assesses all four options for use of recovered gas, and still finds it technically infeasible to route the gas as described, the operator must route the gas to a completion combustion device with a continuous pilot flame and document the technical infeasibility assessment according to § 60.5420a(c) of this final rule, which describes the specific types of information required to document that the operator has exercised due diligence in making the assessment. No direct venting of gas is allowed during the separation flowback stage unless combustion creates a fire or safety hazard or can damage tundra, permafrost or waterways. The separation flowback stage ends when the well is shut in and the flowback equipment is permanently disconnected from the well or on startup of production. This also marks the end of the flowback period.

The operator has a general duty to safely maximize resource recovery and minimize releases to the atmosphere over the duration of the flowback period. For subcategory 1 wells (except for low gas to oil ratio (GOR) and low pressure wells discussed below), the operator is required to have a separator onsite during the entirety of the

flowback period. The operator is also required to document the stages of the completion operation by maintaining records of (1) the date and time of the onset of flowback; (2) the date and time of each attempt to route flowback to the separator; (3) the date and time of each occurrence in which the operator reverted to the initial flowback stage; (4) the date and time of well shut in; and (5) the date and time that temporary flowback equipment is disconnected. In addition, the operator must document the total duration of venting, combustion and flaring over the flowback period. All flowback liquids during the initial flowback period and the separation flowback period must be routed to a well completion vessel, a storage vessel or a collection system. Because the BSER for oil wells and gas wells are the same, the final rule applies these requirements to both oil and gas wells.

For subcategory 2 wells, we are finalizing an operational standard that requires either (1) routing all flowback directly to a completion combustion device with a continuous pilot flame (which can include a pit flare) or, at the option of the operator, (2) routing the flowback to a well completion vessel and sending the flowback to a separator as soon as a separator will function and then directing the separated gas to a completion combustion device with a continuous pilot flame. For option 2, any gas in the flowback prior to the point when the separator will function is not subject to control. In either case, combustion is not required if combustion creates a fire or safety hazard or can damage tundra, permafrost or waterways. Operators are required to maintain the same records described above for category 1 wells.

As with gas wells, we similarly recognize the limitation of “low pressure” oil wells from conducting REC. Therefore, consistent with the 2012 NSPS, low pressure wells are affected facilities and have the same requirements as subcategory 2 wells (wildcat and delineation wells). We have revised the definition of a “low pressure” well in response to comment.

Further, wells with a GOR of less than 300 scf of gas per stock tank barrel of oil produced are affected facilities, but have no well completion requirements, providing the owner or operator maintains records of the low GOR certification and a claim signed by the certifying official.

We are also retaining the provision from the 2012 NSPS, now at § 60.5365a(a)(1), that a well that is refractured, and for which the well completion operation is conducted

according to the requirements of § 60.5375a(a)(1) through (4), is not considered a modified well and, therefore, does not become an affected facility for purposes of the well completion standards. We point out that such an exclusion of a “well” from applicability under the NSPS has no effect on the affected facility status of the “well site” for purposes of the fugitive emissions standards at § 60.5397a.

G. Fugitive Emissions From Well Sites and Compressor Stations

We are finalizing standards to control GHGs (in the form of limitations on methane emissions) and VOC emissions from fugitive emission components at well sites and compressor stations. Specifically, we are finalizing semiannual monitoring and repair of fugitive emission components at well sites and quarterly monitoring and repair at compressor stations. Monitoring of the components must be conducted using optical gas imaging (OGI), and repairs must be made if any visible emissions are observed. Method 21 may be used as an alternative monitoring method at a repair threshold level at 500 parts per million (ppm). Repairs must be made within 30 days of finding fugitive emissions and a resurvey of the repaired component must be made within 30 days of the repair using OGI or Method 21 at a repair threshold of 500 ppm. A monitoring plan that covers the collection of fugitive emissions components at well sites or compressor stations within a company-defined area must be developed and implemented.

H. Equipment Leaks at Natural Gas Processing Plants

We are finalizing standards to control GHGs (in the form of limitations on methane emissions) from equipment leaks at new, modified or reconstructed natural gas processing plants. These requirements are the same as the VOCs equipment leak requirements in the 2012 NSPS and require the level of control established in NSPS part 60, subpart VVa, including a detection level of 500 ppm for certain pieces of equipment, as in the 2012 NSPS. As with VOC reduction, we believe that subpart VVa level of control reflects the best system of emission reductions for reducing methane emissions.

I. Liquids Unloading Operations

The EPA stated in the proposal that we did not have sufficient information to propose a national standard for

liquids unloading.⁷⁶ However, the EPA requested comment on nationally applicable technologies and techniques that reduce GHG and VOC emissions from these events. Although the EPA received valuable information from the public comment process, the information was not sufficient to finalize a national standard representing BSER for liquids unloading.

Specifically, we requested data and information on the level of GHG and VOC emissions per unloading event, the number of unloading events per year, and the number of wells that perform liquids unloading. In addition, we requested comment on (1) characteristics of the well that play a role in the frequency of liquids unloading events and the level of emissions; (2) demonstrated techniques to reduce the emissions from liquids unloading events, including the use of smart automation and the effectiveness and cost of these techniques; (3) whether there are demonstrated techniques that can be employed on new wells that will reduce the emissions from liquids unloading events in the future; and (4) whether emissions from liquids unloading can be captured and routed to a control device and whether this has been demonstrated in practice.

The EPA received some information pertaining to our request for information. Specifically, the EPA received information on the frequency of unloading and on techniques to reduce emissions through capture or flaring and learned of some operators that have been able to achieve capture in practice. While we have gained better understanding of the practice of liquids unloading, the EPA did not receive the necessary information to identify an emission reduction technology that can be applied across the category of sources. We also considered the possibility of subcategorization. However, according to the information received, the differences in liquids unloading events (with respect to both frequency and emission level) are not due to differences in well size or type of wells at which liquids unloading is performed, but rather the specific conditions of a given well at the time the operator determines that well production is impaired such that unloading must be done. Operators select the technique to perform liquids unloading operations based on the conditions of the well each time production is impaired. Because well conditions change over time, each

iteration of unloading may require repeating a single technique or attempting a different technique that may not have been appropriate under prior conditions. Given the differences in conditions at different wells when liquids unloading must be performed, the EPA did not receive information about techniques, individually or as a group, that helped us to identify a BSER under our CAA section 111(b) authority. The EPA continues to search for better means to address emissions associated with liquids unloading and is including this emissions source in the upcoming information gathering effort.⁷⁷ Please refer to the RTC for additional discussion on liquids unloading.⁷⁸

J. Recordkeeping and Reporting

We are finalizing recordkeeping and reporting requirements that are consistent with those in the current NSPS. The final rule requires owners or operators to submit initial notifications and annual reports, in addition to retaining records to assist in documenting that they are complying with the provisions of the NSPS.

For new, modified, or reconstructed pneumatic controllers, owners and operators are not required to submit an initial notification for each piece of equipment; rather, they must report the installation of these affected facilities in their first annual report following the compliance period during which they were installed. Owners or operators of well affected facilities (consistent with current requirements for gas well affected facilities) are required to submit an initial notification no later than two days prior to the commencement of each well completion operation. This notification must include contact information for the owner or operator, the United States Well Number (formerly the American Petroleum Institute (API) well number), the latitude and longitude coordinates for each well, and the planned date of the beginning of flowback.

In addition, initial annual reports are due no later than 90 days after the end of the initial compliance period, which is established in the rule. Subsequent annual reports are due no later than the same date each year as the initial annual report. The annual reports include information on all affected facilities that were constructed, modified or reconstructed during the previous year. A single report may be submitted covering multiple affected facilities,

⁷⁷ See section III.E of this preamble for a discussion of the upcoming information gathering effort.

⁷⁸ See RTC document in EPA Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505.

⁷⁶ See 80 FR 56614 and 80 FR 56644, September 18, 2015.

provided that the report contains all the information required by § 60.5420a(b). This information includes general information on the company (e.g., company name), as well as information specific to individual affected facilities, such as the well ID associated with the affected facility (e.g., storage vessels) and the facility site name (e.g., “Compressor Station XYZ” or “Tank Battery 123”) and the address of the affected facility.

For well affected facilities, the information required in the annual report includes the location of the well, the United States well number, the date and time of the onset of flowback following hydraulic fracturing or refracturing, the date and time of each attempt to direct flowback to a separator, the date and time of each occurrence of returning to the initial flowback stage, and the date and time that the well was shut in and the flowback equipment was permanently disconnected or the startup of production, the duration of flowback, the duration of recovery to the flow line, duration of the recovery of gas for another useful purpose, duration of combustion, duration of venting, and specific reasons for venting in lieu of capture or combustion. For each well for which a technical infeasibility exemption is claimed, to route the recovered gas to any of the four options specified in § 60.5375a(a)(1)(ii), the report includes the reasons for the claim of technical infeasibility with respect to all four options provided in that subparagraph.

For each well for which an exemption is claimed the owner or operator must maintain records of the low GOR certification and submit a claim signed by the certifying official in the annual report. For each well for which an exemption is claimed for conditions in which combustion may result in a fire hazard or explosion, or where high heat emissions from a completion combustion device may negatively impact tundra, permafrost or waterways, the report should include the location of the well, the United States Well Number, the specific exception claimed, the starting date and ending date for the period the well operated under the exception, and an explanation of why the well meets the claimed exception. The annual report must also include records of deviations where well completions were not conducted according to the applicable standards.

For centrifugal compressor affected facilities, information in the annual report must include an identification of each centrifugal compressor using a wet seal system constructed, modified or

reconstructed during the reporting period, as well as records of deviations in cases where the centrifugal compressor was not operated in compliance with the applicable standards.

For reciprocating compressors, information in the annual report must include the cumulative number of hours of operation or the number of months since initial startup or the previous reciprocating compressor rod packing replacement, whichever is later, or a statement that emissions from the rod packing are being routed to a process through a closed vent system under negative pressure.

Information in the annual report for pneumatic controller affected facilities includes location and documentation of manufacturer specifications of the natural gas bleed rate of each pneumatic controller installed during the reporting period. For pneumatic controllers for which the owner is claiming an exemption from the standards, the annual report includes documentation that the use of a pneumatic controller with a natural gas bleed rate greater than 6 scfh is required and the reasons why. The annual report also includes records of deviations from the applicable standards.

For pneumatic pump affected facilities, information in the annual report includes an identification of each pneumatic pump constructed, modified or reconstructed during the compliance period; if applicable, a certification that no control was available onsite and that there is no ability to route to a process; an identification of any sites that contain pneumatic pumps and installed a control device during the reporting period, where there was previously no control device or ability to route to a process at a site; and records of deviations in cases where the pneumatic pump was not operated in compliance with the applicable standards.

The final rule includes new requirements for monitoring and repairing sources of fugitive emissions at well sites and compressor stations. An owner or operator must submit an annual report, which covers the collection of fugitive emissions components at well sites and compressor stations within an area defined by the company. The report must include the date and time of the surveys completed during the reporting year, the name of the operator performing the survey; the ambient temperature, sky conditions, and maximum wind during the survey; the type of monitoring instrument used; the number and type of components that were found to have fugitive emissions;

the number and type of components that were not repaired during the monitoring survey; the number and type of difficult-to-monitor and unsafe-to-monitor components that were monitored; the date of the successful repair of the fugitive emissions component if it was not repaired during the survey; the number and type of fugitive emission components that were placed on delay of repair and the explanation of why the component could not be repaired and was placed on delay of repair; and the type of monitoring instrument used to resurvey a repaired component that could not be repaired during the initial monitoring survey. If an owner or operator chooses to use Method 21 to conduct the monitoring survey, they are required to keep records that include the type of monitoring instrument used and the fugitive emissions component identification. The owner or operator is required to keep a log for each affected facility. The log must include the date the monitoring survey was performed, the technology used to perform the survey, the number and types of equipment found to have fugitive emissions, a digital photograph or video of the monitoring survey when an OGI instrument is used to perform the monitoring survey, the date or dates of first attempt to repair the source of fugitive emissions, the date of repair of each source of fugitive emissions that could not be repaired during the initial monitoring survey, any source of fugitive emissions found to be technically infeasible or unsafe to repair and an explanation of why the component was placed on delay of repair, a list of the fugitive emissions components that were tagged as a result of not being repaired during the initial monitoring survey, and a digital photograph or video of each untagged fugitive emissions component that could not be repaired during the monitoring survey when the fugitive emissions were initially found. These digital photographs and logs must be available at the affected facility or the field office.

Consistent with the current requirements of subpart OOOO, records must be retained for 5 years and generally consist of the same information required in the initial notification and annual reports. The records may be maintained either onsite or at the nearest field office.

K. Reconsideration Issues Being Addressed

The EPA is finalizing numerous items in subpart OOOO on which we granted reconsideration and proposed changes with some further adjustments as a

result of public comment. To the extent that these items relate to subpart OOOOa, we are also finalizing the same provisions for purposes of consistency between the two rules. First, we are finalizing corrections to the storage vessel control device monitoring and testing provisions related to in-field performance testing of enclosed combustors, initial and ongoing performance testing for any enclosed combustors used to comply with the emissions standard for an affected facility, and consistent requirements for monitoring of visible emissions for all enclosed combustion units. We are also finalizing clarified applicability requirements for storage vessel affected facilities. Next, we are finalizing amendments to include initial compliance requirements for bypass devices and certain closed vent systems and provide an alternative in subpart OOOO. Specifically, the rule allows for either an alarm at the bypass device or a remote alarm. The EPA is not finalizing our proposal to require both forms of alarm under subpart OOOO to avoid retroactive requirements.

Additionally, the EPA is finalizing recordkeeping requirements for repair logs for control devices failing a visible emissions test. We are clarifying the due date for the initial annual report and finalizing that flares used to comply with subpart OOOO are subject to the design and operation requirements in the general provisions. Next, we clarify that the monitoring provisions of subpart VVa applicable to affected units of subpart OOOO do not extend to open-ended valves or lines. We are finalizing clarification to the initial compliance requirement specifically to identify that the 2012 rule already includes a provision similar to subpart KKK. The EPA is finalizing the exemption from the notification required for reconstruction to affected facility pneumatic controllers, centrifugal compressors, and storage vessels in subpart OOOOa. The EPA is finalizing provisions for management of waste from spent carbon canisters. The EPA is finalizing a definition of the term "capital expenditure" in subpart OOOO. The EPA is finalizing an exemption for certain water recycling vessels that EPA did not intend to be affected facility storage vessels under subparts OOOO or OOOOa. By exempting such vessels, EPA will address a disincentive for recycling of water for hydraulic fracturing. Lastly, the EPA is not finalizing continuous control device monitoring requirements for storage vessels and centrifugal compressor affected facilities in subpart OOOO. For

additional discussion of these issues, please refer to section VI of this preamble and the RTC.

L. Technical Corrections and Clarifications

We discovered 22 drafting errors in the proposal and have corrected these errors in the final rule. Please see section VI for a complete list of technical corrections and clarifications.

M. Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Permitting

In the proposed rule, we stated that the pollutant we were proposing to regulate was GHGs, not methane as a separately regulated pollutant. 80 FR 56593, 56600–01 (Sept. 18, 2015). As explained in section VII of this preamble, we are adding provisions to the final rule, analogous to what was included in Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units, 80 FR 64509 (Oct. 23 2015), to make clear in the regulatory text that the pollutant regulated by this rule is GHGs.

N. Final Standards Reflecting Next Generation Compliance and Rule Effectiveness

In making decisions on the final requirements for this rule, we have emphasized the value of requirements that reflect principles of Next Generation Compliance and Rule Effectiveness. EPA's Next Generation Compliance strategy includes designing rules that promote improved compliance and better environmental outcomes. Specifically, we are finalizing standards with the following Next Generation Compliance strategies: (1) Electronic reporting via the EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX), (2) clear applicability criteria (*e.g.*, modification criteria), (3) incentives for intrinsically lower emitting equipment (*e.g.*, solar pumps at gas plants are not affected facilities), (4) OGI technology for monitoring fugitive emissions, (5) digital picture reporting as an alternative for well completions ("REC PIX") and manufacturer installed control devices, (6) qualified professional engineer certification of technical infeasibility to connect a pneumatic pump to an existing control device, and (7) qualified professional engineer certification of closed vent system design. These requirements, or options for compliance, provide opportunities for owners and operators to reduce obligations by making particular choices, reduce the burden for both the regulated industry and the

agencies providing oversight, and provide greater transparency for all parties, including the public.

VI. Significant Changes Since Proposal

This section identifies significant changes in this rule from the proposed rule. These changes reflect the EPA's consideration of over 900,000 comments submitted on the proposal and other information received since the proposal, while preserving the aims underlying the proposal. The final rule protects human health and the environment by improving the existing NSPS and adding emission reduction standards for additional significant sources of GHGs and VOCs, consistent with the CAA. The EPA sought to achieve this important goal by endeavoring, where possible, to consistently expand the 2012 NSPS requirements across the oil and natural gas sector while also accounting for the unique characteristics of each type of source in setting emission reduction requirements. In this section, we discuss the significant changes since proposal by source category and the broad background for those changes. More specific information regarding comments and our responses appears in section VIII and in materials available in the docket.

A. Centrifugal Compressors

For centrifugal compressors, comments and information available led us to finalize the standards as proposed. In the proposed rule, we proposed to require 95 percent reduction of emissions from each centrifugal compressor affected facility. The standard can be achieved by capturing and routing the emissions using a cover and closed vent system to a control device (*i.e.*, combustion control device) that achieves an emission reduction of 95 percent, or by routing the captured emissions to a process. For additional details, please refer to section VIII, the TSD, and the RTC supporting documentation in the public docket.

B. Reciprocating Compressors

For the reciprocating compressors requirements, we are finalizing the standards as proposed, except with a slight modification to the definition of reciprocating compressor rod packing. In the proposed rule, we proposed to require replacement of rod packing on or before 26,000 hours or 3 years of operation, or alternatively to route emissions via a closed vent system under negative pressure. To account for segments of the industry in which reciprocating compressors operate in a pressurized mode for a fraction of the

calendar year, the standard is based on the determination that 26,000 hours of operation are comparable to 3 years of continuous operation.

In the final rule, we revised the definition of reciprocating compressor rod packing. The EPA received comment that the definition of rod packing should be included in the rule to clarify the intent to replace any component of the rod packing that was contributing to emissions from the rod packing assembly. Because we agree that this clarification is useful, we have revised the definition of reciprocating compressor rod packing in the final rule to mean a series of flexible rings in machined metal cups that fit around the reciprocating compressor piston rod to create a seal limiting the amount of compressed natural gas that escapes from the compressor, or any other mechanism that provides the same function of limiting the amount of compressed natural gas that escapes from the compressor. For additional details, please refer to section VIII, the TSD, and the RTC supporting documentation in the public docket.

C. Pneumatic Controllers

For pneumatic controllers, comments and information available led us to finalize the standards as proposed. We proposed to require the use of low-bleed controllers in place of high-bleed controllers (*i.e.*, natural gas bleed rate not to exceed 6 scfh)⁷⁹ at all locations within the source category, except for natural gas processing plants. For natural gas processing plants, the standards require control of GHG and VOC emissions by requiring that pneumatic controllers have a zero natural gas bleed rate (*i.e.*, they are operated by means other than natural gas, such as being driven by compressed instrument air).

The final rule provides that certain pneumatic controllers, reflecting the particular functions they perform, have only tagging and recordkeeping and reporting requirements. As discussed in the proposal, the EPA identified situations where high-bleed controllers (*i.e.*, controllers with a natural gas bleed rate greater than 6 scfh) are necessary because of functional requirements, such as positive actuation or rapid actuation. An example would be controllers used on large emergency shutdown valves on pipelines entering or exiting compressor stations. The 2012 NSPS accounts for this by providing an exemption to pneumatic controllers for which compliance would pose a

functional limitation due to their actuation response time or other operating characteristics. The EPA is finalizing the same exemption for all pneumatic controllers across the source category. For additional details, please refer to section VIII, the TSD, and the RTC supporting documentation in the public docket.

D. Pneumatic Pumps

In the final rule, the EPA is finalizing requirements for pneumatic pumps that use control devices or processes that are already available onsite. At natural gas processing plants, the EPA proposed to require reductions of 100 percent of GHG (in the form of methane) and VOC emissions from all diaphragm pneumatic pumps. For locations other than natural gas processing plants, the EPA proposed to require reductions of 95 percent of GHG (in the form of methane) and VOC emissions from all natural gas-driven diaphragm pumps, if an existing control or process was available.

The public comment process helped us to identify aspects of the proposed requirements that may not be practical or feasible in all cases, and commenters submitted additional information for us to analyze. In this final rule, based on our consideration of the comments received and other relevant information, we have made certain changes to the proposed standards for pneumatic pumps. The final standards require the GHG (in the form of a limitation on methane) and VOC emissions from new, modified, or reconstructed natural gas-driven diaphragm pumps located at well sites to be routed to an available control device or process onsite, unless such routing is technically infeasible at non-greenfield sites. We are not finalizing a technical infeasibility exemption at greenfield sites, where circumstances that could otherwise make control of a pneumatic pump technically infeasible at an existing location can be addressed in the site's design and construction. For pneumatic pumps located at a natural gas processing plant, the final rule requires the GHG (in the form of a limitation on methane) and VOC emissions from natural gas-driven diaphragm pumps to be zero.

While we acknowledge that solar-powered, electrically-powered, and air-driven pumps cannot be employed in all applications, we encourage operators to use pumps other than natural gas-driven pneumatic pumps where their use is technically feasible. To incentivize the use of these alternatives, the final rule's definition of "pneumatic pump affected facility" described in § 60.5365a(h) only includes natural gas-driven pumps.

Pumps that are driven by means other than natural gas are not affected facilities subject to the pneumatic pump provisions of the NSPS and are not subject to any requirements under the final rule.

Provided below are the significant changes since proposal that result from the information in the record and the comments that we received and our rationale for these changes. For additional details, please refer to section VIII, the TSD, and the RTC supporting documentation in the public docket.

1. Piston Pumps

The EPA received several comments concerning the level of GHG and VOC emissions from natural gas-driven pneumatic piston pumps. The comments focused on the small volume of gas discharged by these pumps and the intermittent nature of their use. Other commenters suggested that the EPA treat pneumatic pumps consistently with pneumatic controllers. The commenters state that the same bleed rate considerations should be applied to pneumatic pumps because they are similar devices. Other commenters discussed the technical infeasibility of controlling emissions from piston pumps due to the inability to move such a small and intermittent gas flow through a duct or pipe to a control device.

We agree with commenters that pneumatic controller bleed rate considerations can serve as a useful guide in considering emission reduction requirements for pneumatic pumps. In response to these comments, we further evaluated the natural gas flow rate of pneumatic pumps and agree that piston pumps are inherently low-emitting because of their small size, design, and usage patterns. As discussed in the TSD to the proposed rule, we used natural gas emission rates between 2.2 to 2.5 scf/hr during operation of piston pumps. We determined these emission rates based on a joint report from the EPA and the Gas Research Institute on methane emissions from the natural gas industry. Our analysis of the currently available data, the information in the record, and consideration of public comments lead us to the conclusion that we should exclude piston pumps from coverage under the NSPS based on their inherently low emission rates. This approach is consistent with the manner in which we addressed low-bleed pneumatic controllers. After considering the inherently low emission rates of low-bleed pneumatic controllers, we determined that they should not be subject to the final rule requirements. Similarly, based upon the information

⁷⁹ Low-bleed controllers are not affected facilities under this final rule.

that we have on the low emission rates of piston pumps, we are not establishing requirements for them in this final rule.

We note that our best available emissions data for diaphragm pumps, as discussed in the TSD, indicates that the emission rate ranges from about 20 to 22 scf/hr during operation of a diaphragm pump. Based on our analysis of this data, we do not believe exclusion of diaphragm pumps from the definition of a pneumatic pump affected facility is warranted. As a result, we are retaining requirements for diaphragm pumps in the final rule.

2. Pneumatic Pumps Located in the Gathering and Boosting and Transmission and Storage Segments

We received comment that pneumatic pumps located in the transmission and storage segment generally have very low emissions. Similar to the arguments presented above for piston pumps, commenters contend that these low emission rate pumps should not be subjected to the final rule. In response to these comments, we reviewed our available information used in the proposed rule TSD to estimate the number of pneumatic pumps and the emission rates of these pumps in all segments of the oil and natural gas sector. In the TSD for the final rule, we noted that neither the GHGRP nor the GHG Inventory include data about pneumatic pumps or their emission rates in the natural gas transmission and storage segment. Because we currently have no reliable source of information indicating the prevalence of use of pneumatic pumps in this segment, nor what their emission rates would be if they are used, we are not finalizing pneumatic pump requirements for the transmission and storage segment at this time.

We also reviewed the available GHGRP and GHG Inventory data for pneumatic pumps, which was limited to the production segment. We consider the production segment to include both well sites and the gathering and boosting segment. Our available data indicate that pneumatic pumps are used at well sites as well as emission data for those pumps, but are silent on the prevalence of use of pneumatic pumps in the gathering and boosting segment, and what their emission rates would be if they are used. As with pneumatic pumps in the transmission and storage segment, we are not finalizing pneumatic pump requirements for the gathering and boosting segments at this time because of the lack of information in the record to support finalizing requirements for these pumps.

We note that the EPA is currently conducting a formal process to gather additional data on existing sources in the oil and natural gas sector. We believe that this data collection effort will provide additional information on the use and emissions of pneumatic pumps in the transmission and storage segment and gathering and boosting segment. Once we have obtained and analyzed these data, we will be better equipped to determine whether regulation of pneumatic pumps in the transmission and storage segment and gathering and boosting segment is warranted. See section III.E for more detail regarding the EPA's information collection request for existing sources.

3. Technical Infeasibility

We agree with comments that there may be circumstances, such as insufficient pressure or control device capacity, where it is technically infeasible to capture and route pneumatic pump emissions to a control device or process, and we have made changes in the final rule to include an exemption for these instances. The owner or operator must maintain records of an engineering evaluation and certification providing the basis for the determination that it is technically infeasible to meet the rule requirements. The rule does not allow the operator to claim the technical infeasibility exemption for a pneumatic pump affected facility at a greenfield site (defined as a site, other than a natural gas processing plant, which is entirely new construction), where circumstances that could otherwise make control of a pneumatic pump technically infeasible at an existing location can be addressed in the site's design and construction.

4. Efficiency of Existing Control Devices

As noted above, we are finalizing emission standards for new, modified, and reconstructed natural gas-driven diaphragm pumps located at well sites requiring emissions be reduced by 95 percent if either a control device or the ability to route to a process is already available onsite. In setting this requirement, the EPA recognizes that there may not be a control device or process available onsite. Our analysis shows that it is not cost-effective to require the owner or operator of a pneumatic pump affected facility to install a new control device or process onsite to capture emissions. In those instances, the pneumatic pump affected facility is not subject to the emission reduction provisions of the final rule.

Commenters have also raised concerns, and we agree, that the control device available onsite may not be able

to achieve a 95 percent emission reduction. We evaluated whether this requirement should only be triggered when a NSPS subpart OOOO or OOOOa compliant control device was onsite, which would alleviate the control efficiency concern raised by commenters. However, the EPA is concerned that significant emissions reductions would be lost as a result of limiting the required type of equipment that must be used to control pneumatic pump emissions to only those that are designed to achieve 95 percent emission reductions. We are not requiring the owner or operator to install a new control device on site that is capable of meeting a 95 percent reduction nor are we requiring that the existing control device be retrofitted to enable it to meet the 95 percent reduction requirement. However, we are requiring that the owner or operator of a pneumatic pump affected facility at well sites to route the emissions to an existing control device even if it achieves a level of emissions reduction less than 95 percent. In those instances, the owner or operator must maintain records demonstrating the percentage reduction that the control device is designed to achieve. In this way, the final rule will achieve emission reductions with regard to pneumatic pump affected facilities even if the only available control device on site cannot achieve a 95 percent reduction.

5. Compliance Requirements

In response to concerns about applicability of subpart OOOO or OOOOa compliance requirements, the EPA has clarified our intent in the final rule that existing control devices that are not already subject to subparts OOOO or OOOOa compliance requirements (*i.e.*, control devices that are subject to other federal or state compliance requirements) are not subject to the performance specifications, performance testing, and monitoring requirements in this rule solely because they are controlling pneumatic pump emissions. We believe that control devices covered by other federal, state, or other regulations would be subject to compliance requirements under those provisions and, therefore, we have reasonable assurance that the devices will perform adequately, and we do not need to include existing controls that are not already covered by subparts OOOO and OOOOa under the compliance requirements for these subparts.

6. Cost Analysis

In response to commenters' concerns that the costs were underestimated for compliance with the pneumatic pump

requirements, we revised the cost analysis using the average of our annualized costs and two additional annualized cost estimates provided by commenters.⁸⁰ Commenters' cost estimate methodologies and inputs varied from EPA's cost estimate which prevented us from conducting a side-by-side comparison with our cost estimate, nor could we directly compare the commenters' estimates with one another. However, in order to take into account the cost estimates provided by the commenters, we revised our cost analysis using the average of our annualized costs and the two additional annualized cost estimates provided by commenters. This is the same approach we would have taken had we obtained cost quotes from three separate vendors to install the closed vent system, and which we believe is the most equitable procedure when there is insufficient information to distinguish between the three cost estimates. One commenter gave an estimated capital cost of \$5,800 which is annualized to be \$826. A second commenter gave an estimated capital cost of \$8,500 which annualized to be \$1,210. The proposed capital cost to route emissions through a closed vent system was \$2,000 which when annualized is \$285. Based on our revised cost analysis, the capital cost for routing the emissions to an existing control device or process is \$5,433, and the annualized cost is \$774. We more fully discuss our cost estimate analysis in the TSD.

We evaluated the cost of control for routing emissions to an existing combustion device or process where we assign the cost equally to methane and VOC. For diaphragm pumps at well sites, the cost of reducing methane emissions is \$235 per ton and the cost of reducing VOC emissions is \$847 per ton, using the single-pollutant approach. Based on this revised cost analysis using additional cost information, we find that the cost of control for reducing methane emissions remains reasonable.

7. Affected Facility Definition

The EPA received comment that there was contradictory language in the proposal preamble and regulatory text regarding recordkeeping requirements for pneumatic pumps where no control device was on site. This lack of clarity was the result of the affected facility definition for pneumatic pumps. In the final rule, we have revised the definition to clarify that coverage under this rule is independent of availability of a control device on site. Specifically,

all natural gas-driven diaphragm pumps at natural gas processing plants or well sites are affected facilities, except for pumps at well sites that operate less than 90 days per calendar year. The EPA has revised the final regulatory text to make clear that all pneumatic pumps affected facilities must be reported on the annual report and records maintained as applicable to control status of the pump.

8. Timing of Initial Compliance

The EPA is also finalizing requirements for pneumatic pump affected facilities at natural gas processing plants. The EPA is finalizing GHG and VOC emissions control requirements for pneumatic pump affected facilities at well sites if there is a control device or ability to route to a process available on site or subsequently installed on site. We are also finalizing a technical infeasibility exemption when it is infeasible to route the pneumatic pump to the control device (or route to a process) at non-greenfield sites. An owner or operator applying this exemption must obtain a professional engineering assessment demonstrating the reasons for the exemption.

As pointed out by commenters, the technical infeasibility exemption may be based on safety concerns that could arise when a control device is not designed to handle the additional stream from the pneumatic pump. Commenters also expressed concern about safety issues related to increased pressure on the rest of the closed vent system connected to the control device. In light of these comments, we believe that the proposed 60-day compliance period may be insufficient to identify a qualified professional engineer, obtain the necessary design documents for the existing control device and associated ductwork, evaluate the design documents in light of the increased flow from the pneumatic pump, make an assessment of the technical feasibility of routing the pneumatic pump to the control device, and issue the required certification. Therefore, we are finalizing the compliance period to begin on November 30, 2016 to allow sufficient time for these necessary tasks to be completed.

E. Well Completions

For the well completion requirements, we proposed to require RECs, when technically feasible and in combination with a completion combustion device, for subcategory 1 wells. For subcategory 2 wells, we proposed an operational standard that would require minimization of venting of gas and

hydrocarbon vapors during the completion operation through the use of a completion combustion device, with provisions for venting in lieu of combustion for situations in which combustion would present safety hazards. The proposed rule identified challenging issues for which we solicited comment in order to obtain additional information.

The public comment process helped us to identify aspects of the proposed requirements that in practice may not be practical in all cases, and commenters submitted additional information for us to analyze. In this final rule, based on our consideration of the comments received and other relevant information, we have made certain changes to the proposed standards for well completions. The final rule refines the well completion requirements to reduce emissions and provide clarity for both operators and regulators. The EPA is finalizing well completion standards for hydraulically fractured or refractured wells.⁸¹ The final standards require a combination of REC and combustion at subcategory 1 wells and combustion at subcategory 2 wells and low pressure wells. Provided below are the significant changes since proposal that result from the comments we received and our rationale for these changes. For additional details, please refer to section VIII, the TSD, and the RTC supporting documentation in the public docket.

1. Separator Function

The EPA solicited comment on the use of a separator during flowback and whether a separator can be employed for every well completion. We received several comments identifying situations where a separator cannot function. Specifically, commenters noted instances where a separator cannot function due to very low gas flow from the well, contaminated gas flow, or low reservoir pressure requiring artificial lift techniques. Commenters indicate that because of these scenarios there can be a complete absence of a separation flowback stage during the well completion (which, according to the commenters, can be particularly common in some basins and fields). Commenters asserted that many of these circumstances can be anticipated prior to the onset of flowback. Furthermore, commenters stated that the requirement to have a separator onsite would likely

⁸⁰ See EPA docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505.

⁸¹ As noted earlier in section IV, in 2012 EPA promulgated VOC standards for completions of hydraulically fractured or refractured gas wells. Today's action establishes GHG standards for gas well completions, as well as GHG and VOC standards for hydraulically fractured and refractured oil well completions.

cause the operator to incur a cost with no environmental benefit derived.

We believe that commenters have presented legitimate situations where it would be technically infeasible to use a separator, which is required for performing a REC. The challenge is, however, that the factors that lead to technical infeasibility of a separator to function may not be apparent until the time the well completion occurs, at which time it is too late to provide the equipment and, as a result, the well completion will go forward without controls. Further, the commenters did not provide data, and we do not have sufficient data to consistently and accurately identify the subcategory or types of wells for which these circumstances occur regularly or what criteria would be used as the basis for an exemption to the REC requirement such that a separator would not be required to be onsite for these specific well completions. In order to accommodate these concerns raised by commenters, the final rule requires a separator to be onsite during the entire flowback period for subcategory 1 wells (*i.e.*, non-exploratory or non-delineation wells, also known as development wells), but does not require performance of REC where a separator cannot function. We anticipate a subcategory 1 well to be producing or near other producing wells. We therefore anticipate REC equipment (including separators) to be onsite or nearby, or that any separator brought onsite or nearby can be put to use. For the reason stated above, we do not believe that requiring a separator onsite would incur cost with no environmental benefit.

However, unlike subcategory 1 wells, subcategory 2 wells are in areas where gas composition is likely unknown and, therefore, there is less certainty that a separator can work at these wells. If the separator does not work, there are unlikely subcategory 1 wells nearby that can put the separator to use. For the reasons stated above, we are not requiring that a separator be onsite for the well completion of subcategory 2 wells.

The EPA had proposed that, for subcategory 2 wells and low pressure wells, operators would be required to route flowback to a completion combustion device as soon as the separator was able to function. We had based the proposed requirement for these wells on our determination that BSER was combustion, and efficient combustion using traditional combustion devices could be achieved through separation of the gas from the liquid and solid flowback materials

prior to routing to the completion combustion device.

As discussed in the 2015 proposal, traditional combustion devices (*e.g.*, flares or enclosed combustors) cannot work initially because the flowback following hydraulic fracturing consists for liquids, gases and sand in high-volume, multiphase slug flow. As a result, these devices can work only after a separator can function. While pit flares can be installed and used from the start, considering the makeup of the initial flowback, we believe there is little gas to be burned, and so we assume there is not an appreciable difference between the amount of emissions reductions between a traditional combustion device and a pit flare. In addition, we believe that pit flares have increased potential for secondary impacts compared to traditional flares, due to the potential for the incomplete combustion of natural gas across the pit flare plume.

Although not required, some owners and operators may choose to separate the gas from the other flowback materials for water management or other purposes. If a separator is used, any separated gas can be routed to combustion. In light of all of the above, we are providing in the final rule two options for completions of subcategory 2 wells: (1) Route all flowback directly to a completion combustion device (in that case a pit flare); or (2) should an owner or operator choose to use a separator, route the separated gas to a completion combustion device as soon as a separator is able to operate.

We are providing the same two options for low pressure wells. We believe that wells cannot perform a REC if there is not sufficient well pressure or gas content during the well completion to operate the surface equipment required for a REC, and low pressure gas could prevent proper operation of the separator. Alternatively, when feasible, some owners and operators may choose to separate the gas from the other flowback materials for water management or other purposes. If a separator is used, any separated gas must be routed to combustion.

2. REC Feasibility

The second instance for potential technical infeasibility occurs during the separation flowback stage, where operators cannot perform a REC and, therefore, must combust. The EPA received comment that additional requirements are necessary to ensure that flaring of the recovered gas during the separation flowback stage is limited to scenarios where all options included in our definition for REC—(1) route the

recovered gas from the separator into a gas flow line or collection system, (2) re-inject the recovered gas into the well or another well, (3) use the recovered gas as an onsite fuel source, or (4) use the recovered gas for another useful purpose that a purchased fuel or raw material would serve—have been pursued and their technical infeasibility documented.⁸² Commenters identified factors such as the availability and capacity of gathering lines, right of way issues, the quality of gas, and ownership issues that could impact the ability of operators to capture and use gas. Commenters stated that the provision for technical infeasibility for operators to use the recovered gas is vague and runs counter to the improvements the EPA seeks to establish within the oil and gas industry. Other commenters urged the EPA to allow flaring only as a last resort by requiring advanced notification and detailed documentation of the technical infeasibility of capturing and using salable quality gas. Commenters further stated that flaring should be very rarely necessary, as the EPA has identified four separate options for using recovered gas. The commenter recommends that EPA add additional notification and reporting requirements to ensure that all four options have been pursued and their technical infeasibility documented. The EPA agrees that the exemption from REC due to technical infeasibility should be limited. However, as illustrated by the comments received, the circumstances under which a REC is technically infeasible are varied. It is, therefore, difficult to provide one definition that can address all scenarios.

The EPA considered, but declined to require, advanced notification for the following reasons. Technical infeasibility can be an after-the-fact occurrence (*i.e.*, gas was contaminated and not of salable quality or had characteristics prohibiting other beneficial use and, therefore, the gas was combusted); therefore, advanced notification may not always be possible. A case-by-case advance evaluation by a regulatory agency is also not feasible considering the large number of completions, the wide geographic dispersion of the completions and the remote location of many well sites. For these reasons, we are not requiring prior notification of the claim of the technical infeasibility exemption.

Rather we have expanded recordkeeping requirements in the final

⁸²This definition is the same as the definition for REC in subpart OOOO which, in response to public comment, included options in addition to routing to a gas line.

rule to include: (1) Detailed documentation of the reasons for the claim of technical infeasibility with respect to all four options provided in section 60.5375a(a)(1)(ii), including but not limited to, names and locations of the nearest gathering line; capture, re-injection, and reuse technologies considered; aspects of gas or equipment prohibiting use of recovered gas as a fuel onsite; and (2) technical considerations prohibiting any other beneficial use of recovered gas onsite. We emphasize that the exemption is limited to “technical” infeasibility (e.g., lack of infrastructure, engineering issues, safety concerns).

In addition to the detailed documentation and recordkeeping requirement, the final rule requires that a separator be onsite during the entirety of the flowback period at subcategory 1 (developmental) wells, as described earlier. We believe these additional provisions will support a more diligent and transparent application of the intent of the technical infeasibility exemption from the REC requirement in the final rule. This information must be included in the annual report made available to the public 30 days after submission through the Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface (CEDRI), allowing for public review of best practices and periodic auditing to ensure flaring is limited and emissions are minimized.

3. Gas to Oil Ratio (GOR) Exclusion

We are not finalizing the proposed exclusion of wells with low GOR from the definition of a well affected facility. However, in the final rule, low GOR wells are not subject to REC or combustion requirements. In order to ensure that low GOR claims are not being made without sufficient analysis and oversight, the final rule requires that records used to make the GOR determination must be retained and a certifying official must sign the low GOR determination.

The EPA proposed that wells with a GOR of less than 300 scf of gas per barrel of oil produced would not be affected facilities subject to the well completion provisions of the NSPS.⁸³ The reason for the proposed threshold GOR of 300 is that separators typically do not operate at a GOR less than 300, which is based on industry experience rather than a vetted technical specification for separator performance.

⁸³ On February 24, 2015, API submitted a comment to the EPA stating that oil wells with GOR values less than 300 do not have sufficient gas to operate a separator. <http://www.regulations.gov/#/documentDetail;D=EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0831-0137>.

Though in theory any amount of free gas could be separated from the liquid, in reality this is not practical given the design and operating parameters of separation units operating in the field.

The EPA also solicited comment on how operators could identify low GOR wells (i.e., those with a GOR of less than 300 scf of gas per stock tank barrel of oil produced) prior to well completion, specifically the question of whether the GOR of nearby wells would be a reliable indicator in determining the GOR of a new or modified well. The EPA received comment stating that wells in the same area or reservoir could be used to indicate GOR prior to well completion. In light of the comments received and, upon further consideration, the EPA concludes that GOR of a well can be determined in advance. The EPA, therefore, does not believe that it is appropriate to prescribe in the final rule any specific way to determine the GOR for purposes of exempting low GOR wells from performing REC or combustion. However, to ensure that only those that, in fact, have GOR of less than 300 are exempt from the REC or combustion requirement; these wells remain affected facilities under the final rule. To ensure that their GORs are accurately determined, the final rule requires detailed documentation of their GOR determination as well as annual reporting and recordkeeping requirements. However, they are not subject to the REC or combustion requirement.

4. Low Pressure Wells

We have revised the low pressure well definition in the final rule. In the 2012 NSPS, the EPA recognized that certain wells, which the EPA called “low pressure gas wells,” cannot implement a REC because of a lack of necessary reservoir pressure to flow gas at rates appropriate for the transportation of solids and liquids from a hydraulically fractured gas well against additional back pressure that would be caused by the REC equipment, thereby making a REC infeasible. The 2012 NSPS exempts these wells from REC and instead requires combustion of the recovered gas.

In the EPA’s proposed rule (80 FR 56611, September 18, 2015), in which we proposed to also regulate VOC and GHG emissions from oil wells, we proposed to amend the current requirements for low pressure gas wells to apply to all low pressure wells. We proposed to change the term “low pressure gas well” to “low pressure well” but keep the definition the same. The substance of the definition at proposal for “low pressure well” is the

same as the currently codified definition for “low pressure gas well” in the 2012 NSPS. We solicited comment on whether this definition appropriately defined hydraulically fractured wells for which conducting a REC would be technologically infeasible or whether the definition should be revised to better characterize the criteria for all low pressure wells.

In our proposed definition, the pressure of the flowback fluid (oil, gas, and water) immediately before it enters the flow line is calculated by equation (1) below:

$$P_L (psia) = 0.445 \cdot P_R (psia) - 0.038 \cdot L(ft) + 67.578 \quad \text{Equation (1)}$$

Where:

P_L (psia) is the pressure of flowback fluid immediately before it enters the flow line;

P_R (psia) is the pressure of the reservoir containing oil, gas, and water; and L (ft) is the depth of the well.

The EPA proposed that if the pressure of flowback fluid immediately before it enters the flow line, P_L , calculated using the above equation is less than the available line pressure, the well would be considered a low pressure well. Such a well would not be required to do a REC during flowback (i.e., collect and send the associated gas to the flow line). Instead, such a well would only be required to combust the gas in a completion combustion device.

Commenters asked the EPA to provide a new definition of “low pressure oil well” to differentiate oil wells from gas wells. They stated that the definition of “low pressure well” set out in proposed section 60.5430a and taken from the definition of “low pressure gas well” in subpart OOOO (section 60.5430) is not appropriate for a low pressure oil well, because the surface and back pressure for oil wells is higher than that for gas wells. They further state that “. . . once the hydraulic fracture load stops coming back, a gas well will typically have much less liquids in the production tubing, making the surface pressure actually higher for the gas well vs. an oil well. This difference would be reflected in the 0.038 number which represents the gas gradient in the well, which would impart a back pressure. For oil wells this back pressure would be higher . . .” In response to these comments, the EPA modified the existing low pressure gas well equation (equation (1) above) to add pressure drop resulting from flow of oil and water in a well.

The EPA’s evaluation of the steady flow of petroleum fluid (gas and oil) during flowback in wells resulted in the following modified equation, hereafter

referred to as the low pressure well equation (equation 2 below):

$$P_L \text{ (psia)} = 0.495 \times P_R - \frac{q_g}{q_g + q_o + q_w} [0.05 \times P_R + 0.038 \times L - 67.578] - \left[\frac{q_o}{q_g + q_o + q_w} \times \frac{\rho_o}{144} + \frac{q_w}{q_g + q_o + q_w} \cdot 0.433 \right] \cdot L \quad \text{Equation (2)}$$

Where:

P_L is the pressure of flowback fluid immediately before it enters the flow line, expressed in psia;
 P_R is the pressure of the reservoir containing oil, gas, and water, expressed in psia;
 L is the true vertical depth of the well, expressed in feet;
 q_o , q_g , q_w are the flow rates of oil, gas, and water, respectively, in the well, expressed in cubic feet/second; and
 ρ_o is the density of oil in the well, expressed in pounds per cubic feet.

EPA's low pressure well equation is used to predict the pressure of the flowback fluid (oil, gas, and water) immediately before it enters the flow line. The low pressure well equation uses inputs similar to those required for the gas well definition and for which information is understood to be available before well completion activity starts at a well site. These inputs include reservoir (or formation) pressure; true vertical depth of the well; flow rates of oil, gas, and water in the well; and the density of oil in the well.

As oil-gas-water mixture flows upwards in a well to a lower pressure location, oil and gas volumes change and some of the dissolved gas evolves out of solution in oil. These phenomena result in oil and gas densities and volumetric flows changing with well depth. Therefore, oil density, ρ_o , and volumetric flow rate, q_o , for use in equation (2) are calculated using the known value of oil API gravity at a well site and the widely used correlations provided in Vasquez and Beggs (1980).⁸⁴ The gas volumetric flow, q_g , is calculated using widely used correlations provided in Guo and Ghalambor (2005).⁸⁵ Details on using equation (2) to calculate the pressure of flowback fluid immediately before it enters the flow line, P_L , can be found in the TSD in the public docket.

As noted above, equation (2) is the low pressure well equation for all wells in the final rule. This equation predicts the pressure, P_L , of the flowback fluid

(oil, gas, and water) immediately before it enters the flow line during the separation flowback period. In response to comments, the EPA's final regulations require that this pressure be compared to the actual flow line pressure available at the well site. Wells with insufficient predicted pressure to produce into the flow line are required to combust the gas in a control device. Wells with sufficient pressure to produce into the flow line are required to capture the gas and produce it into the flow line.

EPA further notes that equation (2) is a modification of equation (1) and adds pressure drop resulting from flows of oil and water. When characterizing a well with conditions of gas flow only (*i.e.*, $q_o = q_w = 0$), equation (2) reduces to equation (1), the equation for gas wells. Also note that equation (2) for line pressure is derived using a vertical well. It is known that inclined wells exist in the field, which will experience a somewhat higher frictional drop due to longer flow length. Nonetheless, it is expected that equation (2) would be able to account for minor increases in pressure drop due to increased frictional drop at inclined wells because the frictional pressure drop component contributes a small amount to the total pressure drop (about 1 percent on average) and conservative assumptions were used in deriving equation (2)—notably, bottom hole pressure equals one-half of formation pressure.

In addition to the revised low pressure well equation, we are providing, in the final definition of low pressure well, other characteristics of the well that would indicate that a well is a low pressure well. We believe that if the static pressure (*i.e.*, pressure with the well shut in and not flowing) at the wellhead following hydraulic fracturing, and prior to the onset of flowback, is less than the flow line pressure at the sales meter, the well is a low pressure well without having to demonstrate that it is such by using the low pressure well equation in the final rule.

Instead of using the equation, under the final rule, operators who suspect that a well may be a low pressure well have the option, for screening purposes,

of performing a wellhead static pressure (*i.e.*, pressure with the well shut in and not flowing) check following fracturing and prior to the onset of flowback. If the static pressure at the wellhead was less than the flow line pressure at the sales meter, then the well would be a low pressure well. We believe that such a comparison would be conservative because, for a given well, the static pressure (*i.e.*, with no fluid movement through the well) would be higher than the dynamic pressure (*i.e.*, with the well flowing) because there would be no pressure losses brought about by friction caused by material movement in the tubing string. For some wells, use of this method could eliminate the need for the detailed calculations provided in the low pressure well equation discussed above. For other wells (*i.e.*, those wells where the static pressure was greater than the flow line pressure), it would be necessary for the operator to use the low pressure well equation.

Commenters asserted that many oil reservoirs have pressure that is insufficient for wells to naturally flow even after hydraulic fracturing. The commenters stated that this can be evidenced by the prevalence of artificial lift equipment such as rod pumps visible across the landscape of many oil producing areas. The commenters cited examples of reservoirs such as the Permian Basin, where horizontal drilling is used to extend the life of existing producing formations. The commenters explained that many oil wells that are hydraulically fractured do not have sufficient reservoir pressure to flowback fracture fluids. One company estimated that 30 percent of its hydraulically fractured horizontal wells and 80 percent of its hydraulically fractured vertical wells in the Permian Basin require artificial lift to flowback. In these cases, the commenter explained, rod pumps are installed on the wells to artificially lift the fracture fluids to the surface. In light of the comments received, the EPA believes that wells that require artificial lift equipment for flowback of fracture fluids should be classified as low pressure wells, as we believe that

⁸⁴ Vasquez, M. and Beggs, H.D., "Correlations for fluid physical property prediction," JPT, 1980.

⁸⁵ Guo, B. and Ghalambor, A., "Natural Gas Engineering Handbook," Gulf Publishing Company, 2005.

performing a REC is technically infeasible for these wells.

To meet the definition of low pressure well, the well must satisfy any of the criteria above. We have revised the definition in the regulatory text to reflect this change. Section VIII, the RTC document, the TSD, and other materials available in the docket provide more discussion of these topics.

5. Timing of Initial Compliance

The EPA proposed the well completion requirements that, if finalized, would apply to both oil and gas well completions using hydraulic fracturing. In the 2012 NSPS, we provided a phase-in approach in the gas well completion requirements due to the concern with insufficient REC and trained personnel if REC were required immediately for all gas well completions. However, we did not provide the same in this proposal on the assumption that the supplies of REC equipment and trained personnel have caught up with the demand and, therefore, are no longer an issue. While some commenters agreed, other commenters indicated that the proposed rule, which would dramatically increase the number of well completions subject to the NSPS, would lead to REC equipment shortages. One commenter estimated that it would take at least 6 months to obtain the necessary equipment, while another commenter estimated that it would take 24 months. One commenter noted that owners and operators have been drilling wells, but delaying completion, due to the current economic conditions affecting the industry, causing a suppressed equipment demand. Finally, one state regulatory agency recommended extending the compliance period to 120 days to allow sufficient time to contract for the necessary completion equipment.

After reviewing the comments, we agree that some owners and operators may have difficulty complying with the REC requirements in the final rule in the near term due to the unavailability of REC equipment. Although REC equipment suppliers have increased production to meet the demand for gas well completions under subpart OOOO, the affected facility under subpart OOOOa includes both gas and oil wells and will more than double the number of wells requiring REC equipment over subpart OOOO. We believe this demand will likely lead to a short-term shortage of REC equipment. However, based on the prior experience, we believe that suppliers have both the capability and incentive to catch up with the demand quickly, as opposed to the longer terms

suggested by the commenters; they likely already stepped up production since this rule was proposed last year in anticipation of the impending increase in demand. In light of the above, the final rule provides a phase-in approach that would allow a quick build-up of the REC supplies in the near term. Specifically, for subcategory 1 oil wells, the final rule requires combustion for well completions conducted before November 30, 2016 and REC if technically feasible for well completions conducted thereafter. For subcategory 2 and low pressure oil wells, the final rule requires combustion during well completion, which is the same as that required for completion of subcategory 2 and low pressure gas well in the 2012 NSPS. For gas well completions, which are already subject to well completion requirements in the 2012 NSPS, the requirements remain the same.

F. Fugitive Emissions From Well Sites and Compressor Stations

For fugitive emissions requirements for the source category, three principles or aims directed our efforts. The first aim was to produce a consistent and accountable program for a source to use to identify and repair fugitive emissions at well sites and compressor stations. A second aim was to provide an opportunity for companies to design and implement their own fugitive emissions monitoring and repair programs. The third aim was to focus the fugitive emissions monitoring and repair program on components from which we expected the greatest emissions, with consideration of appropriate exemptions. The fourth aim was to establish a program that would complement other programs currently in place. With these principles in mind, we proposed a detailed monitoring plan; semiannual requirements using OGI technology for monitoring to find and repair sources of fugitive emissions, which we had identified as the BSER; a shifting monitoring schedule based on performance; a 15-day timeframe for repairing and resurveying leaks; and an exemption for low production wells.

The public comment process helped us to identify additional information to consider and provided an opportunity to refine the standards proposed. Commenters specifically identified concerns with the definition of modification for well sites and compressor stations, the monitoring plan, the fluctuating survey frequency, the overlap with state and federal requirements, use of emerging monitoring technologies, the initial compliance timeframe, and the

relationship between production level and fugitive emissions.

In this final rule, based on our consideration of the comments received and other relevant information, we have made changes to the proposed standards for fugitive emissions from well sites and compressor stations. The final rule refines the monitoring program requirements while still achieving the main goals. Below we describe the significant changes since proposal for specific topics related to fugitive emissions and our rationale for these changes. For additional details, please refer to section VIII, the TSD, and the RTC supporting documentation in the public docket.

1. Fugitive Emissions From Well Sites

a. Monitoring Frequency

In conjunction with semiannual monitoring, the EPA co-proposed annual monitoring and solicited comment on the availability of trained OGI contractors and OGI instrumentation. 80 FR 56637, September 18, 2015. Commenters provided numerous comments and data regarding annual, semiannual and quarterly monitoring surveys. These comments largely focused on the cost, effectiveness, and feasibility of the different program frequencies. The EPA evaluated these comments and information, as well as certain production segment equipment counts from the 2016 public review draft GHG Inventory, which were developed from the data reported to the GHGRP. Based on the above information, the EPA updated its proposal assumptions on equipment counts per well site to use data from the 2016 public review draft update. This resulted in changes to the well site model plant. Specifically, the equipment count for meters/piping at a gas well site increased from 1 to 3, which tripled the component counts from meters/piping at these sites. In addition, the EPA developed a third model plant to represent associated gas well sites. This category includes wells with GOR between 300 and 100,000 standard cubic feet per barrel (scf/bbl), and the model plant is assumed to have the same component counts as the model oil well site, as well as components associated with meters/piping. The EPA used this information to re-evaluate the control options for annual, semiannual and quarterly monitoring. As shown in the TSD, the control cost, using OGI, based on quarterly monitoring is not cost-effective, while both semiannual and annual monitoring remain cost-effective for reducing GHG (in the form of

methane) and VOC emissions. Because control costs for both semiannual and annual monitoring are cost-effective, we evaluated the difference in emissions reductions between the two monitoring frequencies and concluded that semiannual monitoring would achieve greater emissions reductions. Therefore, the EPA is finalizing the proposed semiannual monitoring frequency. Please see the RTC document in the public docket for further discussion.⁸⁶ Even though the EPA has determined that semi-annual surveys for well sites is the BSER under this NSPS, this does not preclude the EPA from taking a different approach in the future, including requiring more frequent monitoring (e.g., quarterly).

b. Low Production Well Sites

The EPA proposed to exclude low production well sites (*i.e.*, well sites where the average combined oil and natural gas production is less than 15 barrels of oil equivalent (boe) per day averaged over the first 30 days of production) from the fugitive emissions monitoring and repair requirements for well sites. As we explained in the preamble to the proposed rule, we believed that these wells are mostly owned by small businesses and that fugitive emissions associated with these wells are generally low. 80 FR 56639, September 18, 2015. We were concerned about the burden on small businesses, in particular, where there may be little emission reduction to be achieved. *Id.* We specifically requested comment on the proposed exclusion and the appropriateness of the 15 boe per day threshold. We also requested data that would confirm that low production sites have low GHG and VOC fugitive emissions.

Several commenters indicated that low production well sites should be exempt from fugitive emissions monitoring and that the 15 boe per day threshold averaged over the first 30 days of production is appropriate for the exemption, however, commenters did not provide data. Other commenters indicated that the low production well sites exemption would not benefit small businesses since these types of wells would not be economical to operate and few operators, if any, would operate new well sites that average 15 boe per day.

Several commenters stated that the EPA should not exempt low production well sites because they are still a part of the cumulative emissions that would impact the environment. One

commenter indicated that low production well sites have the potential to emit high fugitive emissions. Another commenter stated that low production well sites should be required to perform fugitive emissions monitoring at a quarterly or monthly frequency. One commenter provided an estimate of low producing gas and oil wells that indicated that a significant number of wells would be excluded from fugitive emissions monitoring.

Based on the data from DrillingInfo, 30 percent of natural gas wells are low production wells, and 43 percent of all oil wells are low production wells. The EPA believes that low production well sites have the same type of equipment (e.g., separators, storage vessels) and components (e.g., valves, flanges) as production well sites with production greater than 15 boe per day. Because we did not receive additional data on equipment or component counts for low production wells, we believe that a low production well model plant would have the same equipment and component counts as a non-low production well site. This would indicate that the emissions from low production well sites could be similar to that of non-low production well sites. We also believe that this type of well may be developed for leasing purposes but is typically unmanned and not visited as often as other well sites that would allow fugitive emissions to go undetected. We did not receive data showing that low production well sites have lower GHG (principally as methane) or VOC emissions other than non-low production well sites. In fact, the data that were provided indicated that the potential emissions from these well sites could be as significant as the emissions from non-low production well sites because the type of equipment and the well pressures are more than likely the same. In discussions with us, stakeholders indicated that well site fugitive emissions are not correlated with levels of production, but rather based on the number of pieces of equipment and components. Therefore, we believe that the fugitive emissions from low production and non-low production well sites are comparable.

Based on these considerations and, in particular, the large number of low production wells and the similarities between well sites with production greater than 15 boe per day and low production well sites in terms of the components that could leak and the associated emissions, we are not exempting low production well sites from the fugitive emissions monitoring program. Therefore, the collection of fugitive emissions components at all

new, modified or reconstructed well sites is an affected facility and must meet the requirements of the fugitive emissions monitoring program.

c. Monitoring Using Method 21

The EPA's analysis for the proposed rule found OGI to be more cost-effective at detecting fugitive emissions than the traditional protocol for that purpose, Method 21, and the EPA, therefore, identified OGI as the BSER for monitoring fugitive emissions at well sites. See 80 FR 56636, September 18, 2015. The EPA solicited comment on whether to allow Method 21 as an alternative fugitive emissions monitoring method to OGI. 80 FR 56638, September 18, 2015. We also solicited comment on the repair threshold for components that are found to have fugitive emissions using Method 21. *Id.*

Numerous industry, state, and environmental commenters indicated that Method 21 is preferred or should be allowed as an alternative to OGI, citing availability, costs, and training associated with OGI.

Several commenters indicated that the EPA should set the Method 21 fugitive emissions repair threshold at 10,000 ppm, the level at which our recent work indicates that fugitive emissions are generally detectable using OGI instrumentation provided that the right operating conditions (e.g., wind speed and background temperature) are present. 80 FR 56635, September 18, 2015. Some commenters stated that the repair threshold should be 500 ppm to achieve a high level of fugitive emission reductions while other commenters state that a 500 ppm repair threshold would target fugitive emissions that would not provide meaningful reductions.

The issue of the repair threshold when Method 21 is used is a critical decision. As discussed in the preamble to the proposed rule, Method 21, at an appropriate repair threshold, is capable of achieving the same or better emission reductions as OGI. However, at proposal, we determined that Method 21 was not cost-effective at a semiannual monitoring frequency with a repair threshold of 500 ppm.

While we agree with the importance of allowing the use of Method 21 as an alternative, we need to ensure that its use does not result in fewer emissions reductions than what would otherwise be achieved using OGI, which is the BSER based on our analysis. Available data show that OGI can detect fugitive emissions at a concentration of at least 10,000 ppm when restricting its use during certain environmental conditions

⁸⁶ See EPA docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505.

such as high wind speeds. Due to the dynamic nature for the OGI detection capabilities, OGI may also image emissions at a lower concentration when environmental conditions are ideal. Because an OGI instrument can only visualize emissions and not the corresponding concentration, any components with visible emissions, including those emissions that are less than 10,000 ppm, would be repaired. Method 21 is capable of detecting fugitive emissions at concentrations well below 10,000 ppm. However, if the repair threshold was set at 10,000 ppm, an owner or operator would not have to repair any leaks that are less than 10,000 ppm, thereby foregoing the reductions that would otherwise be achieved by using the OGI. For the reason outlined in this section, 10,000 ppm is not an appropriate repair threshold for Method 21.

Using information provided by commenters, we evaluated the methane and VOC emission reductions associated with the use of Method 21 at repair thresholds of 10,000 ppm and 500 ppm, the two levels recommended by the various commenters. We used AP-42 emission factors to determine the emissions from fugitive emissions components that were found to be leaking using a Method 21 instrument and concluded that emissions reductions are lower than when OGI is used to survey the same components. The lower emission reductions are due to fugitive emissions with a concentration lower than 10,000 ppm not being found using the Method 21 instrument when it is calibrated to detect emissions at a threshold of 10,000 ppm or greater.

We then calculated the emission reductions that result from using a Method 21 instrument to conduct a monitoring survey at a repair threshold of 500 ppm. At this threshold, the operator would have to repair every component found to have fugitive emissions over 500 ppm threshold. This results in emission reductions greater than the emissions reductions that would be achieved if OGI were used instead. For the reasons stated in this section, using Method 21 to conduct monitoring surveys at a repair threshold of 500 ppm is better than, or at least equivalent to, using OGI to conduct the same survey; we are allowing it in the final rule as an alternative to the use of OGI. We acknowledge that the cost of conducting a survey using Method 21 may be more expensive than using OGI; however, some owners or operators may still chose to use Method 21 for convenience or due to the lack of availability of OGI instruments or

trained personnel. Therefore, to ensure that it achieves at least the level of emission reduction to be achieved using the OGI, the final rule allows the use of Method 21 with a repair threshold of 500 ppm.

Based on interest in having Method 21 as an approved alternative, we are finalizing it as an alternative to OGI. Allowing Method 21 as an alternative will address some of the uncertainty expressed by small entities that indicated a concern with needing to purchase an OGI instrument or hire trained OGI contractors to perform their monitoring surveys. We are finalizing Method 21 as an alternative to OGI for monitoring fugitive emissions components at a repair threshold of an instrument reading of 500 ppm or greater. We are also finalizing specific recordkeeping and reporting requirements when Method 21 is used to perform a monitoring survey.

d. Shifting of Monitoring Frequency Based on Performance

The EPA proposed shifting monitoring frequencies (ranging from annual to quarterly monitoring) based on the percentage of components that are found to have fugitive emissions during a monitoring survey. We solicited comment on the proposed monitoring approach, including the proposed metrics of one percent and three percent to determine monitoring frequency or whether the monitoring frequency thresholds should be based on a specific number of components that are found to have fugitive emissions. In addition, the EPA solicited comment on whether a performance-based frequency or a fixed-frequency program was more appropriate.

Most commenters opposed performance-based monitoring frequency. They raised specific concerns that performance-based monitoring and shifting monitoring frequencies would be costly, time-consuming, and impose a complex administrative burden for the industry and states. For example, commenters pointed out that an owner may have hundreds or even thousands of well sites and a potentially ever-changing survey schedule for each of those sites would present an untenable logistical hurdle. Most of the commenters stated that the EPA should finalize a fixed monitoring frequency to provide a level of certainty to owners and operators for planning future schedules of survey crews.

The EPA considered these comments and agrees that imposing a performance-based monitoring schedule would

require operators to develop an extensive administrative program to ensure compliance. Under the performance-based monitoring, owners and operators would need to count all of the components at the well sites, affix identification tags on each component or develop detailed piping and instrument diagram. During each monitoring survey, owners and operators would need to calculate the percentage of leaking fugitive emissions components to determine the next monitoring frequency schedule.

We also agree that the shifting monitoring frequencies could cause regulated entities additional administrative burden to determine compliance since the monitoring frequencies could change each year, but the correct frequency may not be reflected in the operating permit. This could also result in fugitive emissions being undetected longer due to less frequent monitoring. We believe that the potential for a performance-based approach to encourage greater compliance is outweighed in this case by these additional burdens and the complexity it would add. Therefore, the EPA is finalizing a fixed-frequency monitoring instead of performance-based monitoring.

e. Fugitive Emissions Components Repair and Resurvey

The EPA proposed that components that are a source of fugitive emissions must be repaired or replaced as soon as practicable and, in any case, no later than 15 calendar days after detection of the fugitive emissions. For sources of fugitive emissions that cannot be repaired within 15 days of finding the emissions, due to technical infeasibility or unsafe conditions, the EPA proposed that the components could be placed on a delay of repair until the next scheduled shutdown or within six months, whichever is earlier. We also proposed that a repaired fugitive emissions component be resurveyed within 15 days of the repair. The EPA solicited comment on all three aspects.

Commenters voiced various opinions regarding the requirements. Many commenters shared concerns that the 15-day window for repairs is too short, due to factors such as remoteness of equipment locations, unsuccessful repair attempts, and multiple components needing repair. Other commenters preferred the 15-day window, in the interest of achieving immediate mitigation of health and safety risks and alignment with standards in several states.

Multiple commenters provided comments on the proposed delay of

repair standards, including concerns about delays lasting longer than six months due to availability of supplies needed to complete repairs and information regarding the frequency of delayed repairs. Some commenters also indicated that in some cases, requiring prompt repairs could lead to more emissions than if repairs were able to be delayed, for example if a well shut-in or vent blow-down is required.

Regarding the 15-day window to resurvey repairs to fugitive emissions components, multiple commenters stated that the final rule should allow 30 days for the resurvey, due to the potential need for specialized personnel for the resurvey, while others considered 15 days to be adequate. Regarding performance of the resurvey, many commenters also suggested that soap bubbles, as specified in section 8.3.3 of Method 21, be allowed to determine if the components have been repaired.

After considering the comments above, the EPA agrees that repairs for some sources of fugitive emissions at a well site may take multiple attempts or require additional equipment that is not readily available and may take longer than 15 days to repair. Well sites, unlike chemical plants or refineries, may be located in remote areas and it is unlikely that they would have warehouses or maintenance shops nearby where spare equipment or tools are kept that would be needed to perform repairs within 15 days. We also recognize that fugitive emissions must be alleviated as soon as practicable. We believe that allowing an additional 15 days for repair would give owners and operators enough time to get the parts or the personnel needed to repair or replace the components that could not be repaired during the initial monitoring survey. Therefore, we are finalizing 30 days for the repair of fugitive emissions sources. However, we do recognize that some state LDAR programs require repairs to be made within 5 to 15 days of finding a leak. We encourage operators to continue to fix leaks within that timeframe, since the majority of leaks are fixed when they are found. We do expect that the majority of components will not need the additional 15 days for repair.

The EPA agrees, based on our review of the comments, that only a small percentage of components would not be able to be repaired during that 30 day period. We also agree that a complete well shutdown or a well shut-in may be necessary to repair certain components, such as components on the wellhead, and this could result in greater emissions than what would be emitted

by the leaking component. The EPA does not agree that unavailability of supplies or custom parts is a justification for delaying repair (*i.e.*, beyond the 30 days for repair provided in this final rule) since the operator can plan for repair of fugitive emission components by having stock readily accessible or obtaining the parts within 30 days after finding the fugitive emissions.

Based on available information, it may be two years before a well is shut-in or shutdown. Therefore, to avoid the excess emissions (and cost) of prematurely forcing a shutdown, we are amending the rule to allow 2 years to fix a leak where it is determined to be technically infeasible to repair within 30 days; however, if an unscheduled or emergency vent blowdown, compressor station shutdown, well shutdown, or well shut-in occurs during the delay of repair period, the fugitive emissions components would need to be fixed at that time. The owner or operator will have to record the number and types of components that are placed on delay of repair and record an explanation for each delay of repair.

Method 21 allows a user to spray a soap solution on components that are operating under certain conditions (*e.g.*, no continuous moving parts or no surface temperatures above the boiling point or below the freezing point of the soap solution) to determine if any soap bubbles form. If no bubbles form, the components are deemed to be operating with no detected emissions. We note that spraying soap solution to confirm whether a component has been repaired may not work for all fugitive emissions components, such as a leak found under the hood of the thief hatch because it would be difficult to apply the soap solution or observe bubbles. However, we believe that this alternative will provide some owners and operators a simple, low cost way to confirm that a fugitive emissions component has been repaired. This would also allow the resurveys to be performed by the same personnel that completed the repairs instead of other certified monitoring personnel or hired contractors that would have to come back to verify the repairs. Therefore, we are finalizing the use of the alternative screening procedures specified in Section 8.3.3 of Method 21 for resurveying repaired fugitive emissions components, where appropriate.

For owners or operators that cannot use soap spray to verify repairs, we are allowing an additional 30 days for resurvey of the repaired fugitive emissions components, to allow time for contractors or designated OGI personnel

to perform the resurvey because they are not typically the same personnel that would perform the repairs.

f. Definition of “Fugitive Emission Component”

As just discussed, we proposed monitoring, repair, and resurvey of “fugitive emission components.” The EPA solicited comment on the proposed definition of fugitive emissions components. Commenters indicated that, as proposed, the fugitive emissions component definition is too broad and vague, because it contains both equipment and component types, and suggested that the EPA modify the definition to be more targeted and easier for states and other regulatory authorities to determine compliance, and recommended other definitions, such as that used by the state of Colorado.

The EPA agrees with commenters that, as proposed, the fugitive emissions component definition may cause confusion due to inclusion of equipment types, such as uncontrolled storage vessels that are potential sources of vented emissions (as opposed to fugitive emissions), in the definition.

Therefore, we are finalizing changes to the definition to remove equipment types and identify specific components, such as valves and flanges, that have the potential to be sources of fugitive emissions and that, when surveyed and repaired, would significantly reduce GHG and VOC emissions. This targeted list will remove the ambiguity of the proposed definition and will allow owners and operators to consistently identify fugitive emissions at well sites. We are finalizing the definition for fugitive emissions components in § 60.4530a of this final rule.

As finalized, the definition also aligns closely with other states’ and federal agencies’ definitions of fugitive emissions components by targeting similar components to the components in those definitions. Owners and operators can therefore monitor one set of components while complying with the requirements of this final rule and other state or federal fugitive emissions monitoring programs.

g. Timing of the Initial Monitoring Survey

The EPA proposed that the initial monitoring be conducted within 30 days after the initial startup of the first well completion or modification of a well site. EPA solicited comment on whether the proposal provides an appropriate amount of time to begin conducting fugitive emissions monitoring. We received a wide variety of comments

and suggestions for the appropriate time for fugitive emissions monitoring to begin.

Several commenters indicated that initial monitoring should begin after production starts, because time is needed to close out the drilling activities. The commenters further stated that completion activities and the transition from completion to production at well sites is unpredictable and temporary completion equipment may still be onsite 30 days after the "initial startup of the first well completion." One commenter indicated that production may not begin immediately after a well completion, so initial monitoring should not begin until after production starts.

The EPA acknowledges that at the time of a well completion all of the associated permanent equipment may not be present and conducting the initial monitoring survey may not capture all of the fugitive emissions components that would be in operation during production. In addition, we believe it is important to conduct the initial survey soon after the permanent equipment is in place to catch any improperly installed or defective equipment that may have substantial fugitive emissions immediately after installation. We believe that the permanent equipment will be in place at the startup of production (*i.e.*, the initial flow following the end of the flowback when there is continuous recovery of saleable quality gas). Therefore, the startup of production more accurately reflects the start of normal operations and would capture any fugitive emissions from the newly constructed or modified components at the well site. Therefore, we are finalizing that the startup of production marks the beginning of the initial monitoring survey period for the collection of fugitive emissions components.

Furthermore, based on the comments received, we are concerned that the tasks required prior to conducting an initial survey would take more than the 30 days we had proposed. Because each new or modified well site must be covered by a monitoring plan for a company-defined area, owners and operators must visit and assess each new or modified well site in order to incorporate it into a newly developed or modified monitoring plan for that area. They also need to secure certified monitoring survey contractors or monitoring instruments. In addition, they need to ensure that other compliance requirements will be met, such as recordkeeping and reporting. In light of the activities described above, the EPA is requiring in the final rule

that the initial survey be conducted within 60 days from the startup of production.

While 60 days from startup of production is sufficient time to conduct the initial survey once the underlying program infrastructure is established, we recognize that the initial establishment of the required program's infrastructure and the initial round of monitoring surveys will require additional time. Most importantly, additional time is needed to secure the necessary equipment or trained personnel, according to one OGI instrument manufacturer, which commented that they would need to increase production of key components for the OGI instrument to meet demand. The OGI manufacturer also indicated that they would need to scale up the number of personnel needed to provide OGI training and service of the equipment. We are concerned that currently there is not sufficient equipment and trained personnel to meet the demand imposed by this final rule in the near term. Accordingly, it will be necessary to have a window of time for trained personnel to work through this backlog. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, an owner or operator will need to develop a monitoring plan that would apply to each well site located within the company-defined area, which requires an assessment of each well site. Therefore, before a plan can be developed or modified, the owner or operator would need time to visit each well site within the company-defined area. Based on the information that we used to develop the model well site plants, each company-defined area may consist of up to 22 well sites within a 70-mile radius of a central or district office. In light of the above, the initial site visits and development of the monitoring plan would require a significant amount of time. Time is also needed to secure certified monitoring survey contractors or monitoring instruments. In addition, owners and operators will need to plan the logistics of the initial activities in order to comply with the requirements. This includes time to set up recordkeeping systems and to train personnel to manage the fugitive emissions monitoring program. These corporate systems are critical for submitting the notification of initial and subsequent annual compliance status.

As noted above, once programs are established and equipment supplies have caught up, well owners will be able to add additional affected facilities to existing programs and, thus, this longer timeline will not be needed.

Therefore, in order to provide time for owners and operators to establish the initial groundwork of their fugitives program, we are requiring that the initial monitoring survey must take place by June 3, 2017 or within 60 days of the startup of production, whichever is later.⁸⁷ We anticipate that sources will begin to phase in these requirements as additional devices and trained personnel become available. For additional discussion, please refer to the materials in the docket.

h. Monitoring Plan

The EPA proposed that owners or operators develop a corporate-wide fugitive emissions monitoring plan that specifies the measures for locating sources and the detection technology to be used. We also proposed that, in addition to the corporate-wide monitoring plan, owners or operators develop a site-specific fugitive emissions monitoring plan that specifies information such as the number of fugitive emission components that pertains to that single site.⁸⁸ The EPA solicited comment on the required elements of the proposed corporate-wide monitoring plan; specifically, the EPA asked for comment on whether other techniques, such as visual inspections to help identify indicators of potential leaks, should be included within the monitoring plan.

Some commenters agreed with the EPA's proposal to require a corporate-wide fugitive monitoring plan but expressed concerns about the elements of the plan, while others objected that the proposed plan is overly prescriptive and costly, with particular concerns about including requirements for a walking path and for digital photographs. Other commenters suggested changing the scope of monitoring plans to accommodate variations in locations of contractors and equipment.

We considered these comments, and we have made the following changes to the proposal in the final rule.

First, the final rule requires owners or operators to develop a fugitive emission monitoring plan for well sites within a company-defined area instead of corporate-wide and site-specific monitoring plans. This will give companies the flexibility to group well sites that are located within close proximity, under common control within a field or district, or that are

⁸⁷ For well site activities, such as the installation of a new well, a hydraulically fractured or refractured well, which commenced on or after September 18, 2015 are subject to this rule once it is finalized.

⁸⁸ See 80 FR 56612 (September 18, 2015).

managed by a single group of personnel. This would also afford owners and operators of well sites within different basins the ability to tailor their plans for the specific elements within each basin (*i.e.*, geography, well site characterization, emission profile). Information we received indicates that, in many cases, several sites within a specific geographic area may have similar equipment and would use the same contractors, company-owned monitoring instruments, or company personnel to perform the monitoring surveys. Based on a study conducted for the city of Fort Worth, Texas, we estimate that, on average, there are 22 well sites within a company's specific geographic region.⁸⁹ In this study, a total of 375 well pads were identified in the Fort Worth area, and these well pads were owned and operated by 17 different companies, or an average of 22 well pads per company. We believe these data provide a reasonable estimate of the number of well sites operated by a company in a specific geographic region. Therefore, we are removing the proposed corporate-wide and site-specific monitoring plan requirements and finalizing requirements that owners and operators develop a fugitive emissions monitoring plan for each of the company-defined areas that covers the collection of fugitive emissions components at well sites. As a result, the final rule requires owners and operators to develop a plan that describes the sites generally, including descriptions of equipment, plans for how they will monitor, etc., that apply to all similar sites. This will allow owners and operators to develop a monitoring plan for groups of similar well sites within an area for ease of implementation and compliance.

Second, we have made changes in the final rule to the proposed digital photograph requirements. We believe concerns regarding the burden of printing or transmitting digital pictures within the annual report are the result of unclear language in the proposed rule. Our intent was to require the owner or operator to include one or more digital photographs of the survey being performed. However, we inadvertently included that text within the requirement for each fugitive emission. It was not our intent to require a digital photograph of each fugitive emission in the annual report; instead we wanted to ensure, through

pictorial documentation, that the monitoring survey had been performed. After consideration of the comments received, we believe we can further streamline this requirement. Because a source with fugitive emissions during the reporting period is subject to other recordkeeping and reporting requirements, this provides sufficient documentation that the survey was performed. Therefore, we have removed the proposed requirement to provide a digital photograph in the annual report for each required monitoring survey. We are requiring owners and operators to retain a record of each monitoring survey performed with optical gas imaging by keeping one or more digital photographs or videos captured with the OGI instrument. The photograph or video must either include the latitude and longitude of the collection of fugitive emissions components imbedded within the photograph or video or must consist of an image of the monitoring survey being performed with a separately operating GPS device within the same digital picture or video, provided that the latitude and longitude output of the GPS unit can be clearly read in the image.

Third, with the allowance for Method 21 monitoring as an alternative to OGI instrument monitoring, we are finalizing a requirement that sources of fugitive emissions (*e.g.*, a leaking fugitive emissions component) that cannot be repaired during the initial monitoring survey either be temporarily tagged for identification for repair or be digitally photographed or video recorded in a way that identifies the location of the fugitive emissions component needing repair. If an owner or operator chooses to digitally photograph the leaking component(s) instead of using identification tags, the photograph will meet the requirement to take a digital photograph during a monitoring survey, as long as the digital photograph is taken with the OGI instrument and includes the latitude and longitude either imbedded in the photograph or visible in the picture.

Fourth, we are finalizing the walking path requirement with minor changes. We are revising the walking path terminology to observation path in order to clarify that our intent is focused on the field of view of the OGI instrument, not the physical location of the OGI operator. We believe this terminology change will alleviate commenters' concerns regarding the potentially overly prescriptive nature of the defined walking path with transient interferences, environmental obstructions, weather conditions and safety issues. This revision also clarifies

our intent to allow for the use of all types of OGI instruments (*e.g.*, mounted, handheld or remote controlled).

The purpose of the observation path is to ensure that the OGI operator visualizes all of the components that must be monitored, just as a Method 21 operator in a traditional leak detection program surveys all of the components. In the traditional scenario, the owner or operator tags all of the equipment that must be monitored, and when the Method 21 operator subsequently inspects the affected facility, the operator scans each component's tag and notes the component's instrument reading. The EPA realizes that this is a time-consuming practice. Additionally, while the Method 21 operator must contact each component with the probe of the Method 21 instrument and monitor it individually, we recognize that with OGI, the operator can be away from the components and still monitor several components simultaneously.

Recognizing these aspects of traditional and OGI leak detection methods, we want to offer owners and operators an alternative to the traditional tagging approach. However, because we are no longer requiring a traditional log of instrument readings, the rule must provide another way to ensure that the compliance obligation to monitor all equipment is met. We believe that the observation path requirement effectively ensures that an operator looks at all of the required components but reduces the burden of tagging and logging associated with traditional Method 21 programs. Unlike the tagging and logging requirement associated with traditional Method 21 programs, the requirement to develop an observation path is a one-time requirement (as long as the path does not need to change due to the addition of components). We do not expect facilities to create overly detailed process and instrumentation diagrams to describe the observation path. The observation path description could be a simple schematic diagram of the facility site or an aerial photograph of the facility site, as long as such a photograph clearly shows locations of the components and the OGI operator's walking path. As a result, we do not believe that the requirement to document the observation path is burdensome.

i. Provision for Emerging Technology

As the EPA noted in the 2015 proposal, fugitive emissions monitoring is a field of emerging technology, and major advances are expected in the near future. 80 FR at 56639. We are seeing a rapidly growing push to develop and

⁸⁹ ERG and Sage Environmental Consulting, LP. City of Fort Worth Natural Gas Air Quality Study, Final Report. Prepared for the City of Fort Worth, Texas. July 13, 2011. Available at <http://fortworthtexas.gov/gaswells/default.aspx?id=87074>.

produce low-cost monitoring technologies to find fugitive and direct methane and VOC emissions sooner and at lower levels than current technology allows, thus enhancing the ability of operators to detect fugitive emissions. During the development of the proposed rule, the EPA solicited comments and information on emerging technologies that could potentially be used to detect fugitive emissions at well sites or compressor stations and how these technologies could be used (e.g., as standalone monitors or in conjunction with OGI). Several commenters indicated that methane and VOC leak detection technology is undergoing continuous and rapid development and innovation, potentially yielding, for example, continuous emissions monitoring technologies, and urged the EPA to allow emerging technology to be used for fugitive emissions monitoring. The EPA agrees that continued development of these cost effective technologies is important and that the final rule should encourage and accommodate it to the extent possible.

Fugitive emissions monitoring and repair is a work practice standard, as allowed under section 111(h)(1) of the CAA. A work practice standard is an emission limitation that is not necessarily in a numeric format, such as the visualization of fugitive emissions using OGI. As described in section 111(h)(3), the Administrator may approve an alternative means of emission limitation for a work practice standard if it can be proven that an equal reduction in emissions will be achieved. To that end, pursuant to CAA section 111(h)(3), we are establishing in the final rule a process for the agency to permit the use of innovative technology for reducing fugitive emissions at well sites and/or compressor stations. Specifically, under the final rule, owners or operators may submit a request to the EPA for "an alternative means of emission limitation" where a technology has been demonstrated to achieve a reduction in emissions at least equivalent to the reduction in emissions achieved under the work practice or operational requirements for reducing fugitive emissions at well sites and/or compressor stations in subpart OOOOa.

To facilitate the application and review process, the final rule includes information to be provided in the application that would be needed for us to expeditiously evaluate the emerging technology. Such information must include a description of the emerging technology and the associated monitoring instrument or measurement technology; a description of the method and data quality used to ensure the

effectiveness of the technology; a description of the method detection limit of the technology and the action level at which fugitive emissions would be detected; a description of the quality assurance and control measures employed by the technology; field data that verify the feasibility and detection capabilities of the technology; and any restrictions for using the technology.

This process will allow for the use of any currently emerging technology or any technology that is developed in the future that is capable of achieving methane and VOC emission reductions at levels that are at least equivalent to reductions achieved when using OGI or Method 21 for fugitive emissions monitoring. This process will also allow for the use of alternative fugitive emissions monitoring approaches such as periodic, continuous, fixed, mobile, or a hybrid approach. Consistent with section 111(h)(3), any application will be publicly noticed in the **Federal Register**, which the EPA intends to provide within six months after receiving a complete application, including all required information for evaluation. The EPA will provide an opportunity for public hearing and comment on the application and on intended action the EPA might take. The EPA intends to make a final determination within six months after the close of the public comment period. The EPA will also publish its final determination in the **Federal Register**. If final determination is a denial, the EPA will provide reasoning for denial and recommendations for further development and evaluation of the emerging technology, if appropriate.

j. Definition of Well Site

In the proposed rule, we had defined "well site," for purposes of the fugitive emissions standards at § 60.5397a, to include separately located, centralized tank batteries. We received comments that the definition was unclear and that there was concern that the affected facility status of centralized tank batteries could inadvertently pull into affected facility status those well sites that only contain one or more wellheads, which were proposed to be excluded from affected facility status. We agree that the proposed definition of well site was somewhat unclear, and we have revised the definition in the final rule. With regard to the affected facility status of centralized tank batteries and its effect on well sites that only contain one or more wellheads, our intent is not to have well sites that only contain one or more wellheads subject to fugitive emissions standards. To make this intent more explicit, we have added

language to § 60.5365a(i)(2) to this effect.

2. Fugitive Emissions From Compressor Stations

Based on our consideration of the comments received and other relevant information, we have made several changes to the proposed fugitive emissions standards for the compressor stations in this final rule. The finalized fugitive emissions monitoring and repair requirements for compressor stations are similar to the requirements for well sites, so we streamlined this section by referencing our well site discussion, where appropriate. Below we provide the significant changes since proposal and our rationales for these changes.

a. Monitoring Frequency

In conjunction with semiannual monitoring, the EPA co-proposed annual monitoring, solicited comment on conducting monitoring surveys on a quarterly basis, and solicited comment on the availability of trained OGI contractors and OGI instrumentation. 80 FR at 56639.

Some commenters supported quarterly monitoring on the belief that it is more accurate and cost-effective than the monitoring frequencies proposed by the EPA. Other commenters opposed quarterly monitoring, alleging that it is not cost-effective and may be infeasible due to weather or shortages associated with OGI, necessary for the surveys. Also citing factors such as cost-effectiveness and questioning data underlying the EPA's analysis, some commenters supported annual monitoring or generally opposed semiannual monitoring.

Based on the comments received, the EPA reviewed the type of equipment and the associated components that were included in the model plant used to determine emission reductions and costs for compressor stations at proposal. The storage and transmission model plants developed for the proposed rule had inadvertently included site blowdown open-ended lines, which are not sources of fugitive emissions but are vents. Therefore, the transmission and storage model plants were revised for the final rule to remove these components from the total component count.

The EPA used information provided by commenters to re-evaluate the control options for annual, semiannual and quarterly monitoring. As shown in the TSD, the control costs for quarterly, semiannual, and annual monitoring remain cost-effective for reducing GHG

(in the form of methane) and VOC emissions. Semiannual and quarterly monitoring would provide greater emissions reductions than would annual monitoring. However, as explained in the proposed rule, we were concerned with compliance burden, in particular for small businesses, associated with quarterly monitoring even though it was cost effective. 80 FR at 56641. Specifically, we were concerned that the limited supplies of trained personnel for performing surveys might lead to disadvantages for small businesses, which are more likely to hire trained personnel. *Id.* However, certain changes we have made in the final rule will help alleviate the concern. For example, the final rule requires that the initial monitoring survey must take place by June 3, 2017 or within 60 days of the startup of production, whichever is later. This allows additional time for owners and operators to establish the requirement program's infrastructure at the initial stage. Another example, in light of comments urging EPA to allow Method 21 as an alternative, and the fact that we know many companies already own Method 21 instruments, offering Method 21 at a repair threshold of 500 ppm, as an alternative to conduct the monitoring surveys, will alleviate some of the demand for OGI instruments and personnel. Therefore, the EPA is finalizing quarterly monitoring frequency for the collection of fugitive emissions components at compressor stations to ensure the maximum amount of emission reductions. Please see the RTC document in the public docket for further discussion.⁹⁰

Some commenters requested that fugitive emissions monitoring exemptions be given to well sites and compressor stations that are located in areas of the country that routinely experience extreme weather. The commenters noted that these areas experience several months of average temperatures below 0 °F and long periods of snow cover. The commenter also provided information from one of the OGI instrument manufacturers which indicates that the instrument cannot operate at temperatures below -4 °F. The commenter also expressed concerns about monitoring survey personnel's safety if they were to attempt to conduct surveys in these weather conditions.

We agree that there are areas within the United States that regularly have extreme weather conditions such as three or more consecutive months of

average temperatures below 0 °F. We also obtained information from two OGI instrument manufacturers that confirm that the minimum operating temperature of the OGI instruments is -4 °F. As such, these prolonged subzero temperature conditions would make performing fugitive emissions monitoring surveys impossible during several months of the year. Additionally, while we believe that company personnel may be accessing these sites for maintenance activities, it may be difficult to transport OGI contractors to unmanned sites within these areas during these periods, as outside access for OGI contractors usually requires air travel to access these production sites.

Based on these considerations, we are waiving quarterly fugitive emissions monitoring surveys at compressor stations if, based on three years of historical climatic data, two of the three consecutive months within the quarter has an average temperature below 0 °F. The average temperatures must be determined by historical climatic data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or a source approved by the EPA Administrator. This waiver may not be used for two consecutive quarters and is not extended to well sites because we do not believe that there will be any locations that have average monthly temperatures below 0 °F for six consecutive months. Owners and operators will have to keep records of the waiver period, including the three months within the quarterly monitoring period, the average monthly temperatures and the source of the temperature information. Owners and operators will also have to report this information in their annual report.

b. Monitoring Using Method 21

In performing analysis for the proposed rule, the EPA found OGI to be more cost-effective than Method 21 and, therefore, identified OGI as the BSER for monitoring fugitive emissions at compressor stations. See 80 FR 56641, September 18, 2015. As with well sites, discussed previously in section VI.F.1.c, the EPA solicited comment on whether to allow Method 21 as an alternative fugitive emissions monitoring method to OGI and solicited comment on the repair threshold for components that are found to have fugitive emissions using Method 21.

The EPA received the same types of comments regarding allowing Method 21 as an alternative to OGI for monitoring fugitive emissions at compressor stations as for well sites, as discussed in section VI.F.1.c. Likewise,

for the same reasons as discussed earlier, we are finalizing Method 21 as an alternative to OGI for monitoring fugitive emissions components at compressor stations at a repair threshold of an instrument reading of 500 ppm or greater. We are also finalizing specific recordkeeping and reporting requirements when Method 21 is used to perform a monitoring survey. See section V.J for more details on the recordkeeping and reporting requirements.

c. Shifting of Monitoring Frequency Based on Performance

The EPA proposed shifting monitoring frequencies (ranging from annual to quarterly monitoring) based on the percentage of components that are found to have fugitive emissions during a monitoring survey. We solicited comment on the proposed monitoring scheme, including the proposed metrics of one percent and three percent to determine monitoring frequency or whether the monitoring frequency thresholds should be based on a specific number of components that are found to have fugitive emissions. In addition, the EPA solicited comment on whether a performance-based frequency or a fixed-frequency was more appropriate.

The EPA received the same comments regarding frequency of monitoring for compressor stations as for well sites, discussed in section VI.F.1.d. Likewise, for the same reasons as discussed earlier, the EPA is finalizing a fixed monitoring frequency instead of performance based monitoring.

d. Fugitive Emissions Components Repair and Resurvey

The EPA proposed that a source of fugitive emissions at compressor stations must be repaired or replaced as soon as practicable, and, in any case, no later than 15 calendar days after detection of the fugitive emissions. The EPA solicited comment on whether 15 days is the appropriate amount of time for repair of sources of fugitive emissions from compressor stations. We also solicited comment on whether 15 days is the appropriate amount of time needed to resurvey a component after it has been repaired.

The EPA received the same comments regarding the timeframe for repairs, delay of repair, and resurveys for compressor stations as for well sites, discussed in section VI.F.1.e. Likewise, for the same reasons as discussed earlier, we are finalizing 30 days for the repair of fugitive emissions sources and an additional 30 days for resurvey of the repaired fugitive emissions components.

⁹⁰ See EPA docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505.

We also are finalizing revisions to the delay of repair requirements. If a repair cannot be made due to a technical infeasibility that would require a blowdown or shutdown of the compressor station, or would be unsafe to repair by exposing personnel to immediate danger, the repair can be delayed until the next scheduled or emergency blowdown or station shutdown or within 2 years of finding the fugitive source of emissions, whichever is earlier. We believe that the likelihood of an emergency blowdown or a compressor station shutdown occurring within six months of finding fugitive emissions from a component may be low; however, it would be feasible to repair the component within a two-year timeframe, since one of above described events is likely to occur within that two-year timeframe. The owner or operator will also have to record the number and types of components that are placed on delay of repair and record an explanation for each delay of repair.

Similarly with respect to well sites, and as discussed in section VI.F.1.e, we are finalizing the use of the alternative screening procedures specified in Section 8.3.3 of Method 21 for resurveying repaired fugitive emissions components. Please see the RTC document in the public docket for further discussion.

e. Definition of "Fugitive Emission Component"

As discussed earlier, we proposed monitoring, repair and resurvey of "fugitive emission components," that apply to both well sites and compressor stations because the type of components are identical. We solicited comment on the proposed definition. The EPA received the same comments regarding the fugitive emissions component definition for compressor stations as for well sites, discussed in section VI.F.1.f. Likewise, for the same reasons as discussed earlier, we are finalizing changes to the definition to identify specific components, such as valves and flanges, that have the potential to be sources of fugitive emissions and that, when surveyed and repaired, would significantly reduce GHG and VOC emissions. This targeted list will remove the ambiguity of the proposed definition and will allow owners and operators to consistently identify fugitive emissions at compressor stations.

f. Timing of the Initial Monitoring Survey

The EPA proposed that the initial monitoring be conducted within 30 days after the initial startup of a new

compressor station or modification of an existing compressor station. The EPA solicited comment on whether 30 days is an appropriate amount of time to begin conducting fugitive emissions monitoring.

Many commenters supported a longer timeframe for commencing monitoring, citing time needed to complete well ties into a compressor station that collects field gas, safety, and the relationship with other regulations, while some commenters supported the timeframe proposed. The EPA recognizes that at the time of startup of a compressor station, additional gathering lines or well tie-ins may be required. However, we also believe that, at the time of startup, the associated collection of fugitive emissions components is operational and initial monitoring can begin, even if the gathering lines or well tie-ins are incomplete, which could take several months or longer. Sources of fugitive emissions could go undetected for months if we were to allow monitoring to begin after all of the gathering lines and tie-ins were completed. Therefore, we are finalizing the proposed requirement that initial monitoring will begin after the initial startup of a compressor station instead of allowing all of the gathering lines or tie-ins to be completed before monitoring begins.

However, based on the comments received, we are concerned that the tasks required prior to conducting an initial survey would take more than the 30 days we had proposed. Because each new or modified compressor station must be covered by a monitoring plan for a company-defined area, owners and operators must visit and assess each new or modified compressor station in order to incorporate it into a newly developed or modified monitoring plan for that area. They also need to secure certified monitoring survey contractors or monitoring instruments. In addition, they need to ensure that other compliance requirements will be met, such as recordkeeping and reporting. In light of the activities described above, the EPA is requiring in the final rule that the initial survey be conducted within 60 days from startup or modification of a compressor station.

While 60 days from startup or modification of a compressor station is sufficient time to conduct the initial survey once the underlying program infrastructure is established, we recognize that the initial establishment of the required program's infrastructure and the initial round of monitoring surveys will require additional time. Most importantly, additional time is needed to secure the necessary

equipment or trained personnel according to one OGI instrument manufacturer, which commented that they would need to increase production of key components for the OGI instrument to meet demand. The OGI manufacturer also indicated that they would need to scale up the number of personnel needed to provide OGI training and service of the equipment. We are concerned that currently there is not sufficient equipment and trained personnel to meet the demand imposed by this final rule in the near term. Accordingly, it will be necessary to have a window of time for trained personnel to work through this backlog. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, an owner or operator will need to develop a monitoring plan that would apply to each compressor station located within the company-defined area, which requires an assessment of each compressor station. Therefore, before a plan can be developed or modified, the owner or operator would need time to visit each compressor station within the company-defined area. In light of the above, the initial site visits and development of the monitoring plan would require a significant amount of time. Time is also needed to secure certified monitoring survey contractors or monitoring instruments. In addition, owners and operators will need to plan the logistics of the initial activities in order to comply with the requirements. This includes time to set up recordkeeping systems and to train personnel to manage the fugitive emissions monitoring program. These corporate systems are critical for submitting the notification of initial and subsequent annual compliance status.

As noted above, once programs are established and equipment supplies have caught up, well owners will be able to add additional affected facilities to existing programs and, thus, this longer timeline will not be needed. Therefore, in order to provide time for owners and operators to establish the initial groundwork of their fugitives program, we are requiring that the initial monitoring survey must take place by June 3, 2017 or within 60 days of the startup or modification of a compressor station, whichever is later. We anticipate that sources will begin to phase in these requirements as additional devices and trained personnel become available. For additional discussion, please refer to the materials in the docket.

g. Monitoring Plan

The EPA proposed that owners or operators develop a corporate-wide

emissions monitoring plan that specifies the measures for locating sources and the detection technology to be used. The EPA also proposed that owners or operators develop a separate site-specific fugitive emissions monitoring plan that specifies information, such as the number of fugitive emission components for that site and for each affected facility. The EPA solicited comment on the required elements of the proposed corporate-wide monitoring plan and specifically asked for comment regarding whether the monitoring plan should include other techniques, such as visual inspections to help identify indicators of potential leaks.

As with this topic in the context of well sites, and as discussed in section VI.F.1.h, some commenters agreed with the EPA's proposal to require a corporate fugitive monitoring plan, but expressed concerns about the elements of the plan, while others objected that the proposed plan is overly prescriptive and costly, with particular concerns about including requirements for a walking path and for digital photographs. Other commenters suggested changing the scope of monitoring plans to accommodate variations in locations of contractors and equipment.

Based on the comments that we received, we are revising the fugitive emissions monitoring plan for compressor stations. We acknowledge that developing and implementing a corporate-wide monitoring plan that would be applicable to all compressor stations within a company could be problematic because compressor station configurations may differ across areas (*i.e.*, basins, fields, or districts) and what may be applicable in one area may not be relevant in another area. This would mean that a company could have to design and implement a site-specific plan for each compressor station.

We also agree that developing a site-specific plan may be overly burdensome because several gathering and boosting or transmission compressor stations may exist in a specific geographic area and have similar equipment. Using information from the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA) and the Energy Information Administration (EIA), we estimated that, on average, compressor stations are located 70 miles apart. We also assumed that a company could monitor emissions from gathering and boosting or transmission compressor stations within a 210-mile radius of a central location. Using these assumptions, we estimated that a company could monitor seven gathering and boosting or transmission compressor stations within

that company's specific geographic region. In such cases, companies would benefit from having a plan to cover all of the compressor stations within that area, as the monitoring will likely require use of the same contractors, the same company-owned monitoring instruments, or the same company personnel to perform the monitoring surveys. Allowing companies to develop one fugitive emissions monitoring plan for all of the compressors within a company-defined area would alleviate burden and provide efficiency for owners and operators.

Therefore, we are replacing the proposed corporate-wide and site-specific monitoring plan requirements with a requirement for owners or operators to develop a corporate monitoring plan for each of the company-defined areas that would cover the collection of fugitive emissions components at the compressor stations located within that company-defined area. This will allow owners and operators flexibility in developing monitoring plans for compressor stations by allowing owners and operators to determine which company-defined area can be covered under the specifications outlined in one monitoring plan, for ease of implementation and compliance. See section VI.F.1.h of this preamble for further discussion.

h. Modifications for Compressor Stations

The EPA proposed that, for the purposes of the collection of fugitive emissions monitoring and repair requirements, a compressor station is modified when a new compressor is constructed at an existing compressor station or when a physical change is made that causes an increase in the compression capacity of an existing compressor station. We received numerous comments on the compressor modification definition.

Several commenters stated that the compressor station modification definition is too vague and broad because anytime a physical modification occurred, a regulatory modification would be triggered regardless of whether there were additional emissions. Commenters also stated if a compressor station is not operating at full capacity, addition of a compressor may not necessarily increase the compressor station capacity, nor would addition of a compressor with greater horsepower (thus adding capacity) necessarily increase emissions.

At proposal, we attempted to identify distinct actions that we were confident

would result in an emissions increase and would clearly mark for operators and regulators when a modification occurs. However, upon reviewing the comments, we agree that certain triggering events identified in the proposal may not result in an increase in emissions. Specifically, EPA agrees that an addition of a compressor does not result in an increase in emissions in all instances. For example, there is no emission increase when a new compressor is being installed as a replacement to an existing one. We have, therefore, made changes in the final rule to clarify when an addition of a new compressor would increase emission and therefore trigger the fugitive emission standards (*i.e.*, when it is installed as an additional compressor or if it is a replacement that is of greater horsepower than the compressor or compressors that it is replacing).

The EPA agrees that an increase in the compression capacity that is not due to the addition of a compressor that would result in an increase of the overall design capacity of the compressor station is not a modification. For example, a compressor station may have to increase the operating throughput by bringing existing compressors on-line to meet demand during peak seasons. In such a case, the compressors' capacities are already accounted for in the overall design capacity for the compressor station, and bringing them on-line would not increase the overall design capacity nor would it increase the potential emissions of the compressor station. Therefore, we are not finalizing that an increase in compression capacity is a modification.

Commenters also indicated that the addition of a new compressor at an existing compressor station should not trigger a fugitive emissions monitoring program for the entire compressor station but, should only apply to the new compressor and its associated components. We disagree that the addition of a compressor at an existing compressor station should not trigger a fugitive emissions monitoring program for the entire compressor station. We have clarified that the installation of a compressor will only trigger the fugitive monitoring requirements if it is installed as an additional compressor or if it is a replacement that is of greater horsepower than the compressor or compressors that it is replacing. In this case, the design capacity and potential emissions of the compressor station would increase. Unlike the affected facilities for purposes of standards for centrifugal and reciprocating compressors themselves, the affected facility for purposes of the fugitive

emission requirements is the collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station, not the fugitive emissions components associated with a single compressor. Therefore, if a compressor is added to an existing compressor station, the entire compressor station is subject to the fugitive emissions monitoring program.

Therefore, we are finalizing a definition that we are confident identifies actions that increase emissions and achieves our original goal of having clearly identifiable criteria that can be easily recognized by operators and regulators. We are finalizing that a modification to a compressor station occurs when a compressor is added to a compressor station or if one or more compressors is replaced with one or more compressors with a greater total horsepower.

i. Provision for Emerging Technology

Pursuant to CAA section 111(h)(3), we are establishing in the final rule a process for the Agency to permit the use of innovative technology for reducing fugitive emissions at well sites and/or compressor stations. For a detailed discussion, please see section VI.F.1.i.

G. Equipment Leaks at Natural Gas Processing Plants

For equipment leaks at natural gas processing plants, the EPA received a total of seven comments addressing issues such as the definition of natural gas processing plant and whether OGI may be used in place of Method 21. We reviewed the comments received and determined to finalize the standard for equipment leaks at natural gas processing plants as proposed. Specifically, the final rule requires NSPS part 60, subpart VVa level of control, including a detection limitation of 500 ppm for certain pieces of equipment. Please see the TSD and RTC documents in the public docket for further discussion.

H. Reconsideration Issues Being Addressed

To address numerous items on which we granted reconsideration, we proposed amendments to subpart OOOO and solicited comment on certain topics that would also impact the new NSPS requirements. With some revisions based on our consideration of public comment, the EPA is finalizing certain reconsideration amendments. These amendments address: Storage vessel control device monitoring and testing provisions; initial compliance requirements for bypass devices; recordkeeping requirements for repair logs for control devices failing a visible

emissions test; clarification of the due date for the initial annual report under the 2012 NSPS; flare design and operation standards; LDAR for open-ended valves or lines; compliance period for LDAR for newly affected units; exemption to notification requirement for reconstruction; disposal of carbon from control devices; the definition of capital expenditure; and continuous control device monitoring requirements for storage vessels and centrifugal compressor affected facilities. This section identifies specifically what the EPA proposed, identifies the regulatory text changes from proposal, and states how the EPA is finalizing these provisions.⁹¹ Please see the TSD and RTC documents in the public docket for further discussion.⁹²

1. Storage Vessel Control Device Monitoring and Testing Provisions

The EPA proposed regulatory text changes to address performance testing and monitoring of control devices used for new storage vessel installations and centrifugal compressor emissions, specifically relating to in-field performance testing of enclosed combustors. The EPA specifically proposed to revise the limit for total organic carbon (TOC) concentration in the exhaust gases at the outlet of the control device from 20 ppmv to 600 ppmv as propane on a dry basis corrected to 3 percent oxygen, a value that more appropriately reflects 95 percent control of VOC inflow to control devices. The EPA also proposed initial and ongoing performance testing for any enclosed combustors used to comply with the emissions standard for an affected facility and whose make and model are not listed on the EPA Oil and Natural Gas Web site (<http://www.epa.gov/airquality/oilandgas/implement.html>) as those having already met a manufacturer's performance test demonstration. The proposal stated that performance testing of combustors not listed at the above Web site would be conducted on an ongoing basis, every 60 months of service, and monthly monitoring of visible emissions from each unit would also be required.

Additionally, the EPA proposed amendments to make the requirements for monitoring visible emissions consistent for all enclosed combustion units. Specifically, the EPA proposed to amend 40 CFR 60.5413(e)(3) to require monthly 15-minute period observations using EPA Method 22.

Based on information submitted through the public comment process, the EPA has identified four necessary revisions for the final storage vessel provisions. First, commenters provided information to the EPA concerning the use of 600 ppmv as propane as appropriately reflecting 95 percent control of VOC inflow to control devices. After an evaluation of the comments, we agreed that the EPA's assumption about the ratio of fuel to combustion air was incorrect, making the proposed 600 ppmv as propane value incorrect. The 600 ppmv as propane value was derived in the memorandum dated June 2, 2015,⁹³ which discusses the background for the § 60.5412(a)(1)(ii) TOC exhaust gas standard for combustion control devices to control VOC emissions from oil and gas affected facilities. While this analysis reflects the destruction of hydrocarbons compared to the concentration of hydrocarbon in the inlet fuel, our analysis did not take into account any in-stack dilution represented by the introduction of combustion air or the correction of that air to 3 percent oxygen. Since hydrocarbon combustion requires approximately a ratio of 12:1 input of combustion air to hydrocarbon, the outlet concentration of TOC would be adjusted downward to 275 parts per million by volume on a wet basis (ppmvw), as propane, at 3 percent O₂. The final rule corrects this concentration at § 60.5412(a)(1)(ii), and the EPA has appended the memo in the public docket with this adjustment.

Second, the EPA is finalizing amendments to make the requirements for monitoring of visible emissions consistent for all enclosed combustion units. Prior to the proposal, enclosed combustors that met the manufacturer's performance test requirement were to conduct quarterly observations for visible smoke emissions employing section 11 of EPA Method 22 for a 60-minute period. Petitioners suggested it would ease implementation to adjust the frequency and duration to monthly 15-minute EPA Method 22 tests, which is currently required for continuous monitoring of enclosed combustors that are not manufacturer tested. The EPA agrees with the petitioners. This revision will result in consistent requirements to all enclosed combustors, which will make compliance easier for owners and operators. Because both monitoring requirements ensure compliance of the enclosed combustors, and having the

⁹¹ 80 FR 56645, September 18, 2015.

⁹² See EPA docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505.

⁹³ See Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505-4907.

same requirement would ease implementation burden, we are finalizing amendments to §§ 60.5413(e)(3) and 60.5415(b)(2)(vii)(B) to require monthly 15-minute period observations using EPA Method 22 Test, as suggested by the petitioner.

The EPA proposed requirements for determining applicability for new storage tanks that replace existing tanks. Commenters provided alternative text indicating how the meaning of the regulation was difficult to discern. The EPA considered the suggested text and agrees that amending this section will make the requirements for compliance easier to understand. The amended language has been finalized in § 60.5365(e)(4).

Fourth, the EPA received comments requesting removal of the requirement that certain devices that route emissions to processes must reduce emissions by 95 percent and instead be written to be consistent with § 60.5411a(c), which requires that process devices must operate 95 percent of the year or greater. Upon further reflection, the EPA determined that, because § 60.5395a(a) clearly requires that affected sources (except those with uncontrolled emissions below 4 tons per year (tpy)) must reduce VOC emission by 95 percent, it is not necessary to further prescribe the level of reduction to be achieved when emissions are routed to a process. The EPA has therefore removed such specification in § 60.5395a(b)(1) in the final rule. As finalized, this specific provision relative to control requirements is the same for centrifugal compressors, pneumatic pumps, and storage vessel affected facilities routing to a process.

2. Initial Compliance Requirements for Bypass Devices

The EPA proposed to amend § 60.5416(c)(3)(i) to include notification via remote alarm to the nearest field office in order to maintain consistency with previous amendments. The EPA proposed to require both an alarm at the bypass device and a remote alarm. The EPA proposed similar amendments to parallel requirements at § 60.5411(a)(3)(i)(A) for closed vent systems used with reciprocating compressors and centrifugal compressor wet seal degassing systems. At proposal to amend subpart OOOO, EPA changed “or” to “and” under subpart OOOO at §§ 60.5411(a)(3)(i)(A) and 60.5411(c)(3)(i)(A), which would have required that both an audible and remote alarm be installed on a bypass device with the potential to vent to the atmosphere. One commenter pointed

out that the requirements would be applied retroactively, as the EPA changed the requirements in subpart OOOO as well as subpart OOOOa. The EPA agrees with the commenter that our intent was not to create a retroactive requirement by revising subpart OOOO. The EPA is therefore not finalizing the changes to subpart OOOO, § 60.5411(a)(3)(i)(A), or § 60.5411(c)(3)(i)(A).

Although we are not finalizing both audible and remote alarm requirements in subpart OOOO, the EPA disagrees that the requirement for remote notification is unreasonable and is therefore preserving the option as an alternative to an audible alarm. The EPA notes that either requirement is restricted to those bypass devices that vent to the atmosphere, not bypass devices (such as some pressure relief devices) that are required to be routed through closed vent systems to control devices. The EPA proposed to require both types of notification in subpart OOOOa because of the diverse nature of facilities that will use them. While an audible alarm may be sufficient at facilities that have personnel present on a continuous basis, not all affected facilities are at continuously-manned locations. An audible alarm on a bypass at a remote location that is visited only on a schedule by maintenance personnel would likely alert no one authorized to take action on the audible alarm until such time as the maintenance personnel arrive, which according to industry, may be a considerable time. The EPA agrees that the logistical requirements may need to be resolved in some instances, and is therefore finalizing the requirements in subpart OOOOa to be the same in substance as the requirements in subpart OOOO, which allow for the operator to choose one form of alarm or the other. Section 60.5416a(c)(3)(i) was revised to match the promulgated regulatory language in § 60.5416(c)(3)(i) of OOOO for consistency.

3. Recordkeeping Requirements for Repair Logs for Control Devices Failing a Visible Emissions Test

The EPA proposed that the recordkeeping requirements include the repair logs for control devices failing a visible emissions test as required by the rule. Petitioners noted that the recordkeeping requirements of § 60.5420(c) do not include the repair logs for control devices failing a visible emissions test required by § 60.5413(c). We agree that these recordkeeping requirements should be listed and are finalizing them at § 60.5420(c)(14).

4. Due Date for Initial Annual Report

The EPA did not propose regulatory text to amend the rule; rather, the EPA stated in the preamble to the proposed rule that we will consider any initial annual report submitted no later than January 15, 2014 to be a timely submission. All subsequent annual reports must be submitted by the correct date of January 13 of the year.

5. Flare Design and Operation Standards

The EPA proposed to remove the provision of Table 3 in subpart OOOO that exempts flares from complying with the requirements for the design and operation of flares under 40 CFR 60.18 of the General Provisions. By removing the exemption from the General Provisions of subpart OOOO, this clarifies that flares used to comply with subpart OOOO are subject to the design and operation requirements in the general provisions.

Comments on our proposal focused on support for the use of pressure-assisted flares. Pressure-assisted flares are designed to operate with high velocities up to sonic velocity conditions (e.g., 700 to 1,400 feet per second for common hydrocarbon gases). In order to evaluate the use of pressure-assisted flares by the oil and natural gas industry and determine whether to develop operating parameters for pressure-assisted flares for purposes of subparts OOOO and subpart OOOOa, the EPA solicited comment on where in the source category, under what conditions (e.g., maintenance), and how frequently pressure-assisted flares are used to control emissions from an affected facility, as defined within this subpart. From comments to our proposal, the EPA understands that there may be affected facilities that use pressure-assisted flares (e.g., sonic flares) to control emissions from certain activities; however, the EPA now understands that an affected facility storage vessel, pneumatic pump, or centrifugal or reciprocating compressor would not use a pressure-assisted flare for control. The affected facility could be routed by closed vent system to a low pressure flare, which can comply with the velocity requirements of 40 CFR 60.18. The EPA received information showing that certain configurations have separate flare tips that accommodate high pressure and low pressure. The EPA understands that a flare configured this way would be able to meet § 60.18 on the low pressure side, which would be appropriate for compliance with these standards. Given these facts, the EPA is finalizing the rule as proposed, because no regulatory

amendment appears necessary for such flares to comply with the proposed requirements.

6. Leak Detection and Repair (LDAR) for Open-Ended Valves or Lines

In the preamble to the final 2012 rule, the EPA stated that subpart VVa lowered the concentration limit defining a leak from 10,000 ppm to 500 ppm. The EPA's action did not revise subpart VVa, but rather changed the application of leak detection and repair provisions by making the LDAR standards of subpart VVa applicable to affected units subject to LDAR under subpart OOOO if the concentration emanating from a leak is 500 ppm or greater. The EPA further stated that monitoring requirements from subpart VVa applied to pumps, pressure relief devices, and open-ended valves or lines at units affected by LDAR under subpart OOOO. Although the preamble may have obscured the issue, we clarify here that the monitoring provisions of subpart VVa applicable to affected units of subpart OOOO do not extend to open-ended valves or lines. Given this clarification of preamble language, the EPA can identify no need to modify the regulatory language in response to this petition.

7. Compliance Period for LDAR for Newly Affected Units

An issue was raised in an administrative petition that the EPA did not adequately respond to a comment on the 2011 proposed NSPS regarding the compliance period for the LDAR requirements for on-shore natural gas processing plants. The commenter requested that the EPA include in subpart OOOO a provision similar to subpart KKK, 40 CFR 60.632(a), which allows a compliance period of up to 180 days after initial start-up. The commenter was concerned that a modification at an existing facility or a subpart KKK regulated facility could subject the facility to subpart OOOO LDAR requirements without adequate time to bring the whole process unit into compliance with the new regulation. We clarify that subpart OOOO, as promulgated in 2012, already includes a provision similar to subpart KKK, § 60.632(a), as requested in the comment. Therefore, the EPA has determined there is no need to modify the current regulations.

8. Exemption to Notification Requirement for Reconstruction

The EPA received an administrative petition that raised the issue that notification of reconstruction requirements under § 60.15(d) is unnecessary for some affected facilities.

After consideration, the EPA agrees that some notifications are unnecessary because the EPA specifies notification of reconstruction for affected unit pneumatic controllers, centrifugal compressors, reciprocating compressors, and storage vessels under § 60.5410a and § 60.5420a, in lieu of the general notification requirement in § 60.15(d). To make this change effective, the EPA has noted this change in the explanatory comments in Table 3 reflecting that § 60.15(d) does not apply to affected facility pneumatic controllers, centrifugal compressors, reciprocating compressors and storage vessels in subpart OOOO. The EPA has determined to finalize these amendments as proposed.

9. Disposal of Carbon From Control Devices

The EPA re-proposed provisions for management of waste from spent carbon canisters that were finalized in § 60.5412(c)(2) of the 2012 NSPS to allow for comment. The EPA received no comment to the re-proposal. The EPA has determined to finalize these amendments as proposed.

10. The Definition of Capital Expenditure

The EPA proposed to specifically define the term "capital expenditure" in subpart OOOO. In this proposed definition, the EPA updated the formula to reflect the calendar year that subpart OOOO was proposed, as well as specified that the B value for subpart OOOO is 4.5. These updates are necessary for proper calculation of capital expenditure under subpart OOOO. The EPA has determined to finalize these amendments as proposed. Please refer to the RTC document in the public docket for this rulemaking for further discussion.

11. Tanks Associated With Water Recycling Operations

The EPA solicited comment in the proposed rule to remove tanks that are used for water recycling from potential NSPS applicability and on approaches that could be taken to amend the definition of "storage vessel." Commenters requested that the EPA remove water tanks that are primarily used for water recycling from subpart OOOOa applicability. Commenters discussed that large storage tanks encourage large scale water recycling and are expected to reduce fresh water usage primarily in the Permian Basin. After reviewing the public comments, the EPA agrees that certain large water recycling vessels should be exempt from affected facility status for storage vessels

because EPA did not intend such vessels to be affected facility storage vessels under subpart OOOO or OOOOa. By exempting such vessels, EPA will not create a disincentive for recycling of water for hydraulic fracturing. Therefore, the final rule exempts water recycling vessels that receive water that has been through separation, and are much larger than the storage vessels generally intended to be regulated by subparts OOOO and OOOOa for VOC emissions. The EPA has included the exemption language at § 60.5365(e)(5) and § 60.5365a(e)(5) in the final rule.

12. Continuous Control Device Monitoring

The EPA proposed under § 60.5417 to add continuous control device monitoring requirements for storage vessels and centrifugal compressor affected facilities. The EPA received comments indicating that to impose this requirement on affected facilities under subpart OOOO may make such requirements retroactive, given the time between the original proposal for subpart OOOO and the proposal of the additional requirements. To avoid this possibility, the EPA will not finalize the change proposed to subpart OOOO, § 60.5417(h)(4).

I. Technical Corrections and Clarifications

The EPA is finalizing technical corrections and clarifications intended to provide clarity, improve implementation, and update procedures. This section identifies each correction and the rationale for these changes. Please see the TSD and RTC documents in the public docket for further discussion.⁹⁴

1. The EPA discovered drafting errors in § 60.5412a(d)(1)(iv)(A), § 60.5412a(d)(2) and § 60.5415a(e)(3) that required control of methane from storage vessels. As discussed in the preamble and the TSD for the proposed rule, the EPA did not consider reduction of methane emissions from storage vessels. Therefore, the reference to controlling storage vessel methane emissions in the proposed regulatory text in the above provisions was a drafting error. In correction, the EPA is removing "methane and" from these three provisions because methane control is not required for storage vessels under subpart OOOOa.

2. A commenter noted that EPA had omitted a clear deadline by which newly constructed, reconstructed, or

⁹⁴ See EPA docket I.D. No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505.

modified storage vessels that receive liquids from sources other than hydraulically fractured wells must make their potential to emit determination, in § 60.5365a(e)(1). The commenter presumed, correctly, that the omission was inadvertent, stating that “Presumably, EPA intends that such tanks with potential VOC emissions greater than 6 tons per year would be subject to the rule.” We have more clearly specified the deadline.

3. We removed the requirement in § 60.5375a(a)(2) that all salable gas recovered from a well completion be routed as soon as practicable to a gathering line. This requirement was duplicative of the provisions of paragraph (a)(1) of the same section.

4. We revised § 60.5420a(b)(4)(i) to include the provision that gas recovered from reciprocating compressors could also be routed to a process as an alternative to replacing rod packing no later than on or before 26,000 hours of operation or 36 months. We additionally corrected an error that identified a wrong initial startup period. This correction consists of removing “since [insert date 60 days after publication of final rule in the **Federal Register**].” This correction was also made in § 60.5420a(c)(3)(i) and § 60.5415a(c)(1).

5. We revised the requirements in § 60.5417a for heat sensing monitoring devices on pilot flames to clarify that these devices are not subject to calibration, quality assurance and quality control requirements. While we intended for these devices to monitor continuously, we did not intend to place all of the requirements for continuous parameter monitoring systems on these devices. We also revised the language in § 60.5417a(e) and § 60.5417a(g) to indicate that heat sensing is not a daily average and that a deviation occurs when the device fails to indicate the presence of a pilot flame.

6. We revised the language in § 60.5417a(f)(1)(iii) for monitoring inlet gas flow rate on control devices tested by the manufacturer. We did not intend for owners or operators to have to continuously achieve a minimum inlet gas flow rate. We have revised the requirement to indicate that there is only a limit on the maximum gas inlet flow rate to the device. We also revised the language in § 60.5417a(d)(1)(viii)(A) to indicate that the accuracy requirement is at the maximum flow rate.

7. We revised the language in § 60.5413a(d)(11)(iii) to indicate that manufacturers must demonstrate a destruction efficiency of 95 percent for total hydrocarbons (THC), as propane. This requirement previously stated that

the manufacturer must demonstrate a destruction efficiency of 95 percent for VOC and methane. The revised language aligns more accurately with the testing requirements in the rule. Additionally, as these units are burning propene during the test, it would be impossible to demonstrate a destruction efficiency of methane. As methane is a one-carbon, single-bonded compound, it is more easily destructed than propene, a double-bonded compound, and thus, the destruction efficiency should be just as high or higher for methane than for the THC measured during the performance test.

8. We revised the testing language in § 60.5413a(b) in order to make it clearer for compliance purposes. The proposed language failed to clearly identify the number of runs or the length of runs expected for each performance test. Additionally, the calculations did not properly align with the specified methods. Section 60.5412a(d)(1)(i) has no subsections. The reference to “percent reduction performance requirement” in the referring section 60.5413a(b)(3) indicates that the cross reference should refer to section 60.5412a(d)(1)(iv)(A), which contains the percent reduction required.

9. We revised the language in § 60.5395a(a) to clarify that owners and operators must comply with the requirements of § 60.5395a(a)(1). The proposed language could have been interpreted to mean that compliance with § 60.5395a(a)(1) was not required if owners or operators complied with § 60.5395a(a)(3); however, it would be impossible to comply with § 60.5395a(a)(3) without first determining the potential for VOC emissions, as required by § 60.5395a(a)(1). We also further clarified when owners and operators must comply with the requirements of § 60.5395a(a)(2) and when they may comply with the requirements of § 60.5395a(a)(3).

10. We revised the language in § 60.5420a(b)(9)(i), § 60.5420a(b)(11), § 60.5422a(a), and 60.5423a(b) to update the Web site address for the Electronic Reporting Tool (ERT). We have also clarified that if the CEDRI form is not available at the time that a report is due, we do not intend for owners or operators to submit forms electronically through CEDRI until the form has been available for 90 days. We are also clarifying that this only applies to subsequent reports; owners or operators would not be required to enter previous reports into CEDRI once the form is available. While similar language was proposed, we realize that the previous

language did not fully capture our intent.

11. We revised the language in § 60.5412a(c)(2)(iii) to correct a drafting error. The proposed language lists the types of units in which owners or operators must regenerate or reactivate spent carbon. The proposed language stated the unit must be operating emission controls in accordance with an emissions standard for VOC under another subpart in 40 CFR part 60 or this part, which is redundant. The language has been revised to state part 63 or this part. We also removed § 60.5412a(c)(2)(ii), as we do not believe that owners or operators would be able to regenerate or reactivate spent carbon in accordance with this section, as there are no requirements in this section for that activity. Finally, we removed the phrase “thermal treatment” in front of unit in § 60.5412a(c)(2)(i) and (iii) as the phrase “thermal treatment unit” is not defined.

12. We revised the language in § 60.5412a(c)(2)(iv) through (vii) and § 60.5413a(a)(4) and (5) to reconcile the fact that most hazardous waste combustion units are subject to the requirements of 40 CFR part 63 subpart EEE. While our intent was to encompass all hazardous waste incinerators, boilers and industrial furnaces in these requirements, referencing only 40 CFR parts 264, 265, 266 and 270 may have inadvertently excluded units.

13. We revised the language in § 60.5413a(b)(5)(ii)(B) to more clearly identify the continuing compliance obligations for units exempt from periodic testing.

14. We revised the TOC emission rate limit in § 60.5412a(a)(1)(ii) and § 60.5412a(d)(1)(iv)(B) to be consistent with the changes to the limit in 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOOO. For more explanation on this topic, see the discussion on reconsideration issues in section VI.H of this preamble. We also revised the TOC limit to be on a wet basis, as these units will be tested with Method 25A, which provides measurement data on a wet basis. While we note that compressors must control both VOCs and methane to at least 95 percent, the calculated limit reflects 95 percent control of VOC inflow to control devices. Because methane is the simplest carbon compound, it is very easy to destroy through combustion. Ensuring 95 percent destruction of VOCs will guarantee greater than 95 percent destruction of methane.

15. We revised the wording of § 60.5365(e)(4) and 60.5365a(e)(4) at the request of commenters seeking clearer direction on the applicability of standards to storage vessels returning to

service. Since the re-wording does not change the meaning or requirements of the section, the revisions have been made to both subparts OOOO and OOOOa for consistency.

16. We corrected the cross reference in section 60.5415(c)(4) from § 60.5411(a) to section 60.5416(a) and (b), and in § 60.5415a paragraph (c)(4) from section 60.5411a(a) to § 60.5416a(a) and (b).

17. We corrected language in in § 60.5420(c)(6) to include reciprocating compressors.

18. We adjusted the language in § 60.5412(d)(1)(iv)(C), § 60.5412a(a)(1)(iii) and § 60.5412a(d)(1)(iv)(C). This language allowed operation of the control device at a minimum temperature of 760°Celsius, if the control device was able to demonstrate a uniform combustion temperature during the performance test. In our response to comments on the August 23, 2011 proposed rule, we agreed with commenters that uniform combustion profiles are difficult to obtain due to flame zone mixing and heat transfer. In response to that comment, we revised the language in 40 CFR part 63 subpart HH. We have now revised the language in 40 CFR part 60 subparts OOOO and OOOOa to mimic the language in 40 CFR part 63 subpart HH. We believe that this change is necessary as we do not believe that owners or operators will be able to demonstrate a uniform combustion zone temperature, nor have we defined what it means to have a uniform combustion zone temperature (e.g., the number of measurement points necessary, the agreement between points, etc.). Additionally, § 60.5412(d)(1)(iv)(C), § 60.5412a(a)(1)(iii) and § 60.5412a(d)(1)(iv)(C) previously referenced performance testing in accordance with § 60.5413 and § 60.5413a, but it was unclear what the performance testing obligations were. We believe the revised language will allow owners and operators to more easily comply with this requirement.

19. We added language to § 60.5412(d) and § 60.5412a(d) to make our intent clear that flares are acceptable control devices for storage vessels and to identify the design requirements for flares. We also revised language in § 60.5415a(b)(2)(vii) to clearly identify the continuing compliance requirements for flares.

20. We adjusted the language in § 60.5413a(b)(5)(ii)(A) and § 60.5417a(d)(1)(viii) to add a second compliance option for control device models tested under § 60.5413a(d). We are allowing owners and operators an

option to retest these units every five years in lieu of continuously monitoring the gas flow rate. Owners and operators must still ensure they are not overwhelming the control device by using a control device that can handle the maximum flow rate at the site.

21. We added language to § 60.5417a(a) to identify the continuing compliance requirements for enclosed combustion devices that are not specifically identified in § 60.5417a(d).

22. In preparation of the final rule, EPA discovered an error in both subpart OOOO and the proposed subpart OOOOa. Specifically, they fail to include a general duty to minimize emissions. As the EPA clarified during the 2012 NSPS rulemaking, “[t]he general duty is applicable to a source at all times.”⁹⁵ Therefore, the absence of this provision in subpart OOOO and the proposed subpart OOOOa was an error, which is being corrected in these final rules at § 60.5370 and § 60.5370a.

J. Final Standards Reflecting Next Generation Compliance and Rule Effectiveness

We are finalizing certain standards that are reflecting EPA’s Next Generation Compliance and rule effectiveness strategies. Based on our consideration of the comments received, we are finalizing some aspects as proposed while, for others, we have made a number of changes to the proposed standards. We have the opportunity to expand transparency by making the information we have more accessible and by making new information, obtained from advanced emissions monitoring and electronic reporting, publicly available. We are finalizing an electronic reporting requirement, via the EPA’s CDX.

Other aspects of the final rule will maximize regulatory compliance, such as clear applicability of the final rule (e.g., in revisions to modification criteria) and provide incentives for inherently low-emitting equipment (e.g., solar pumps at gas plants are not affected facilities). Advances in technology additionally promote compliance by enhancing a “visibility” factor; this rule builds on such Next Generation strategies, by including measures involving the use of digital picture reporting and OGI technology. In lieu of independent third party verification for closed vent system design, we are finalizing a qualified professional engineer certification for certain issues. For example, as discussed in section VIII of this

preamble, in response to comment, we are providing that a pneumatic pump that cannot be connected to an existing control device due to technical infeasibility does not have to meet this requirement. However, we will require that the source make this determination through use of a professional engineer certification. We are finalizing the use of OGI technology as a method for detecting fugitive emissions at well sites and compressor station sites. With the exception of “clear applicability”, “incentives for inherently low-emitting equipment” and “OGI technology for monitoring fugitive emissions”, which are discussed elsewhere in this preamble, this section identifies the rationale to the regulatory text changes from proposal and states how the EPA is finalizing these provisions. For additional details, please refer to section VIII, the TSD, and the RTC supporting documentation in the public docket.

1. Electronic Reporting

Through electronic reporting, or e-reporting, paper reporting is replaced by standardized, Internet-based, electronic reporting to a central repository using specifically developed forms, templates, and tools. E-reporting is not simply a regulated entity emailing an electronic copy of a document to the government but, also a means to make collected information easily accessible to the public and other stakeholders.

On March 20, 2015, the EPA proposed the “Electronic Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements for New Source Performance Standards” (80 FR 15099, March 20, 2015). If adopted, the rule would revise the part 60 General Provisions and various NSPS subparts in part 60 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) to require affected facilities to submit specified air emissions data reports to the EPA electronically and to allow affected facilities to maintain electronic records of these reports. This proposed rule focuses on the submission of electronic reports to the EPA that provide direct measures of air emissions data such as performance test reports, performance evaluation reports, summary and excess emission reports and subpart specific reports that are similar in nature to these reports.

Subpart OOOO is one of the rules potentially affected by this rulemaking. When promulgated, in addition to electronically reporting the results of performance tests, which is already a requirement, a requirement to report the annual reports required in § 60.5420(b), the semiannual reports required in § 60.5422 and the excess emissions reports required in § 60.5423(b) would

⁹⁵ See RTC document in EPA Docket I.D. No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505-4546.

be added to subpart OOOO. The owner or operator would be required to use the appropriate electronic form in CEDRI for the subpart or an alternate electronic file format consistent with the form's extensible markup language (XML) schema. If the reporting form specific to the subpart is not available at the time that the report is due, the owner or operator would submit the report to the Administrator at the appropriate address listed in § 60.4 of the General Provisions. The owner or operator would begin submitting reports electronically with the next report that is due once the electronic form has been available for at least 90 days. The EPA is currently working to develop the form for subpart OOOO.

In the proposal for subpart OOOOa, the EPA included the same electronic reporting requirements for subpart OOOOa that were included for subpart OOOO in the March 2015 proposal. The EPA is finalizing the requirement to report certain performance test reports, excess emission reports, annual reports and semiannual reports electronically through the EPA's CDX using the CEDRI. The EPA believes that the electronic submittal of the reports addressed in this rulemaking will increase the usefulness of the data contained in those reports, is in keeping with current trends in data availability, will further assist in the protection of public health and the environment, and will ultimately result in less burden on the regulated community. Electronic reporting can also eliminate paper-based, manual processes, thereby saving time and resources, simplifying data entry, eliminating redundancies, minimizing data reporting errors, and providing data quickly and accurately to the affected facilities, air agencies, the EPA and the public.

The EPA Web site that stores the submitted electronic data, WebFIRE, will be easily accessible to everyone and will provide a user-friendly interface that any stakeholder can access. By making the records, data and reports addressed in this rulemaking readily available, the EPA, the regulated community and the public will benefit when the EPA conducts its CAA-required reviews. As a result of having reports readily accessible, our ability to carry out comprehensive reviews will be increased and achieved within a shorter period of time.

The EPA anticipates fewer or less substantial information collection requests (ICRs) in conjunction with prospective CAA-required reviews may be needed, resulting in a decrease in time spent by industry to respond to data collection requests. The EPA also

expects the ICRs to contain less extensive stack testing provisions, as we will already have stack test data electronically. Reduced testing requirements would be a cost savings to industry. The EPA should also be able to conduct these required reviews more quickly. While the regulated community may benefit from a reduced burden of ICRs, the general public benefits from the Agency's ability to provide these required reviews more quickly, resulting in increased public health and environmental protection.

Air agencies will benefit from more streamlined and automated review of the electronically submitted data. Having reports and associated data in electronic format will facilitate review through the use of software "search" options, as well as the downloading and analyzing of data in spreadsheet format. The ability to access and review air emission report information electronically will assist air agencies to more quickly and accurately determine compliance with the applicable regulations, potentially allowing a faster response to violations that could minimize harmful air emissions. This benefits both air agencies and the general public.

For a more thorough discussion of electronic reporting, see the discussion in the preamble of the March 2015 proposal. In summary, in addition to supporting regulation development, control strategy development, and other air pollution control activities, having an electronic database populated with performance test data will save industry, air agencies, and the EPA significant time, money, and effort while improving the quality of emission inventories, air quality regulations, and enhancing the public's access to this important information.

2. Digital Picture Reporting as an Alternative for Well Completions ("REC PIX") and Manufacturer Installed Control Devices

The EPA is finalizing digital picture reporting as an alternative for well completions and manufacturer installed control devices as proposed. Specifically, the final rule allows digital picture reporting as an alternative for well completions ("REC PIX") and manufacturer installed control devices. These alternative reporting options provide flexibility for owners and operators, provide enhanced "visibility" for regulators, and take advantage of the advances of the digital age with the ability to capture geospatial accuracy at any location.

Digital picture reporting as an alternative for well completions ("REC

PIX") reflects the 2012 NSPS. As with the 2012 NSPS, we continue to promote an optional mechanism by which owners and operators could streamline annual reporting of well completions by using a digital camera to document that a well completion was performed in compliance with subpart OOOOa. Although we understand that commenters have concerns about the amount of electronic storage capability necessary to store digital pictures, we believe that by allowing either the REC PIX or the elements required under the recordkeeping requirements for well completions, the owner or operator may determine what is most advantageous for their company. Should an owner or operator choose to submit the REC PIX, the REC PIX must consist of a digital photograph of the REC equipment in use, with the date and geospatial coordinates shown on the photographs. These photographs must be submitted with the next annual report, along with a list of well completions performed with identifying information for each well completed.

Digital picture reporting as an alternative for manufacturer installed control devices provides further opportunity and flexibility to owners and operators to advance data capture to ensure that compliance practices are in effect. This alternative recordkeeping and reporting option is allowed specifically for centrifugal compressors and storage vessels routed to control devices, where the control device used is one tested in accordance with the manufacturer testing procedures in the rule and is posted to the EPA Oil and Gas page. In lieu of a written record with the location of the centrifugal compressor or storage vessel and its associated control device in latitude and longitude, the digital picture alternative must have the date the photograph was taken and the latitude and longitude of the centrifugal compressor and control device or storage vessel and control device imbedded within or stored with the digital file. As an alternative to imbedded latitude and longitude within the digital picture, the digital picture may consist of a photograph of the centrifugal compressor and control device with a photograph of a separately operating GPS device within the same digital picture, provided the latitude and longitude output of the GPS unit can be clearly read in the digital photograph. Furthermore, as discussed in section VI.F of this preamble, digital pictures and frame captures will help ensure that OGI for fugitive emissions is being performed properly.

3. Certification of Technical Infeasibility of Connecting a Pneumatic Pump to an Existing Control Device

In response to comment, the final rule requires that a new, modified, or reconstructed pneumatic pump be routed to an existing control device or process onsite, unless the owner or operator obtains a certification that it is technically infeasible to do so. The EPA understands that some factors such as capacity of the existing control device and back pressure on the exhaust of the pneumatic pump imposed by the closed vent system and control device can contribute to infeasibility of routing a pneumatic pump to an existing control device or process technically infeasible, we do not think we could prescribe a specific set of criteria or factors that must be considered for making such determination that could capture all such circumstances. However, we want to ensure that the owner or operator has effectively assessed these factors before making a claim of infeasibility. To that end, we have included provisions in the final rule to require certification by a qualified professional engineer of such technical infeasibility. In addition, we are requiring that the owner or operator maintain records of that certification for a period of five years.

4. Professional Engineer Design of Closed Vent Systems

It is the EPA's experience, through site inspections and interaction with the states, that closed vent systems and control devices for storage vessels and other emission sources often suffer from improper design or inadequate capacity that results in emissions not reaching the control device and/or the control device being overwhelmed by the volume of emissions. Either of these conditions can seriously compromise emissions control and can render the system ineffective. We also discussed the issue in the September 2015 Compliance Alert "EPA Observes Air Emissions from Controlled Storage Vessels at Onshore Oil and Natural Gas Production Facilities" (See <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/oilgascompliancealert.pdf>).

We believe it is important that owners and operators make real efforts to provide for proper design of these systems to ensure that all the emissions routed to the control device reach the control device and that the control device is sized and operated to result in proper control. As a result, we have

included in the final rule provisions for certification by a qualified professional engineer that the closed vent system is properly designed to ensure that all emissions from the unit being controlled in fact reach the control device and allow for proper control.

Although the final rule does not include requirements for specific criteria for proper design, the EPA believes there are certain minimum design criteria that should be considered to ensure that the closed vent and control device system are designed to meet the requirements of the rule; *i.e.*, the closed vent system must be capable of routing all gases, vapors, and fumes emitted from the affected facility to a control device or to a process that meets the requirements of the rule.

Furthermore, because other emissions may be collected into the closed vent system and routed to the control device, these design criteria include consideration of the contribution of these additional emissions to ensure proper sizing and operation. The minimum design elements include, but are not limited to, based on site-specific considerations:

1. Review of the Control Technologies to be Used to Comply with §§ 60.5380a and 60.5395a.

2. Closed Vent System Considerations:

- a. Piping—
 - i. Size (include all emissions, not just affected facility);
 - ii. Back pressure, including low points which collect liquids;
 - iii. Pressure losses; and
 - iv. Bypasses and pressure release points.

3. Affected Facility Considerations:

- a. Peak Flow from affected facility, including flash emissions, if applicable; and

- b. Bypasses, pressure release points.

4. Control Device Considerations:

- a. Maximum volumetric flow rate based on peak flow, and

- b. Ability to handle future gas flow.

K. Provision for Equivalency Determinations

In recent years, certain states have developed programs to control various oil and gas emission sources in their own states. Due to the differences in the sources covered and the requirements, determining equivalency through direct comparison of the various state programs with the NSPS has proven to be difficult. We also did not find that any state program as a whole would reflect what we have identified as the BSERs for all emissions sources covered by the NSPS. In any event, federal

standards are necessary to ensure that emissions from the oil and natural gas industry are controlled nationwide.

However, depending on the applicable state requirements, certain owners and operators may achieve equivalent or more emission reduction from their affected source(s) than the required reduction under the NSPS by complying with their state requirements. States may adopt and enforce standards or limitations that are more stringent than the NSPS. See CAA section 116 and the EPA's regulations at 40 CFR 60.10(a). For states that are being proactive in addressing emissions from the oil and natural gas industry, it is important that the NSPS complement such effort. Therefore, in the final rule, through the process described in section VI.F.1.i for emerging technology, owners and operators may also submit an application requesting that the EPA approve certain state requirement as "alternative means of emission limitations" under the NSPS for their affected facilities. The application would include a demonstration that emission reduction achieved under the state requirement(s) is at least equivalent to the emission reduction achieved under the NSPS standards for a given affected facility. Consistent with section 111(h)(3), any application will be publicly noticed, which the EPA intends to provide within six months after receiving a complete application, including all required information for evaluation. The EPA will provide an opportunity for public hearing on the application and on intended action the EPA might take. The EPA intends to make a final determination within six months after the close of the public comment period. The EPA will also publish its determination in the **Federal Register**.

VII. Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Permitting

A. Overview

This final rule will regulate GHGs under CAA section 111. In this section, the EPA is addressing how regulation of GHGs under CAA section 111 could have implications for other EPA rules and for permits written under the CAA Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) preconstruction permit program and the CAA Title V operating permit program. The EPA is adopting provisions in the regulations that explicitly address some of these potential implications based on our review of the proposed regulatory text and comments received on the proposal.

For purposes of the PSD program, the EPA is finalizing provisions in part 60

of its regulations and explaining in this preamble that the current threshold for determining whether a PSD source must satisfy the best available control technology (BACT) requirement for GHGs continues to apply after promulgation of this rule. This rule does not require any additional revisions to state implementation plans (SIPs). With respect to the Title V operating permits program, we are finalizing provisions in part 60 and explaining in this preamble that this rule does not affect whether sources are subject to the requirement to obtain a Title V operating permit based solely on emitting or having the potential to emit GHGs above major source thresholds.

B. Applicability of Tailoring Rule Thresholds Under the PSD Program

EPA received several comments asking for clarification or changes to make clear that this rule did not directly regulate methane as a separate pollutant from GHG and that it would not cause sources to trigger PSD or Title V permitting requirements based solely on methane emissions.⁹⁶ This section discusses changes made in response to these comments as well as clarification as to what, if any, impact this rule has on PSD permitting. Section VII.C below addresses Title V-specific issues.

Under the PSD program in part C of title I of the CAA, in areas that are classified as attainment or unclassifiable for NAAQS pollutants, a new or modified source that emits any air pollutant subject to regulation at or above specified thresholds is required to obtain a preconstruction permit. This permit ensures that the source meets specific requirements, including application of BACT to each pollutant subject to regulation under the CAA. Many states (and local districts) are authorized by the EPA to administer the PSD program and to issue PSD permits. If a state is not authorized, then the EPA issues the PSD permits for facilities in that state.

To identify the pollutants subject to the PSD permitting program, EPA regulations contain a definition of the term “regulated NSR pollutant.” 40 CFR 52.21(b)(50); 40 CFR 51.166(b)(49). This definition contains four subparts, which cover pollutants regulated under various parts of the CAA. The second subpart covers pollutants regulated under section 111 of the CAA. The fourth subpart is a catch-all provision that applies to “[a]ny pollutant that is

otherwise subject to regulation under the Act.”

This definition and the associated PSD permitting requirements applied to GHGs for the first time on January 2, 2011, by virtue of the EPA’s regulation of GHG emissions from motor vehicles, which first took effect on that same date. 75 FR 17004 (Apr. 2, 2010). GHGs became subject to regulation under the CAA and the fourth subpart of the “regulated NSR pollutant” definition became applicable to GHGs.

On June 3, 2010, the EPA issued a final rule, known as the Tailoring Rule, which phased in permitting requirements for GHG emissions from stationary sources under the CAA PSD and Title V permitting programs (75 FR 31514). Under its understanding of the CAA at the time, the EPA believed the Tailoring Rule was necessary to avoid a sudden and unmanageable increase in the number of sources that would be required to obtain PSD and Title V permits under the CAA because the sources emitted GHGs in amounts over applicable major source and major modification thresholds. In Step 1 of the Tailoring Rule, which began on January 2, 2011, the EPA limited application of PSD or Title V requirements to sources of GHG emissions only if the sources were subject to PSD or Title V “anyway” due to their emissions of non-GHG pollutants. These sources are referred to as “anyway sources.” In Step 2 of the Tailoring Rule, which began on July 1, 2011, the EPA applied the PSD and Title V permitting requirements under the CAA to sources that were classified as major and, thus, required to obtain a permit based solely on their potential GHG emissions and to modifications of otherwise major sources that required a PSD permit because they increased only GHG emissions above applicable levels in the EPA regulations.

In the PSD program, the EPA implemented the steps of the Tailoring Rule by adopting a definition of the term “subject to regulation.” The limitations in Step 1 of the Tailoring Rule are reflected in 40 CFR 52.21(b)(49)(iv) and 40 CFR 51.166(b)(48)(iv). With respect to “anyway sources” covered by PSD during Step 1, this provision established that GHGs would not be subject to PSD requirements unless the source emitted GHGs in the amount of 75,000 tons per year (tpy) of CO₂ Eq. or more. The primary practical effect of this paragraph is that the PSD BACT requirement does not apply to GHG emissions from an “anyway source” unless the source emits GHGs at or above this threshold. The Tailoring Rule

Step 2 limitations are reflected in 40 CFR 52.21(b)(49)(v) and 51.166(b)(48)(v). These provisions contain thresholds that, when applied through the definition of “regulated NSR pollutant,” function to limit the scope of the terms “major stationary source” and “major modification” that determine whether a source is required to obtain a PSD permit. See *e.g.*, 40 CFR 51.166(a)(7)(i) and (iii); 40 CFR 51.166(b)(1); 40 CFR 51.166(b)(2).

On June 23, 2014, the United States Supreme Court, in *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. Environmental Protection Agency*, issued a decision addressing the application of PSD permitting requirements to GHG emissions. The Supreme Court held that the EPA may not treat GHGs as an air pollutant for purposes of determining whether a source is a major source (or modification thereof) for the purpose of PSD applicability. The Court also said that the EPA could continue to require that PSD permits, otherwise required based on emissions of pollutants other than GHGs, contain limitations on GHG emissions based on the application of BACT. The Supreme Court decision effectively upheld PSD permitting requirements for GHG emissions under Step 1 of the Tailoring Rule for “anyway sources” and invalidated application of PSD permitting requirements to Step 2 sources based on GHG emissions. The Court also recognized that, although the EPA had not yet done so, it could “establish an appropriate *de minimis* threshold below which BACT is not required for a source’s greenhouse gas emissions.” 134 S. Ct. at 2449.

In accordance with the Supreme Court decision, on April 10, 2015, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (the D.C. Circuit) issued an amended judgment vacating the regulations that implemented Step 2 of the Tailoring Rule but not the regulations that implement Step 1 of the Tailoring Rule. The court specifically vacated 40 CFR 51.166(b)(48)(v) and 40 CFR 52.21(b)(49)(v) of the EPA’s regulations, but did not vacate 40 CFR 51.166(b)(48)(iv) or 40 CFR 52.21(b)(48)(iv). The court also directed the EPA to consider whether any further revisions to its regulations are appropriate in light of *UARG v. EPA* and, if so, to undertake such revisions.

The practical effect of the Supreme Court’s clarification of the reach of the CAA is that it eliminates the need for Step 2 of the Tailoring Rule and subsequent steps of the GHG permitting phase-in that the EPA had planned to consider under the Tailoring Rule. This also eliminates the possibility that the

⁹⁶ As is discussed elsewhere, the EPA has made clear that the pollutant subject to regulation is GHG, in the form of methane. Additional regulatory language in 40 CFR 60.5360a has been added to provide additional clarity.

promulgation of GHG standards under section 111 could result in additional sources becoming subject to PSD based solely on GHGs, notwithstanding the limitations the EPA adopted in the Tailoring Rule.⁹⁷ However, for an interim period, the EPA and the states will need to continue applying parts of the PSD definition of “subject to regulation” to ensure that sources obtain PSD permits meeting the requirements of the CAA.

The CAA continues to require that PSD permits issued to “anyway sources” satisfy the BACT requirement for GHGs. Based on the language that remains applicable under 40 CFR 51.166(b)(48)(iv) and 40 CFR 52.21(b)(49)(iv), the EPA and states may continue to limit the application of BACT to GHG emissions in those circumstances where a source emits GHGs in the amount of at least 75,000 tpy on a CO₂ Eq. basis. The EPA’s intention is for this to serve as an interim approach while the EPA moves forward to propose a GHG significant emission rate (SER) that would establish a *de minimis* threshold level for permitting GHG emissions under PSD. Under this forthcoming rule, the EPA intends to propose restructuring the GHG provisions in its PSD regulations so that the *de minimis* threshold for GHGs will not reside within the definition of “subject to regulation.” This restructuring will be designed to make the PSD regulatory provisions on GHGs universally applicable, without regard to the particular subparts of the definition of “regulated NSR pollutant” that may cover GHGs. Upon promulgation of this PSD rule, it will then provide a framework that states may use when updating their SIPs consistent with the Supreme Court decision.

While the PSD rulemaking described above is pending, the EPA and approved state, local, and tribal permitting authorities will still need to implement the BACT requirement for GHGs. In order to enable permitting authorities to continue applying the 75,000 tpy CO₂ Eq. threshold to determine whether BACT applies to GHG emissions from an “anyway source” after GHGs are subject to regulation under CAA section 111, the EPA has concluded that it is appropriate to adopt language in 40 CFR 60.5360a, language that is substantially

similar to language found in 40 CFR 60.5515 (subpart TTTT).

While most of the Tailoring Rule limitations are no longer needed to avoid triggering the requirement to obtain a PSD permit based on GHGs alone, the limitation in 40 CFR 51.166(b)(48)(iv) and 40 CFR 52.21(b)(49)(iv) will remain important to provide an interim applicability level for the GHG BACT requirement in “anyway source” PSD permits. Thus, there continues to be a need to ensure that the regulation of GHGs under CAA section 111 does not make this BACT applicability level for “anyway sources” effectively inoperable. The language in 40 CFR 60.5360a is necessary to avoid this result in light of the judicial actions described above.

C. Implications for Title V Program

Under the Title V program, certain stationary sources, including “major sources” are required to obtain an operating permit. This permit includes all of the CAA requirements applicable to the source, including adequate monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements to ensure sources’ compliance. These permits are generally issued through EPA-approved state Title V programs.

In the proposal for this rulemaking, the EPA indicated that “the air pollutant that it propose[d] to regulate [was] the pollutant GHGs (which consist of the six well-mixed gases), consistent with other actions the EPA has taken under the CAA, although only methane will be reduced directly by the proposed standards.” 80 FR 56600–56601 (Sept. 18, 2015).

Similar to the comments received on PSD permitting, the EPA received several comments asking for clarification to make clear that this rule did not directly regulate methane as a separate pollutant from GHG and that it would not cause sources to be considered a major source under the Title V permitting program based solely on having methane emissions above the major source threshold. Several of these comments suggested that this issue could be addressed by adding provisions similar to those that appear in 40 CFR 60.5515 (subpart TTTT).

The immediately preceding section provides some general background about the application of the PSD and Title V permitting programs to GHG emissions. With respect to Title V, the definition of major source includes, in relevant part, a stationary source that “directly emits or has the potential to emit, 100 tpy or more of any air pollutant subject to regulation.” 40 CFR 70.2, 71.2 (definition of “major source”).

In the Tailoring Rule, a GHG threshold was incorporated into the definition of “subject to regulation” under 40 CFR 70.2 and 71.2, such that those definitions specify that GHGs are not subject to regulation, unless, as of July 1, 2011, the emissions of GHGs are from a source emitting or having the potential to emit 100,000 tpy of GHGs on a CO₂ Eq. basis. 40 CFR 70.2, 71.2 (definition of “subject to regulation”); see also 75 FR 31583, June 3, 2010. However, there is not a similar threshold for methane as a separately regulated air pollutant. Some comments reflected a concern that if methane were to be subject to regulation as a separate air pollutant, sources that emitted or had the potential to emit 100 tpy or more of methane would trigger major source status under Title V and any related requirements under the Title V permitting program.

In consideration of these comments and for purposes of clarity, the EPA has concluded that it is appropriate to adopt language in 40 CFR 60.5360a that is substantially similar to language found in 40 CFR 60.5515 (subpart TTTT). Consistent with the statement quoted above from the proposal, that provision along with the explanation in this preamble clarifies that the GHG standard established in this rulemaking regulates the air pollutant GHGs, although the standard is expressed in the form of a limitation on emission of methane. Accordingly, the air pollutant that is subject to regulation under this standard for Title V purposes is GHGs.

As noted above, on June 23, 2014, the United States Supreme Court issued its opinion in *UARG v. EPA*, 134 S.Ct. 2427 (June 23, 2014) and, in accordance with that decision, the D.C. Circuit subsequently issued an amended judgment in *Coalition for Responsible Regulation, Inc. v. Environmental Protection Agency*, Nos. 09–1322, 10–073, 10–1092 and 10–1167 (D.C. Cir., April 10, 2015). With respect to Title V, the Supreme Court said in *UARG v. EPA* that the EPA may not treat GHGs as an air pollutant for purposes of determining whether a source is a major source required to obtain a Title V operating permit. In accordance with that decision, the D.C. Circuit’s amended judgment in *Coalition for Responsible Regulation, Inc. v. Environmental Protection Agency*, vacated the Title V regulations under review in that case to the extent that they require a stationary source to obtain a Title V permit solely because the source emits or has the potential to emit GHGs above the applicable major source thresholds. The D.C. Circuit also directed the EPA to consider whether any further revisions to its regulations

⁹⁷ As discussed in other portions of this rulemaking, GHG are the pollutant subject to regulation by this rule. The standards are specific to GHGs expressed in the form of limitations on emissions of methane. Changes, consistent with 40 CFR part 60, subpart TTTT as suggested by several of the commenters, have been made in 40 CFR 60.5360a to make this clear.

are appropriate in light of *UARG v. EPA*, and, if so, to undertake to make such revisions. These court decisions make clear that promulgation of CAA section 111 requirements for GHGs will not result in the EPA imposing a requirement that stationary sources obtain a Title V permit solely because such sources emit or have the potential to emit GHGs above the applicable major source thresholds.⁹⁸

To be clear, however, unless exempted by the Administrator through regulation under CAA section 502(a), any source, including an area source (a “non-major source”), subject to an NSPS is required to apply for, and operate pursuant to, a Title V permit that ensures compliance with all applicable CAA requirements for the source, including any GHG-related applicable requirements. This aspect of the Title V program is not affected by *UARG v. EPA*, as the EPA does not read that decision to affect either the grounds other than those described above on which a Title V permit may be required or the applicable requirements that must be addressed in Title V permits.⁹⁹ For the source category in this rule, there is an exemption in 40 CFR 60.5370a from the obligation to obtain a Title V permit for sources that are not otherwise required by law to obtain a permit under 40 CFR 70.3(a) or 40 CFR 71.3(a). However, sources that are subject to the CAA section 111 standards promulgated in this rule and that are otherwise required to obtain a Title V permit under 40 CFR 70.3(a) or 40 CFR 71.3(a) will be required to apply for, and operate pursuant to, a Title V permit that ensures compliance with all applicable CAA requirements, including any GHG-related applicable requirements.

VIII. Summary of Significant Comments and Responses

This section summarizes the significant comments on our proposed

⁹⁸ The EPA intends to propose revisions to the Title V regulations in a future rulemaking action to respond to the Supreme Court decision and the D.C. Circuit’s amended judgment. To the extent there are any issues related to the potential interaction between the promulgation of CAA section 111 requirements for GHGs and Title V applicability based on emissions above major source thresholds, the EPA anticipates there would be an opportunity to consider those during that rulemaking.

⁹⁹ See Memorandum from Janet G. McCabe, Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation, and Cynthia Giles, Assistant Administrator, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, to Regional Administrators, Regions 1–10, *Next Steps and Preliminary Views on the Application of Clean Air Act Permitting Programs to Greenhouse Gases Following the Supreme Court’s Decision in Utility Regulatory Group v. Environmental Protection Agency* (July 24, 2014) at 5.

amendments and our response to those comments.

A. Major Comments Concerning Listing of the Oil and Natural Gas Source Category

As previously explained, the EPA interprets the 1979 listing of this source category to cover the oil and natural gas industry broadly. To the extent there is any uncertainty, EPA proposed, as an alternative in the 2015 proposal, to revise the listing of this source category to include oil production and natural gas production, processing, and transmission and storage. We received several comments regarding the EPA’s interpretation of the 1979 category listing and its alternative proposal to revise that listing. Provided below is one such comment and the EPA’s response. Other comments on this subject and the EPA’s responses thereto can be found in the RTC.

Comment: One commenter argues that, in the proposed rule, the EPA seeks to unlawfully expand the scope of the oil and natural gas sector source category, even beyond the expansion that the EPA undertook in 2012 with subpart OOOO, which the commenter had also opposed as unlawful. The commenter asserts that the EPA’s attempt here to expand even further the types of emissions sources that would be subject to the NSPS is likewise unlawful. The commenter notes that, in this proposal, several types of never before regulated emissions sources would be regulated under NSPS, specifically, hydraulically fractured oil well completions, pneumatic pumps and fugitive emissions from well sites and compressor stations, and that some source types would also be regulated more generally for methane and VOC emissions, as only a small subset are currently regulated for VOC: Pneumatic controllers, centrifugal compressors and reciprocating compressors (except for compressors at well sites).

The commenter notes that the EPA’s proposed NSPS would cover an even greater number of very small source types in the EPA’s broadly defined “oil and natural gas source category,” which, according to the EPA, includes production, processing, transmission and storage. The commenter notes that the EPA again maintains, as it did in the original subpart OOOO rulemaking, that all emissions sources proposed for regulation are covered by its 1979 listing of the oil and natural gas category.

The commenter claims that the EPA is incorrect that the 1979 original source category determination can be read to include the numerous smaller emissions points covered by this proposal.

According to the commenter, the 1979 listing was focused on major emitting operations and cannot be reasonably construed as encompassing small, discrete sources that exist separate and apart from a large facility, like a processing plant.

The commenter claims that the EPA made clear in the 1979 listing notice that the category was listed to satisfy section 111(f) of the Clean Air Act. According to the commenter, that section required the EPA to create a list of “categories of major stationary sources” that had not been listed as of August 7, 1977, under section 111(b)(1)(A) of the Act, and to promulgate NSPS for the listed categories according to a set schedule. The commenter asserts that the EPA explained in the listing rule that its list included “major source categories,” which the EPA defined to include “those categories for which an average size plant has the potential to emit 100 tons or more per year of any one pollutant.”

Although the commenter notes that the EPA provided no further explanation in its original 1979 listing decision as to what facilities it intended to regulate under the “crude oil and natural gas production” source category, the commenter claims that “there can be no doubt that the category originally included ‘stationary sources’ (*i.e.*, ‘plants’) that typically have a potential to emit at least 100 tons per year of a regulated pollutant.”¹⁰⁰ The commenter argues that this communicates two important limitations on the original listing decision: First, the EPA was focused on discrete “plants” or “stationary sources”; and second, the EPA was focused on large emitting plants or stationary sources. The commenter argues that, as a result, the original listing decision cannot reasonably be interpreted to extend to the types of sources the EPA seeks to regulate in the proposal and that the additional source types that the EPA seeks to regulate in this proposal could not plausibly be considered part and parcel of major emitting plants.

The commenter notes that the EPA interpreted the 1979 listing to be broader than the “production source segment” because the EPA evaluated equipment that is used in various segments of the natural gas industry, such as stationary pipeline compressor engines. 80 FR 56600, September 18, 2015. The commenter argues that this

¹⁰⁰ *API Comments on the Proposed Rulemaking—Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources: Oil and Natural Gas Production and Natural Gas Transmission and Distribution*, at 2 (December 4, 2015).

does not evince an intent to regulate non-major source types, but only that the Agency evaluated equipment located at what it perceived to be major facilities.

The commenter further notes that, in the preamble to the proposed NSPS for natural gas processing plants, the EPA described the major emission points of this source category to include process, storage and equipment leaks. However, the commenter argues that this does not support what the commenter claims as “broad regulation of even the smallest sources in the oil and natural gas industry.”¹⁰¹ The commenter notes that the emissions points regulated in that rulemaking—process units and compressors—were located at gas processing plants. The commenter argues that it is telling that the Agency decided to regulate only natural gas processing plants—the closest thing to a major emitting plant that can be found in this sector—in that NSPS.

Response: In 1979, the EPA published a list of source categories, including “oil and natural gas production,” pursuant to a new section 111(f) in the Clean Air Act amendment of 1977, which directed the EPA to list under 111(b)(1)(A) “categories of major stationary sources” and establish standards of performance for the listed source categories. As explained in the September 2015 proposal preamble and earlier in section IV.A of this preamble, the EPA interprets the 1979 listing to broadly cover the oil and natural gas industry. The commenter claims that the EPA’s interpretation is incorrect because the 1979 listing included only large emitting plants or stationary sources. However, the commenter’s interpretation fails for the following reasons.

The commenter’s claim relies in large part on the EPA’s definition of a “major source category” in the 1979 listing action, which was defined as “an average size plant that has the potential to emit 100 tons or more per year of any one pollutant,” 44 FR 49222 (August 21, 1979). However, despite the definition above, the EPA provided notice in the listing action that “certain new sources of smaller than average size within these categories may have less than a 100 ton per year emission potential.” 43 FR 38872, 38873 (August 31, 1978). The EPA thus made clear that the 1979 listing did not include only those meeting the major source threshold. The EPA’s contemporaneous explanation indicates that, while the 1979 action focused on large emitting sources, the EPA recognized at the time that there

are smaller sources that may warrant regulation.

The commenter next argues that the 1979 listing included only large plants because it included only “stationary sources.” However, “stationary sources,” as defined in section 111(a)(2), include not only buildings, structures and facilities (e.g., plants) but also installations, such as equipment, that emit or may emit any pollutant. Moreover, this definition contains no size limitation.

The commenter cites to the EPA’s initial NSPS promulgation in 1985, which regulated only natural gas processing plants, as evidence that the 1979 listing included only large emitting stationary sources and, in the case of the oil and natural gas source category, only natural gas processing plants. However, the fact that the EPA regulated only natural gas processing plants in the 1985 NSPS does not establish that the listed oil and natural gas source category consists of only large natural gas processing plants. On the contrary, this argument ignores that the category, as listed, also includes crude oil production. Further, such narrow view is inconsistent with the EPA’s clarification of the 1979 listing and the statutory definition of “stationary sources,” neither of which limits a listed category of stationary sources under section 111 only to large plants such as natural gas processing plants, as explained above.

The commenter’s assertion is also refuted by the EPA’s statements during the development of the 1985 NSPS. Specifically, in the preamble to the proposed rule for equipment leaks at natural gas processing plants, the EPA described the major emission points of this source category to include process, storage and equipment leaks, which can be found in various segments of the oil and natural gas industry. Further, as mentioned earlier, the EPA described the listed oil and natural gas source category to include emission points that the EPA did not regulate at that time, such as “well systems field oil and gas separators, wash tanks, settling tanks and other sources.” 49 FR at 2637. The EPA explained in that action that it could not address these emission at that time because “best demonstrated control technology has not been identified.”

In light of the above, EPA reasonably interprets the 1979 listing to include the sources regulated under the 2012 oil and gas NSPS as well as those subject to today’s action. The EPA established well completion performances standards for hydraulically fractured gas wells in the 2012 NSPS and for oil wells

in today’s action. These standards address some of the above mentioned well system emissions that the EPA could not regulate previously due to the lack of data. In addition, as mentioned above, the EPA had previously identified equipment leaks as a major emission point from this listed source category and established leaks standards for natural gas processing plants. Today’s action further reduces emissions from equipment leaks by establishing work practice standards to detect and repair fugitive emissions at well sites and compressor stations. Emissions from equipment do not result only from leaks but also from normal operations that, if uncontrolled, are vented into the atmosphere. Therefore, both the 2012 NSPS and today’s rule include performance standards for certain equipment used throughout the oil and natural gas industry, such as storage vessels, pneumatic controllers, pneumatic pumps, and compressors. Because these equipment are widely used across this industry, they contribute significant amount of emissions even if emissions from an individual piece of equipment may not be big.¹⁰²

The commenter’s main concern appears to be with the EPA regulating what the commenter claims to be “very small emission sources” and, therefore, unreasonable. However, section 111(b)(1)(A) requires that the EPA list source categories, not emission sources. In listing a source category, the EPA is not required to identify specific emission points within that source category. However, having listed a source category, the EPA is then required under section 111(b)(1)(B) to establish through rulemaking performance standards that reflect the best system of emission reductions, which would entail evaluation of emissions, control options, and other considerations (including their costs) for the sources to be regulated. Therefore, specific concerns with regulation of certain emission sources can be addressed during the rulemaking to establish such performance standards, where a commenter can argue that controlling a specific type of source is unreasonable under 111(b)(1)(B).

For the reasons stated above, the commenter fails to support its claim that the EPA’s interpretation of the 1979 listing is unlawful. The commenter also fails to support its interpretation of the 1979 listing. The EPA’s interpretation of

¹⁰² For example, based on industry wide estimate, high-bleed pneumatic controllers (from production through transmission and storage) emit in total of 87,285 tons of VOC and 350,000 tons of methane (8.7 million metric tons of CO₂e).

¹⁰¹ *Id.*

the 1979 listing therefore remains unchanged.

Comment: The commenter claims that the EPA fails to make the required statutory findings under section 111(b)(1)(A) to support its proposed revision to the 1979 listing. The commenter asserts that, under section 111(b)(1)(A), the EPA is authorized to regulate additional source types if and only if it: (1) Defines a discrete “category” of stationary sources; and (2) determines that emissions from the source category cause or significantly contribute to endangerment to health or the environment.

The commenter claims that the EPA makes no effort whatsoever to demonstrate that emissions from the particular additionally-regulated sources in subpart OOOOa cause or contribute to endangerment to health or the environment. Instead, the Agency simply asserts general public health effects associated with GHGs, VOC, and SO₂ and then evaluates emissions from oil and natural gas sources generally. See 80 FR 56601–08, September 18, 2015. For methane, the EPA merely breaks down emissions into four general “segments” (natural gas production, natural gas processing, natural gas transmission and storage, and petroleum production), but does not evaluate particular source type emissions within those segments. The EPA does nothing to break down its evaluation of emissions even by sector segment for SO₂ and VOC. This failure to investigate the key statutory listing criteria is patently arbitrary and plainly violates the requirement in section 307(d)(3) of the Clean Air Act to clearly set forth the basis and purpose of the proposal.

The commenter claims that under the EPA’s logic, as long as certain types of stationary sources in a category, or segment of a category, cause or significantly contribute to endangerment to health or the environment, the Agency can lump together in the defined source category (or segment of a source category) all manner of ancillary equipment and operations, even if those ancillary equipment and operations do not in and of themselves significantly contribute to the previously identified endangerment. See 80 FR 56601, September 18, 2015. This is not a reasonable interpretation of section 111(b)(1)(A) because such an interpretation would bestow virtually unlimited regulatory authority upon the EPA, allowing the EPA to evade the express listing criteria by creating loose associations of nominally related sources in a sector.

Response: The commenter claims that the EPA must separately list and make

the required findings under CAA section 111(b)(1)(A) for the “additional source types” from the oil and natural gas industry that were not covered by the 1979 listing. First of all, the EPA disagrees that there are such “additional source types” because, for the reasons stated in section IV.A of this preamble and the response to comment immediately above, the EPA interprets the 1979 listing to broadly cover the oil and natural gas industry. To the extent there is any uncertainty, the EPA rejects the commenter’s claim that the 1979 listing covers only natural gas processing plants. But, more importantly, the EPA rejects this comment because it is contrary to the law.

CAA section 111(b)(1)(A) requires that the EPA list a category of sources “if in [the Administrator’s] judgment it causes, or contributes significantly to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare.”¹⁰³ The provision is clear that the listing and endangerment findings requirements are to be made for source categories, not specific emission sources within the source category. The provision also does not require that the EPA identify all emission points within a source category when listing that category.

The commenter’s claim that the EPA must separately list and make findings for particular emission source types within individual segments of the natural gas industry clearly contradicts with the plain language of section 111(b)(1)(A) which, as discussed above, is stated in terms of source category, not emission source types. Regardless, the EPA has satisfied the two criteria the commenter has identified as required by section 111(b)(1)(A): (1) Define a discrete category of stationary sources; and (2) determine that emissions from the source category cause or significantly contribute to endangerment to health or the environment. Although the EPA does not believe that revision to the 1979 category listing to be necessary for today’s action, the EPA is finalizing as an alternative its proposed revision of the category listing to broadly include the oil and natural gas industry. In support of the revision, the final rule includes the Administrator’s determination under section 111(b)(1)(A) that, in her judgment, this source category, as defined in this revision, contributes significantly to air pollution which may reasonably be

¹⁰³ As previously mentioned, the required findings under section 111(b)(1)(A) is commonly referred to as the “endangerment findings.”

anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.

The commenter also appears to claim that the EPA cannot revise the scope of a listed source category, but must instead separately list and make findings for what the commenter considers as “additional source types” within an already listed source category. The commenter offers no legal basis to support its claim because there is none. On the contrary, as explained below, the commenter claim impermissibly restricts the EPA’s authority under section 111(b)(1)(A).

Section 111(b)(1)(A) requires that the EPA revise the category listing from time to time; it does not limit such revision to simply adding new source categories. The only criteria that section 111(b)(1)(A) states for the EPA to apply to category listing revision are the same as those for the initial category listing: That the category “causes, or contributes significantly to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare.” Thus, the statute leaves the EPA with the discretion to determine how to carry out such task, and that gives the EPA the flexibility to list and revise the list, including redefining the scope of a previously listed category, as long as long as the EPA meets the above criteria with the requisite endangerment findings for the source category as a whole. It allows the EPA to revise a category listing to include sources that, though not included in the initial listing (e.g., the EPA might now have known about it at the time), reasonably belong in a listed source category. The commenter provides no compelling reason that such emission sources need a separate category listing and endangerment finding. In light of the above, the commenter’s claim for a separate category listing and endangerment finding is not only unsupported by the statute, it unreasonably curtails the discretion section 111(b)(1)(A) provides the EPA in executing its category listing and revision authority under that provision. For the reasons stated above, the EPA disagrees with this comment.

B. Major Comments Concerning EPA’s Authority To Establish GHG Standards in the Form of Limitations on Methane Emissions

As previously explained in section IV.D, the EPA’s authority for regulating GHGs in this rule is CAA section 111. The standards in this rule that are specific to GHGs are expressed in the form of limitations on emissions of methane, and not the other constituent gases of the air pollutant GHGs. We

received several comments regarding the EPA's interpretation of CAA section 111. Provided below is a summary of such comments and the EPA's response. Other comments on this subject and the EPA's responses thereto can be found in the RTC document.

Comment: Several commenters argued that the EPA cannot rely on the 2009 Endangerment Finding for GHG to justify the limitations of methane in this rule. The commenters made several arguments.

First, some commenters asserted that the EPA cannot regulate methane alone or specifically without a new Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Finding for the individual gas, because the original 2009 Finding defined the pollutant as the six well-mixed greenhouse gases. One commenter further stated that it is unlawful for the EPA to regulate only methane based on an endangerment finding that is largely attributable to other pollutants and that, of the six greenhouse gases, carbon dioxide is emitted in vastly greater quantities (even on a carbon dioxide equivalent basis) than methane.

Second, some commenters argue that a new endangerment finding is necessary for each pollutant regulated in a given source category. One commenter claims that section 111(b)(1)(A) of the CAA requires the EPA to list a category of stationary sources if, in the Administrator's judgment, the category causes, or contributes significantly to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. The commenter further argues that this CAA section unambiguously requires the EPA to list and regulate according to endangerment and significant contribution findings for particular pollutants. The commenter goes to state that it is unreasonable for the EPA to use a cause-or-contribute finding made for one pollutant thirty years ago in order to justify controlling a different pollutant today. The commenter asserts that a "rational basis test" is insufficient justification, and that the term "rational basis" is not found in section 111.

Third, some commenters argue that methane does not endanger human health or welfare. One commenter states that methane is naturally occurring and is non-toxic, that it does not accumulate in the body, that the only real risks that it poses are that it is flammable when present in high concentrations, and that inhaling high levels can cause oxygen deprivation. Another commenter claims that recent science supports a weakening of the case for human-caused global warming.

Finally, some commenters state that the impacts of the rule will be very small. One commenter argues that "the oil and gas sector do [sic] not significantly cause or contribute to climate change" because methane emissions from that sector "account for only 3 percent of total United States domestic GHG emissions, just over 2 percent of the total United States GHG Inventory, and 0.3 percent of Global GHG emissions" and transmission and storage is only a third of that total.

Response: As a general matter, commenters on this issue consistently mischaracterize the EPA's actions. The standards in this rule that are specific to GHGs are expressed in the form of limitations on emissions of methane. For these standards, GHG is the regulated pollutant. An endangerment finding is only required when the EPA lists a source category under section 111(b)(1)(A). Nothing in section 111 requires that the EPA make further endangerment findings with respect to each pollutant that it regulates under section 111(b)(1)(B). By considering whether there is a rational basis to regulate a given pollutant from a listed source category, the EPA ensures that it regulates pollutants that warrant regulation.

For purposes of this final rule, the EPA's rational basis is supported, in part, by the analysis that supported the 2009 Endangerment Finding. If, as commenters argue, the EPA is required to make additional findings of endangerment and cause-or-contribute for this final rule, then the analysis that supported the 2009 Endangerment Finding, along with other facts presented herein, including the information in sections IV.B and C, would be sufficient to make these findings.

While the 2009 Endangerment Finding defined the pollutant as the "aggregate group of the well-mixed greenhouse gases" the finding was also clear that a given source category does not have to emit every single one of these gases in order to contribute to the pollution in question. *See* 74 FR 66496–99 and 66541 (December 15, 2009). Specifically, as we explained in the 2009 Endangerment Finding, two of the six pollutants (PFCs and SF₆) are not emitted by motor vehicles, the source category in question in the 2009 Endangerment Finding. Moreover, while motor vehicles contribute to emissions of HFC–134a, there are many other HFCs which are not emitted by that source. Just as the GHG emissions from motor vehicles do not need to contain all six gases in order to be regulated, the GHG emissions from the oil and gas

sector do not need to contain all six gases. Therefore, the EPA does not need to make an endangerment finding for methane alone: The 2009 Endangerment Finding that defines the aggregate group of six well-mixed gases as the air pollution addresses emissions of any individual component of that aggregate group and, therefore, supports the rational basis for this final rule.

Next, the assertion that methane has no risks beyond flammability is false. While methane is indeed produced from natural sources, the health and welfare risks of elevated concentrations of greenhouse gases (including methane) was detailed in the 2009 Endangerment Finding. Moreover, methane is a precursor to tropospheric ozone formation, which also impacts human health. As further context, according to the IPCC, historical methane emissions contribute the second most warming today of all the greenhouse gases, after carbon dioxide. This makes methane emission reductions an important contribution to reducing the atmospheric concentrations of the six well-mixed greenhouse gases.

Lastly, the climate benefits anticipated from the implementation of this rule are consequential in terms of the quantity of methane reduced, particularly in light of the potency of methane as a GHG. The reductions are additionally important as the United States oil and natural gas sector emits about 32 percent of United States methane emissions and about 3.4 percent of all United States GHGs. The final standards are expected to reduce methane emissions annually by about 6.9 million metric tons CO₂ Eq. in 2020 and by about 11 million metric tons CO₂ Eq. in 2025. To give a sense of the magnitude of these reductions, the methane reductions expected in 2020 are equivalent to about 2.8 percent of the methane emissions for this sector reported in the United States GHG Inventory for 2014. Expected reductions in 2025 are equivalent to around 4.7 percent of 2014 emissions. As discussed in section IX.E, the estimated monetized benefits of methane emission reductions resulting from this rule are \$160 million to approximately \$950 million for reduced emissions in 2020, and \$320 million to \$1.8 billion for reduced emissions in 2025, depending on the discount rate used. The magnitude of these benefits estimates demonstrates that the methane reductions are consequential from an economic perspective, as well as physical perspective.

C. Major Comments Concerning Compressors

1. Wet Seal Centrifugal Compressors With Emission Rates Equal to or Lower Than Dry Seal Centrifugal Compressors

Comment: The EPA received several comments asserting that there are many wet seal centrifugal compressors that have emissions that are equal to, or lower than, dry seal compressors. One commenter notes that the EPA cites 6 standard cubic feet per minute (scfm) as the emission rate for dry seals and that a wide variety of wet seal systems are in use with varying rates of de-gas emissions and that if wet seal system can meet an emissions performance specification on par with dry seals (*i.e.*, 6 scfm), they should be exempt from the 95 percent reduction requirement. One commenter states that data indicate that a well-maintained wet seal will have a methane emission rate comparable to or lesser than dry seals and that the emission rate for commenter's compressors is significantly lower than the average rate identified in the EPA's National Emissions Inventory for this kind of source.

Response: The emissions factor used in our BSE analysis is an average factor calculated from available emissions information. As such, there are some wet seal centrifugal compressors that have a lower emission rate than the average emission rate. However, we have not been provided, nor do we have, any data indicating that there is a specific type or significant population of wet seal centrifugal compressors that have emission rates that are equal to or lower than dry seal compressors. We acknowledge that a well-maintained wet seal compressor may have lower emissions; however, as noted, the rule is based on an average emission factor derived from the best available information on a population of wet seal compressors. We have no data on which to base an exemption or different requirement for a subcategory of merely presumed low-emitting wet seal centrifugal compressors.

2. Regulation of Centrifugal and Reciprocating Compressors at Well Sites

Comment: The EPA received several comments opposing the exemption of centrifugal and reciprocating compressors located at well heads from the requirements of the rule. The commenters state that there are thousands of well head reciprocating compressors across the nation as well as some centrifugal compressors at well heads, and they pose a significant source of emissions unless properly controlled. The commenters contend

that the reason the EPA claims to exclude these compressors is based on EPA data that show no centrifugal compressors located at well heads and on the determination that it is not cost effective to regulate these reciprocating compressors. Commenters state that the GHGRP data shows that there are centrifugal compressors located at well heads and that they should be regulated under the rule. Further, commenters assert that the EPA's cost effectiveness determination for reciprocating compressors is arbitrary because it was based on outdated emission factors and that if updated, the revised emissions would render the control for the well head compressors as cost-effective. Commenters suggest that the EPA should have relied on updated emission factors to estimate emissions from well-site compressors as it did to estimate emissions from gathering sector compressors, or at least explained why it failed to rely on updated emissions data to estimate emissions from well-site compressors.

Response: The emissions estimates presented in the proposal were based on the most robust data available at the time of their development. The EPA began collecting data through GHGRP on centrifugal compressors in the onshore petroleum and natural gas production segment in 2011. However, reporting of input data for compressors, including the count of centrifugal compressors at a facility, in onshore production was deferred until 2015 and published for the first time in October 2015. As a result, data on the number of centrifugal compressors were not available through GHGRP at the time of the development of the NSPS OOOOa proposal.

The EPA agrees with the commenter that the newly available data from GHGRP show the presence of centrifugal compressors in the onshore production segment, but the EPA disagrees with the commenter that it should cover these sources under the final rule. Although GHGRP data shows that 15 reporters indicated 69 centrifugal compressors at production facilities, the data do not provide a method to determine the number of centrifugal compressors with wet seals in onshore production. The GHGRP does not collect data on seal type (wet seal and dry seal) on onshore production. The EPA is not aware of other data sets on wet seals in the onshore production segment. Based on available data on the number of centrifugal compressors in onshore production, it is unlikely that there is a large population of centrifugal compressors with wet seals in onshore production.

With respect to emission factors for reciprocating compressors at well sites, the EPA proposed to exempt these compressors from the standards because we found that the cost of control for reciprocating compressors at well sites is not reasonable. Commenters on the 2014 Oil and Gas White Papers and on the subpart OOOOa proposal did not provide new data available for development of emission factors for reciprocating compressors at well sites. The EPA has not identified additional data sources for development of emission factors for reciprocating compressors at well sites and, therefore, has not updated its emissions estimate for this source. We continue to believe the cost of control for reciprocating compressors at well sites remains unreasonable. The final rule exempts centrifugal and reciprocating compressors at well sites.

3. Condition-Based Maintenance

Comment: The EPA solicited comment on an alternative to the proposed requirements which consists of monitoring of rod packing leakage to identify when the rate of rod packing replacement is needed. Under such a condition-based maintenance provision, rod packing would be inspected or monitored based on a prescribed method and frequency and rod packing replacement, or repair would be required once a prescribed leak rate was observed. We requested additional information on the technical details of this condition-based concept.

Several commenters state that the rule should include an alternative maintenance program and allow operators flexibility to use a condition-based maintenance approach to reduce emissions rather than a prescribed maintenance schedule as currently included in the rule. In addition to controlling emissions, commenters assert that a condition-based maintenance may extend the operation of functional rod packing, eliminate premature and wasteful rod packing maintenance/replacement and, possibly, where rod packing leakage increases quicker than is typical, condition-based maintenance can result in earlier maintenance than EPA's proposed prescribed maintenance schedule. Commenters note that condition-based maintenance has been a proven successful technique for reducing methane emissions through the Natural Gas STAR program, where rod packing leaks were periodically monitored and the value of the incremental leaked gas (relative to leak rates for "new" packing) was compared to the rod packing

maintenance cost. When the incremental lost gas value exceeded the maintenance/replacement cost, the rod packing maintenance was determined to be cost-effective.

Other commenters noted that because operators in transmission and storage segment do not own the gas, a different performance metric could be used and recommended a metric based on a defined leak rate or change in leak rate over time. Commenters recommended possibly setting a threshold at a leak rate above 2 scfm, combined with annual monitoring, which would require rod packing maintenance/replacement within nine months or during the next unit shutdown, whichever is sooner and which is consistent with a draft California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulation for oil and gas operations.

Response: The EPA disagrees with the commenters that the rule should include an alternative maintenance program and allow operators flexibility to use condition-based maintenance approach to reduce emissions rather than a prescribed maintenance schedule. While we received comment supporting the addition of a threshold-based or condition-based maintenance provision, we did not receive sufficient technical details to properly evaluate this alternative for inclusion in the rule. Although condition-based maintenance has been shown to be effective under the Natural Gas STAR program, the criteria on which rule requirements could be based would require significantly more data and analysis. Specifically, in order to evaluate such a provision for the rule, we would need to determine an appropriate leak-rate threshold which would trigger rod packing replacement. Commenters suggested 2 scfm demonstrated acceptable rod packing leakage; however, the commenters provided no substantive data as to the reason for this threshold. Commenters also recommended that we model the provision after the California Air Resources Board proposed regulation which was based on input from rod packing vendors. Although some valuable information was provided, the level of technical data and information necessary to analyze all aspects of such a provision were not provided. Therefore, we are unable to evaluate the condition-based maintenance provision for inclusion in the rule at this time.

D. Major Comments Concerning Pneumatic Controllers

1. Studies That Indicate Emission Rates for Low-Bleed Pneumatic Controllers That Are Higher Than the EPA Estimates

Comment: The EPA received comment that several recent studies report that pneumatic controllers emit more than they are designed to emit and that their emission rate is higher than the currently estimated EPA emission rate for pneumatic controllers. Specifically, the commenters noted that studies indicated that controllers were observed to have emissions inconsistent with the manufacturer's design and were likely operating incorrectly due to maintenance or equipment issues. Low-bleed pneumatic controllers were observed to have emission rates that were 270 percent higher than the EPA's emission factor for these devices, in some cases approaching the emission rate of high-bleed controllers.

Response: The emissions estimates presented in the proposal were based on the most robust data available at the time of their development. The EPA is familiar with the studies discussed in the comments summarized here and several of those studies were discussed in the EPA's Oil and Gas White Paper. The EPA has reviewed available data; because of the lack of emissions data that are straightforward to use in assessment of emissions from specific bleed rate categories (*i.e.*, high-bleed and low-bleed), the EPA has retained the emission factors for pneumatic controllers used in the proposal analysis and has retained the requirements for pneumatic controllers.

2. Capture and Control of Emissions From Pneumatic Controllers

Comment: The EPA received comment that pneumatic controllers should be required to capture emissions through a closed vent system and route the captured emissions to a process or a control device, similar to the approach the EPA has taken in its proposed standards for pneumatic pumps and compressors. The commenters cite recent Wyoming proposed rules for existing pneumatic controllers that allow operators of existing high-bleed controllers to route emissions to a process and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) proposed rules which requires that operators capture emissions and route to a process or control device. Commenters state that this approach would work for all types of pneumatic controllers and that this approach would be cost effective based

on the costs identified for pneumatic pumps in the TSD.

Response: The EPA disagrees with the commenters that capturing and routing emissions from pneumatic controllers to a process or control device is a viable control option under our BSER analysis. While the commenter stated that a few permits in Wyoming indicate that a facility is capturing emissions from controllers and routing to a control device, we believe that there is insufficient information and data available for the EPA to establish the control option as the BSER. For more information, please see the RTC.

E. Major Comments Concerning Pneumatic Pumps

1. Compliance Date

Comment: Commenters stated that the EPA requires that new or modified pneumatic pumps at a site that currently lack an emission control device will become an affected facility if a control device is later installed; and, the facility must be in compliance within 30 days of installation of the new control device. One commenter states that 30 days does not provide such sources sufficient time to come into compliance. The commenter suggests that the rule be revised to require compliance within 30 days of startup of the control device so that the operator can ensure that the control device is properly tested after installation without concern over triggering non-compliance for pneumatic pump controls.

Response: We agree that additional time is appropriate for designing connections and testing after control device installation. Therefore, we have revised the compliance date in the final rule with respect to control devices that are installed on site after installation of the pneumatic pump affected facility. In the final rule, the compliance date for pneumatic pump affected facilities to be routed to a newly installed onsite control device 30 days after startup of the control device.

2. Subsequent Removal of Control Device

Comment: Several commenters expressed concern that the rule did not provide a way to remove control equipment from a site when it is no longer needed for the purpose for which it was installed. Further, they requested that the EPA clarify that a source ceases to be an affected facility if the control device is no longer needed for other equipment. The commenters cite an example where the exiting control device onsite is installed for a subpart OOOO storage vessel and subsequently

the storage vessel's potential to emit falls below 6 tpy. If this were to occur, the storage vessel would no longer be subject to regulation and the control device would no longer be necessary.

Response: The EPA agrees that the intent of the proposal was not to require existing control devices that are no longer required for their original purposes to remain at a site only to control pneumatic pump affected facility emissions. Therefore, the final rule clarifies that subsequent to the removal of a control device and provided that there is no ability to route to a process, a pneumatic pump affected facility is no longer required to comply with § 60.5393a(b)(1) or (2). However, these units will continue to be affected facilities and we are requiring pneumatic pump affected facilities to continue following the relevant recordkeeping requirements of § 60.5420a even after an existing control device is removed.

3. Limited-Use Pneumatic Pumps

Comment: Commenters state that there are natural gas-driven pneumatic pumps which are used intermittently to transfer bulk liquids. These limited use pumps may be manually operated as needed or may be triggered by a level controller or other sensor. Specific examples provided by the commenters include engine skid sump pumps, pipeline sump pumps, tank bottom pumps, flare knockout drum pumps, and separator knockout drum pumps that are used to pump liquids from one place to another. The commenters contend that these pumps do not run continuously or even seasonally for long periods but only run periodically as needed. Thus, these pumps do not exhaust large volumes of gas in the aggregate. For this reason, the commenters requested that the final rule include an exemption for limited-use pneumatic pumps.

Response: In the TSDs to the proposed and final rule, the emission factors we used for pneumatic pumps assumed that the pumps operated 40 percent of the time. While we understood that pneumatic pumps typically do not run continuously, we did assume that the 40 percent usage was distributed evenly throughout the year. However, based upon the comments we received, the usage of some pneumatic pumps is much more limited than we previously determined and not spread evenly throughout the year. We did not intend to regulate these limited-use pneumatic pumps and are not including limited-use pneumatic pumps in the definition of pneumatic pump affected facilities that are located

at well sites. Specifically, if a pump located at a well site operates for any period of time each day for less than a total of 90 days per year, this limited-use pneumatic pump is not an affected facility under this rule. We believe this requirement is sufficient to address the commenters' concerns for both intermittent use and temporary use pneumatic pumps.

Because we believe there are multiple viable alternatives available at natural gas processing plants that are not available at well sites, we do not believe it is necessary to exclude limited-use pneumatic pumps located at natural gas processing plants from the definition of pneumatic pump affected facility. Based on our best available information, both instrument air and electricity are readily available at natural gas processing plants. We believe owners and operators will choose instrument air over natural gas-driven pumps since their other pumps will be air powered. We also believe owners and operators can utilize electric pumps for intermittent activities cited by the commenters such as sump pumps and transfer pumps where it is safe to use an electric pump. Given these options, we conclude that it is not necessary to exclude limited-use pneumatic pumps located at natural gas processing plants from the definition of pneumatic pump affected facility in the final rule.

4. Removal of Tagging Requirements

Comment: Several commenters requested that the EPA remove the tagging requirement for pneumatic pump affected facilities. As written, the proposed rule required that operators tag pumps that are affected facilities and those that are not affected facilities. The commenters contend that the tagging requirement appears to add little value and is confusing. Commenters suggest operators should only be required to maintain a list of make, model, and serial number, rather than individual tags and that a list of make, model, and serial number will achieve the same results desired by the EPA, without presenting the unnecessary operational hurdles associated with individual tagging and recordkeeping.

Response: The EPA has reviewed the proposed tagging requirements and agrees with the commenters that the recordkeeping in lieu of tagging for pneumatic pumps affected facilities is sufficient. Therefore, the EPA has removed the tagging requirements for pneumatic pump affected facilities in the final rule.

5. Lean Glycol Circulation Pumps

Comment: The EPA solicited comments on the level of uncontrolled emissions from lean glycol circulation pumps and how they are vented through the dehydrator system. We received comments corroborating our understanding at proposal and in the white papers that emissions from these pumps are vented through the rich glycol separator vent or the reboiler still vent and are already regulated under 40 CFR part 63 subparts HH and HHH.

Response: The EPA's understanding during the proposal was that the lean glycol pumps are integral to the operation of the dehydrator, and as such, emissions from glycol dehydrator pumps are not separately quantified because these emissions are released from the same stack as the rest of the emissions from the dehydrator system, including HAP emission that are being controlled to meet the standards under the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) at 40 CFR part 63 subparts HH and HHH. It is also our understanding from white paper commenters that replacing the natural gas in gas-assisted lean glycol pumps with instrument air is not feasible and would create significant safety concerns. Commenters on the white paper stated that the only option for these types of pumps are to replace them with electric motor driven pumps; however, solar and battery systems large enough to power these types of pumps are not currently feasible. Therefore, we have clarified that lean glycol circulation pumps are not affected facilities under the final pneumatic pumps standards.

F. Major Comments Concerning Well Completions

1. Request for a Limited Use of Combustion

Comment: Several commenters support the requirements for reducing completion emissions at oil wells; however, they express concern that the proposed rule does not go far enough in establishing a hierarchy of preference for the beneficial use options provided in the rule (i.e., routing the recovered gas from the separator into a gas flow line or collection system, re-injecting the recovered gas into the well or another well, use of the recovered gas as an onsite fuel source or use of the recovered gas for another useful purpose that a purchased fuel or raw material would serve) over what the commenters perceive to be the least-preferable option to route the emission to a combustion control device. Further, one commenter states that the technical

infeasibility exemption in the rule is vague and could detract significantly from the overall value of this standard if not narrowly limited in application. The commenter notes that because of the swiftly increasing production of oil (along with associated natural gas) in the United States which produces very high initial rates of oil and associated gas, it is vital that the rule's requirements apply rigorously.

Response: The EPA agrees that REC should be preferred over combustion due to the secondary environmental impact from combustion. The final rule reflects such preference by requiring REC unless it is technically infeasible, in which event the recovered gas is to be routed to a completion combustion device. Further, to ensure that the exemption from REC due to technical infeasibility is limited to those situations where the operator can demonstrate that each of the options to capture and use gas beneficially is not feasible and why, we have expanded recordkeeping requirements in the final rule to include: (1) Detailed documentation of the reasons for the claim of technical infeasibility with respect to all four options provided in § 60.5375a(1)(ii), including but not limited to, names and locations of the nearest gathering line; capture, re-injection, and reuse technologies considered; aspects of gas or equipment prohibiting use of recovered gas as a fuel onsite; and (2) technical considerations prohibiting any other beneficial use of recovered gas on site.

We believe these additional provisions will support a more diligent and transparent application of the intent of the technical infeasibility exemption from the REC requirement in the final rule. This information must be included in the annual report made available to the public 30 days after submission through CEDRI and WebFIRE, allowing for public review of best practices and periodic auditing to ensure flaring is limited and emissions are minimized.

G. Major Comments Concerning Fugitive Emissions From Well Sites and Compressor Stations

1. Modification Definitions for Well Sites

Comment: Several commenters assert that the definition of "modification" of a well site under the proposed rule in § 60.5365a(i) is overly broad because it would bring many existing well sites under the Rule's requirements. The commenters believe that drilling a new well or hydraulically fracturing an existing well does not increase the probability of a leak from an individual

component and no new components result from these activities, thus the potential emissions rate does not change and should not be considered a modification.

Response: The EPA believes the addition of a new well or the hydraulically fracturing or refracturing of an existing well will increase emissions from the well site for the following reasons. These events are followed by production from these wells which generate additional emissions at the well sites. Some of these additional emissions will pass through leaking fugitive emission components at the well sites (in addition to the emissions already leaking from those components). Further, it is not uncommon that an increase in production would require additional equipment and, therefore, additional fugitive emission components at the well sites. We also believe that defining "modification" to include these two events, rather than requiring complex case-by-case analysis to determine whether there is emission increase in each event, will ease implementation burden for owners and operators. For the reasons stated above, EPA is finalizing the definition of "modification" of a well site, as proposed.

2. Monitoring Plan

Comment: Commenters expressed concerns about the elements of the proposed monitoring plans and encouraged the EPA to consult with the oil and gas industry and states to adopt requirements that would meet their specific needs. Commenters suggested that an area-wide monitoring plan should be allowed instead of a corporate-wide or site specific plan. The area plan would allow owners to write a plan that covers various areas for each specific region since operators may rely on contractors in one area due to location while company-owned monitoring equipment may be used within another area.

Response: The EPA participated in numerous meetings with industry, environmental and state stakeholders to discuss the proposed rule. During these meetings industry stakeholders further explained why a corporate-wide monitoring plan would be difficult to develop due to their corporate structures, well site locations, basin characteristics and many other factors. They also indicated that a site-specific plan would be redundant since many well sites within a district or field office are similar and would utilize the same personnel, contractors or monitoring equipment. The industry stakeholders provided input on specific elements of

the monitoring plan, such as the walking path requirement. Based on the comments that we received and subsequent stakeholder meetings, we have made changes to the monitoring plan and have further explained our intent for the walking path. We have also modified the digital photograph recordkeeping requirements for sources of fugitive emissions. See section VI.f.1.h of this preamble for further discussion.

H. Major Comments Concerning Final Standards Reflecting Next Generation Compliance and Rule Effectiveness Strategies

1. Electronic Reporting

Comment: While some commenters express support, several commenters oppose electronic reporting of compliance-related records. Some of the commenters state that they have an obligation under the rule to maintain these records and make them available to the regulatory agency upon request, and this should be sufficient. Providing all the records requested under the proposed rule would likely cause a backlog of correspondence between the regulatory agency and the industry. Other commenters expressed concern that sensitive company information could be present in the records, and other parties could use a FOIA request to obtain the records.

Additional commenters pointed out that the EPA should not require electronic reporting until CEDRI is modified to accommodate the unique nature of the oil and natural gas production industry. As the commenters understand the operational characteristics of CEDRI, the system links reports for each affected facility to the site at which they are located. Under subparts OOOO and OOOOa, there is no unique site identifier. This would result in owners and operators having to deconstruct the annual report in order to obtain the affected facility level data needed for CEDRI. The EPA did not account for this burden and cost. The commenters request that should electronic reporting be required, that CEDRI be revised to accept the annual reports as currently specified in the proposed rule as a pdf file or hardcopy until these issues can be resolved. Commenters also request that CEDRI be modified to accept area-wide reports rather than site-level reports. Additionally, commenters noted that the definition of "certifying official" under CEDRI is different than in the proposed rule.

Finally, since the EPA did not propose regulatory language for these

requirements, some commenters believe that the EPA cannot finalize these requirements without first proposing the regulatory language.

Response: The EPA notes that regulatory language for the electronic reporting requirements was available in § 60.5420a, § 60.5422a and § 60.5423a of the proposed rule.

The EPA thanks the commenters for the support for electronic reporting. Electronic reporting is in ever-increasing use and is universally considered to be faster, more efficient and more accurate for all parties once the initial systems have been established and start-up costs completed. Electronic reporting of environmental data is already common practice in many media offices at the EPA; programs such as the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI), the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program, Acid Rain and NO_x Budget Trading Programs and the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) New Chemicals Program all require electronic submissions to the EPA. The EPA has previously implemented similar electronic reporting requirements in over 50 different subparts within parts 60 and 63. WebFIRE, the public access site for these data, currently houses over 5000 reports that have been submitted to the EPA via CEDRI.

The EPA notes that reporting is an essential element in compliance assurance, and this is especially true in this sector. Because of the large number of sites and the remoteness of sites, it is unlikely that the delegated agencies will be able to visit all sites. By providing reports electronically in a standardized format, the system benefits air agencies by streamlining review of data, facilitating large scale data analysis, providing access to reports and providing cost savings through a reduction in storage costs. The narrative and upload fields within the CEDRI forms can even be used to provide information to satisfy extra reporting requirements that state and local air agencies may impose.

The EPA is sensitive to the complexity of the oil and gas regulations and the unique challenges presented by this sector. CEDRI forms are designed to be consistent with the requirements of the underlying subparts and are unique to each regulation. The forms are reviewed multiple times before being finalized, and they are subjected to a beta testing period that allows end-users to provide feedback on issues with the forms prior to requiring their use. Also, if a form has not yet been completed by the time the rule is effective, affected facilities will not be required to use

CEDRI until the form has been available for at least 90 days. The EPA notes that we have recently developed a bulk upload feature for several subparts within CEDRI. The bulk upload feature allows users to enter data for sites across the country in a single file instead of having to submit individual reports for each site. This feature should alleviate some of the commenters' concerns.

The EPA is aware that facility personnel must learn the new reporting system, but the savings realized by simplified data entry outweighs the initial period of learning the system. Electronic reporting can eliminate paper-based, manual processes, thereby saving time and resources, simplifying data entry, eliminating redundancies, minimizing data reporting errors and providing data quickly and accurately. Reporting form standardization can also lead to cost savings by laying out the data elements specified by the regulations in a step-by-step process, thereby helping to ensure completeness of the data and allowing for accurate assessment of data quality. Additionally, the EPA's electronic reporting system will be able to access existing information in previously submitted reports and data stored in other EPA databases. These data can be incorporated into new reports, which will lead to reporting burden reduction through labor savings.

In 2011, in response to Executive Order 13563, the EPA developed a plan to periodically review its regulations to determine if they should be modified, streamlined, expanded, or repealed in an effort to make regulations more effective and less burdensome.¹⁰⁴ The plan includes replacing outdated paper reporting with electronic reporting. In keeping with this plan and the White House's Digital Government Strategy,¹⁰⁵ in 2013 the EPA issued an agency-wide policy specifying that EPA will start with the assumption that reporting will be electronic and not paper. The EPA believes that the electronic submittal of the reports addressed in this rulemaking increases the usefulness of the data contained in those reports, is in keeping with current trends in data availability, further assists in the protection of public health and the environment and will ultimately result in less burden on the regulated community. Therefore, the

¹⁰⁴ EPA's Final Plan for Periodic Retrospective Reviews, August 2011. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/regdarr/retrospective/documents/eparetroreviewplan-aug2011.pdf>.

¹⁰⁵ Digital Government: Building a 21st Century Platform to Better Serve the American People, May 2012. Available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/egov/digital-government/digital-government-strategy.pdf>.

EPA is retaining the requirement to report these data electronically.

2. Third-Party Verification for Closed Vent Systems

Comment: Several commenters express opposition to a third-party verification system for the design of closed vent systems. Some of the commenters explain that they design their closed vent system using in-house staff. Many of the details regarding actual flow volumes and gas composition are unknown at the initial design stage, so it would not be possible to certify the design's effectiveness prior to construction. Also, storage vessels are designed to have some level of losses, so it would also not be possible to certify that the closed vent system routes all emissions to the control device.

Several of the commenters also express concern that the verification process discussed in the preamble to the proposed rule would create a complex bureaucratic scheme with no measurable benefits. Many of the commenters believe such a verification process would add a significant labor and cost burden that the EPA has not quantified. The EPA's contention that third-party verification "may" improve compliance is presented without any analysis or support and does not justify the costs of such a program.

Concerning the impartiality requirements outlined by the EPA, some of the commenters believe that it would be impossible to find someone who is qualified to do verification that could pass those requirements due to the interrelationship between the production and support companies over decades of working with one another. Some commenters contend that the EPA overestimates the availability of qualified third-party consultants, assuming that an impartial one could be found, that understands the industry well enough to competently review designs for closed vent systems.

Some of the commenters remind the EPA of the conclusions the Agency reached after proposing a similar third-party verification system for the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program, in which the EPA expressed concerns about establishing third-party verification protocols, developing a system to accredit third-party verifiers, and developing a system to ensure impartiality.

Response: The EPA continues to believe that independent third party verification can furnish more, and sometimes better, data about regulatory compliance. With better data about compliance, regulatory agencies, including the EPA, would have more

information to determine what types of regulations are effective and how to spend their resources. A critical element to independent third party verification is to ensure third-party verifiers are truly independent from their clients and perform competently. We continue to believe that this model best limits the risk of bias or “capture” due to the third-party verifier identifying or aligning his interests too closely with those of the client. However, in other rulemakings, we have explored and implemented an alternative to the independent third party verification, where engineering design is the element we wish to ensure is examined and implemented without bias. This is the “qualified professional engineer” model. In the “Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Burden Reduction Initiative” (Burden Reduction Rule) (71 FR 16826, April 4, 2006) and the “Oil Pollution Prevention and Response; Non-Transportation-Related Onshore and Offshore Facilities rule (67 FR 47042, July 17, 2002), the Agency came to similar conclusions. First, that professional engineers, whether independent or employees of a facility, being professionals, will uphold the integrity of their profession and only certify documents that meet the prescribed regulatory requirements and that the integrity of both the professional engineer and the professional oversight of boards licensing professional engineers are sufficient to prevent any abuses. And second, that in-house professional engineers may be the persons most familiar with the design and operation of the facility and that a restriction on in-house professional certifications might place an undue and unnecessary financial burden on owners or operators of facilities by forcing them to hire an outside engineer. Also in the “Burden Reduction Rule” the Agency concluded that a professional engineer is able to give fair and technical review because of the oversight programs established by the state licensing boards that will subject the professional engineer to penalties, including the loss of license and potential fines if certifications are provided when the facts do not warrant it. A qualified professional engineer maintains the most important components of any certification requirement: (1) That the engineer be qualified to perform the task based on training and experience; and (2) that she or he be a professional engineer licensed to practice engineering under the title Professional Engineer which requires following a code of ethics with the potential of losing his/her license for

negligence (see 71 FR 16868, April 4, 2006). The personal liability of the professional engineer provides strong support for both the requirement that certifications must be performed by licensed professional engineers. The Agency is convinced that an employee of a facility, who is a qualified professional engineer and who has been licensed by a state licensing board, would be no more likely to be biased than a qualified professional engineer who is not an employee of the owner or operator. The EPA has concluded that the programs established by state licensing boards provide sufficient guarantees that a professional engineer, regardless of whether he/she is “independent” of the facility, will give a fair technical review. As an additional protection, the Agency has re-evaluated the design criteria for closed vent systems to ensure that the requirements are sufficiently objective and technically precise, while providing site specific flexibility, that a qualified professional engineer will be able to certify that they have been met.

It is important to reiterate that state licensing boards can investigate complaints of negligence or incompetence on the part of professional engineers and may impose fines and other disciplinary actions, such as cease-and-desist orders or license revocation. (See 71 FR 16868.) In light of the third party oversight provided by the state licensing boards in combination with the numerous recordkeeping and recording requirements established in this rule, the Agency is confident that abuses of the certification requirements will be minimal and that human health and the environment will be protected.

In other rulemakings, which have allowed for a qualified professional engineer in lieu of an independent reviewer, the Agency has required that the professional engineer be licensed in the state in which the facility is located. (See “Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities; Final Rule” (Coal Ash Rule) (80 FR 21302, April 17, 2015)). The Agency has made this decision, in that rule, for a number of reasons, but primarily because state licensing boards can provide the necessary oversight on the actions of the professional engineer and investigate complaints of negligence or incompetence as well as impose fines and other disciplinary actions such as cease-and-desist orders or license revocation. The Agency concluded that oversight may not be as rigorous if the professional engineer is operating under a license issued from another state.

While we believe this is the appropriate outcome for the Coal Ash Rule, in part due to the regional and geological conditions specific to the landfill design, we do not believe that we need to provide this restriction for the closed vent system design under this rulemaking. Closed vent system design elements are not predicated on regional characteristics but instead follow generally and widely understood engineering analysis such as volumetric flow, back pressure and pressure drops. We do believe that the professional engineer should be licensed in a minimum of one of the states in which the certifying official does business.

Whether to specify independent third-party reporting, some other type of third-party or self-reporting, or a Professional Engineer is a case-specific decision that will vary depending on the nature of the rule, the characteristics of the sector(s) and regulated entities, and the applicable regulatory requirements. Based on all relevant factors for this rule, the EPA has determined that a qualified Professional Engineer approach is appropriate and that it is unnecessary to require the individual making certifications under this rule to be “independent third parties.” Thus the final rule does not prohibit an employee of the facility from making the certification, provided they are a professional engineer that is licensed by a state licensing board.

3. The EPA’s Authority and Costs for Standards Reflecting Next Generation Compliance and Rule Effectiveness

Comment: Several commenters believe that standards reflecting Next Generation Compliance and rule effectiveness strategies discussed in the preamble to the proposed rule are not legal and represent an overreach of its authority. While the EPA has authority to require reasonable recordkeeping, reporting and monitoring under the CAA, there is nothing in the CAA that can be construed to authorize the EPA to force the regulated community to hire a third-party contractor to do the EPA’s work. The commenters point out that the EPA admitted in the preamble to the 2011 proposal of subpart OOOO that ensuring compliance with the well completion requirements would be very difficult and burdensome for regulatory agencies. The commenters believe that the EPA is using the requirements to relieve the regulatory agencies of some of this burden. One commenter stated that the requirements amount to an unfunded enforcement mandate on the facilities it is supposed to be regulating.

The commenters also state that the compliance requirements would violate

the Anti-Deficiency Act because the third-party verification requirements would circumvent budget appropriations for EPA enforcement activities (see 31 U.S.C. 1341(a)(1)(A)).

Some of the commenters also object to the EPA justifying increased monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting requirements on consent decrees in enforcement actions. The commenters point out that consent decrees impose more stringent requirements on facilities that have been found to be in violation of a regulatory requirement; therefore, consent decree requirements would be inappropriate for generally applicable regulations. The commenters state that the EPA has provided no justification for imposing heightened requirements on all facilities regardless of their compliance history.

Several commenters also state that the EPA must propose the regulatory language for all of the compliance provisions reflecting Next Generation Compliance and rule effectiveness strategies before they can be finalized and doing otherwise would raise a notice and comment issue. One commenter added that the EPA's intent is to apply such compliance requirements to more industries than just oil and natural gas production. Therefore, the EPA must separately propose the compliance requirements in their entirety, including estimated costs and benefits, before using them in any specific rulemakings.

Many commenters believe the standards reflecting Next Generation and rule effectiveness strategies will add significant labor and cost burdens over and above the compliance costs that the EPA already estimated for complying with the proposed rule. For example, one commenter calculates that their company will have to generate 270,000 closed vent system monthly inspection reports in the first five years of the rule if current requirements are finalized. Another commenter estimates the cost of installing continuous pressure monitoring equipment at a single site to be \$20,000, resulting in potential company-wide costs of about \$15 million. One commenter adds, based on their own experience with third-party auditors, the cost of an audit can range from \$8,000 to \$15,000 per audit, per facility. In general, the commenters state that the compliance requirements raise technical and operational complexities which can only result in increased costs. Some of the commenters note that these costs would be untenable for small businesses.

Some of the commenters also expressed concern about a lack of necessary IT infrastructure, such as data

acquisition hardware, data management software, and appropriate software, at remote oil and natural gas production and transmission facilities. The commenters also point out the lack of electricity at these sites. The commenters point out that dealing with these issues further increase the costs associated with these compliance measures.

Response: The EPA believes that the comment regarding our legal authority may be based upon a misunderstanding of EPA's Next Generation Compliance and rule effectiveness strategies. The EPA describes these strategies as follows:

"Today's pollution challenges require a modern approach to compliance, taking advantage of new tools and approaches while strengthening vigorous enforcement of environmental laws. Next Generation Compliance is EPA's integrated strategy to do that, designed to bring together the best thinking from inside and outside EPA."¹⁰⁶ Among the referenced modern approaches to compliance is to "[d]esign regulations and permits that are easier to implement, with a goal of improved compliance and environmental outcomes."

Thus EPA's Next Generation Compliance and rule effectiveness strategies, in and of themselves, impose no requirements or obligations on the regulated community. The strategies establish no regulatory terms for any sector or facility nor create rights or responsibilities in any party. Rather, the strategies describe general compliance assurance and regulatory design principles, approaches, and tools that EPA may consider in conducting rulemaking, permitting, and compliance assurance, and enforcement activities.

Regarding comments that in order to avoid notice and comment issues the EPA must propose regulatory language before finalizing any regulatory language, the EPA disagrees. Section 307(d)(3) of the CAA states that "notice of proposed rulemaking shall be published in the **Federal Register**, as provided under section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code" There is nothing in the remainder of section 307(d) that requires the EPA to publish the regulatory text. Similarly, section 553(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) does not require agencies to publish the actual regulatory text. See *EMILY's List v. FEC*, 362 F. Supp. 2d 43, 53 (D.D.C. 2005), where "[t]he Court notes that section 553 itself does not

require the Agency to publish the text of a proposed rule, since the Agency is permitted to publish 'either the terms or substance of the proposed rule or a description of the subjects and issues involved.'" For this rulemaking, the EPA has provided notice and opportunity to comment for all of the specific regulatory requirements applicable to the sector and facilities covered by the rulemaking, either through proposed regulatory language or a description in the preamble.

The EPA notes that the proposal for independent third party verification—replaced in the final rule with qualified Professional Engineer requirements—reflects the responsibility of regulated entities to comply with the new NSPS. CAA Section 111(a)(1) defines "a standard of performance" as "a standard for emissions of air pollutants which reflects the degree of emission limitation achievable through the application of the best system of emission reduction which (taking into account the cost of achieving such reduction and any non-air quality health and environmental impact and energy requirement) the Administrator determines has been adequately demonstrated." Further, in directing the Administrator to propose and promulgate regulations under section 111(b)(1)(B), Congress provided that the Administrator should take comment and then finalize the standards with such modifications "as he deems appropriate." The D.C. Circuit has considered similar statutory phrasing from CAA section 231(a)(3) and concluded that "[t]his delegation of authority is both explicit and extraordinarily broad." *National Assoc. of Clean Air Agencies v. EPA*, 489 F.3d 1221, 1229 (D.C. Cir. 2007).

In addition, the information to be collected for the proposed NSPS is based on notification, performance tests, recordkeeping and reporting requirements which will be mandatory for all operators subject to the final standards. Recordkeeping and reporting requirements are specifically authorized by section 114 of the CAA (42 U.S.C. 7414) which provides that for "any standard of performance under section 7411," the Administrator may require the sources to, among other things, "install, use, and maintain such monitoring equipment, and use such audit procedures, or methods" and submit compliance certifications in accordance with subsection (a)(3) of this section," as the Administrator may require. CAA section 114(a)(1)(A)–(G).

As discussed in section VI and in this section, the EPA has determined that to comply with the new NSPS and meet its

¹⁰⁶ USEPA; Next Generation Compliance Web page at <https://www.epa.gov/compliance/next-generation-compliance>.

emissions standard, regulated entities must obtain certifications from qualified Professional Engineers to demonstrate technical infeasibility to connect a pneumatic pump to an existing control device and to ensure the proper closed vent system design. The EPA believes for the sources covered by this rule, a professional engineer can furnish more, and sometimes better, data about regulatory compliance, especially where engineering design (e.g., closed vent system design) is the element we want to ensure is examined and implemented without bias.

The EPA notes that nothing in this rule relieves the EPA of any of its responsibilities under the CAA or implies that the EPA will not continue to use its enforcement authorities under the CAA or devote resources to monitoring and enforcing this rule. This rule simply ensures that regulated parties will have the tools available to assess and ensure their own compliance.

The EPA wishes to explain that unfunded mandates are typically rules that impose significant obligations, without funding, on state, local, or tribal governments.¹⁰⁷ Interpreting this comment as applying to the obligations this NSPS imposes on entities to which it will apply, all rules, by definition, impose some obligations and responsibilities on subject facilities. In this preamble, the EPA explains the benefits, costs, and justification for each regulatory requirement.

As discussed above, the EPA explains the emission standards in this NSPS apply to the subject regulated entities. The EPA remains responsible for ensuring and enforcing compliance with the rule. The EPA notes that nothing in this rule relieves the EPA of any of its responsibilities under the CAA to ensure and enforce regulatory compliance.

The EPA agrees, that if the EPA were to seek to apply the standards in this rule—or any other regulatory standards, reflecting the Agency's Next Generation Compliance and rule effectiveness strategies or otherwise—to additional sectors beyond oil and natural gas production, the EPA would need to separately propose and justify the standards. As discussed above, however, the EPA's Next Generation Compliance and rule effectiveness strategies, in and of themselves, impose no requirements on the regulated community. The strategies prescribe no

specific regulatory terms for any sector or facility nor do they create rights or responsibilities in any party. Rather, they describe compliance assurance and regulatory design strategies and approaches that the EPA will consider in conducting rulemaking, permitting, and compliance assurance, and enforcement activities that are inappropriate for notice and comment rulemaking. If the EPA believes that these strategies and approaches should be applied in other circumstances and to other industry sectors, the Agency will do this through other regulatory actions.

The EPA agrees with the commenters that certain of the Next Generation and rule effectiveness strategies are the result of information that the Agency has gained from implementation of past consent decrees (e.g., closed vent system design and fugitives monitoring program audit). It is not unusual for the Agency to require additional monitoring practices, and recordkeeping and reporting requirements through consent, as this provides us an opportunity to identify the effectiveness of these standards from those companies that have engaged in violative conduct. Furthermore, through our enforcement efforts, when we see common and widespread compliance problems that can be addressed through improved monitoring, reporting and recordkeeping practices, it is our duty to include these tools in rulemaking, resulting in greater environmental benefit. As discussed elsewhere in this preamble, we are not requiring an "independent third party" verification of closed vent system design, nor are we requiring that the fugitive emissions monitoring program be audited. However, because of the widespread issues we have found with closed vent system design, the Agency will require a certification by a qualified professional engineer.

Regarding the comment about necessary IT infrastructure, such as data acquisition hardware, data management software, and appropriate software, at remote oil and natural gas production and transmission facilities and the lack of electricity at these sites, the Agency does not believe that the next generation and rule effectiveness initiatives we are proposing directly require IT infrastructure beyond that already required by other aspects of the rule. Likewise, onsite electrical availability for remote well sites is not an issue for the Next Generation and Rule Effectiveness strategies that we are finalizing.

IX. Impacts of the Final Amendments

A. What are the air impacts?

For this action, the EPA estimated the emission reductions that will occur due to the implementation of the final emission limits. The EPA estimated emission reductions based on the control technologies proposed as the BSER. This analysis estimates regulatory impacts for the analysis years of 2020 and 2025. The analysis of 2020 represents the accumulation of new and modified sources from the first full year of compliance, 2016, through 2020 to illustrate the near-term impacts of the rule. The regulatory impact estimates for 2020 include sources newly affected in 2020 as well as the accumulation of affected sources from 2016 to 2019 that are also assumed to be in continued operation in 2020, thus incurring compliance costs and emissions reductions in 2020. We also estimate impacts in 2025 to illustrate the continued compound effect of this rule over a longer period. The regulatory impact estimates for 2025 include sources newly affected in 2025 as well as the accumulation of affected sources from 2016 to 2024 that are also assumed to be in continued operation in 2025, thus incurring compliance costs and emissions reductions in 2025.

In 2020, we have estimated that the final NSPS would reduce about 300,000 tons of methane emissions and 150,000 tons of VOC emissions from affected facilities. In 2025, we have estimated that the proposed NSPS would reduce about 510,000 tons of methane emissions and 210,000 tons of VOC emissions from affected facilities. The NSPS is also expected to concurrently reduce about 1,900 tons HAP in 2020 and 3,900 tons HAP in 2025.

As described in the TSD and RIA for this rule, the EPA projected affected facilities using a combination of historical data from the United States GHG Inventory, and projected activity levels, taken from the Energy Information Administration (EIA's) Annual Energy Outlook (AEO). The EPA also considered state regulations with similar requirements to the final NSPS in projecting affected sources for impacts analyses supporting this rule.

B. What are the energy impacts?

Energy impacts in this section are those energy requirements associated with the operation of emission control devices. Potential impacts on the national energy economy from the rule are discussed in the economic impacts section. There would be little national energy demand increase from the operation of any of the environmental

¹⁰⁷ See USEPA, Rulemakings by Effect: Unfunded Mandates Web site at <https://yosemite.epa.gov/oepi/rulegate.nsf/content/effectsunfunded.html?OpenDocument&Count=1000&ExpandView>.

controls expected to be used for compliance with the final NSPS.

The final NSPS encourages the use of emission controls that recover hydrocarbon products, such as methane, that can be used onsite as fuel or reprocessed within the production process for sale. We estimate that the standards will result in a total cost of about \$320 million in 2020 and \$530 million in 2025 (in 2012 dollars).

C. What are the compliance costs?

The EPA estimates the total capital cost of the final NSPS will be \$250 million in 2020 and \$360 million in 2025. The estimate of total annualized engineering costs of the final NSPS is \$390 million in 2020 and \$640 million in 2025. This annual cost estimate includes capital, operating, maintenance, monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping costs. This estimated annual cost does not take into account any producer revenues associated with the recovery of salable natural gas. The EPA estimates that about 16 billion cubic feet in 2020 and 27 billion cubic feet of natural gas in 2025 will be recovered by implementing the NSPS. In the engineering cost analysis, we assume that producers are paid \$4 per thousand cubic feet (Mcf) for the recovered gas at the wellhead. After accounting for these revenues, the estimate of total annualized engineering costs of the final NSPS are estimated to be \$320 million in 2020 and \$530 million in 2025.¹⁰⁸ The price assumption is influential on estimated annualized engineering costs. A simple sensitivity analysis indicates \$1/Mcf change in the wellhead price causes a change in estimated engineering compliance costs of about \$16 million in 2020 and \$27 million in 2025.

D. What are the economic and employment impacts?

The EPA used the National Energy Modeling System (NEMS) to estimate the impacts of the final rule on the United States energy system. The NEMS is a publically-available model of the United States energy economy developed and maintained by the EIA and is used to produce the AEO, a reference publication that provides detailed forecasts of the United States energy economy.

The EPA estimate that natural gas and crude oil drilling levels decline slightly over the 2020 to 2025 period relative to the baseline (by about 0.17 percent for

natural gas wells and about 0.02 percent for crude oil wells). Natural gas production decreases slightly over the 2020 to 2025 period relative to the baseline (by about 0.03 percent), while crude oil production does not vary appreciably. Crude oil wellhead prices for onshore lower 48 production are not estimated to change appreciably over the 2020 to 2025 period relative to the baseline. However, wellhead natural gas prices for onshore lower 48 production are estimated to increase slightly over the 2020 to 2025 period relative to the baseline (about 0.20 percent). Net imports of natural gas are estimated to increase slightly over the 2020 to 2025 period relative to the baseline (by about 0.11 percent). Crude oil net imports are not estimated to change appreciably over the 2020 to 2025 period relative to the baseline.

Executive Order 13563 directs federal agencies to consider the effect of regulations on job creation and employment. According to the Executive Order, “our regulatory system must protect public health, welfare, safety, and our environment while promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation. It must be based on the best available science.” (Executive Order 13563, 2011) While a standalone analysis of employment impacts is not included in a standard benefit-cost analysis, such an analysis is of particular concern in the current economic climate given continued interest in the employment impact of regulations such as this final rule.

The EPA estimated the labor impacts due to the installation, operation, and maintenance of control equipment, control activities, and labor associated with new reporting and recordkeeping requirements. We estimated up-front and continual, annual labor requirements by estimating hours of labor required for compliance and converting this number to full-time equivalents (FTEs) by dividing by 2,080 (40 hours per week multiplied by 52 weeks). The up-front labor requirement to comply with the proposed NSPS is estimated at about 270 FTEs in both 2020 and 2025. The annual labor requirement to comply with final NSPS is estimated at about 1,100 FTEs in 2020 and 1,800 FTEs in 2025.

We note that this type of FTE estimate cannot be used to identify the specific number of employees involved or whether new jobs are created for new employees versus displacing jobs from other sectors of the economy.

E. What are the benefits of the final standards?

The final rule is expected to result in significant reductions in emissions. In 2020, the final rule is anticipated to reduce 300,000 short tons, or 280,000 metric tons, of methane (a GHG and a precursor to tropospheric ozone formation), 150,000 tons of VOC (a precursor to both PM (2.5 microns and less) (PM_{2.5}) and ozone formation), and 1,900 tons of HAP. In 2025, the final rule is anticipated to reduce 510,000 short tons (460,000 metric tons) of methane, 210,000 tons of VOC, and 3,900 tons of HAP. These pollutants are associated with substantial health effects, climate effects, and other welfare effects.

The final standards are expected to reduce methane emissions annually by about 6.9 million metric tons CO₂ Eq. in 2020 and by about 11 million metric tons CO₂ Eq. in 2025. It is important to note that the emission reductions are based upon predicted activities in 2020 and 2025; however, the EPA did not forecast sector-level emissions in 2020 and 2025 for this rulemaking. To give a sense of the magnitude of the reductions, the methane reductions expected in 2020 are equivalent to about 2.8 percent of the methane emissions for this sector reported in the United States GHG Inventory for 2014 (about 232 million metric tons CO Eq. from petroleum and natural gas production and gas processing, transmission, and storage). Expected reductions in 2025 are equivalent to around 4.7 percent of 2014 emissions. As it is expected that emissions from this sector would increase over time, the estimates compared against the 2014 emissions would likely overestimate the percent of reductions from total emissions in 2020 and 2025.

Methane is a potent GHG that, once emitted into the atmosphere, absorbs terrestrial infrared radiation that contributes to increased global warming and continuing climate change. Methane reacts in the atmosphere to form tropospheric ozone and stratospheric water vapor, both of which also contribute to global warming. When accounting for the impacts of changing methane, tropospheric ozone, and stratospheric water vapor concentrations, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 5th Assessment Report (2013) found that historical emissions of methane accounted for about 30 percent of the total current warming influence (radiative forcing) due to historical emissions of GHGs. Methane is therefore a major contributor to the climate

¹⁰⁸ To the extent that NSPS affected facilities would have controlled emissions voluntarily through the Methane Challenge or other initiatives, the estimated costs and benefits of the NSPS would be lower than those included in the RIA analysis.

change impacts described previously. In 2013, total methane emissions from the oil and natural gas industry represented nearly 29 percent of the total methane emissions from all sources and account for about 3 percent of all CO₂-equivalent emissions in the United States, with the combined petroleum and natural gas systems being the largest contributor to United States anthropogenic methane emissions.

We calculated the global social benefits of methane emission reductions expected from the final NSPS standards for oil and natural gas sites using estimates of the social cost of methane (SC-CH₄), a metric that estimates the monetary value of impacts associated with marginal changes in methane emissions in a given year. The SC-CH₄ estimates applied in this analysis were developed by Marten et al. (2014) and are discussed in greater detail below.

A similar metric, the social cost of CO₂ (SC-CO₂), provides important context for understanding the Marten et al. SC-CH₄ estimates.¹⁰⁹ The SC-CO₂ is a metric that estimates the monetary value of impacts associated with marginal changes in CO₂ emissions in a given year. Similar to the SC-CH₄, it includes a wide range of anticipated climate impacts, such as net changes in agricultural productivity, property damage from increased flood risk, and changes in energy system costs, such as reduced costs for heating and increased costs for air conditioning. Estimates of the SC-CO₂ have been used by the EPA and other federal agencies to value the impacts of CO₂ emissions changes in benefit cost analysis for GHG-related rulemakings since 2008.

The SC-CO₂ estimates were developed over many years, using the best science available, and with input from the public. Specifically, an interagency working group (IWG) that included the EPA and other executive branch agencies and offices used three integrated assessment models (IAMs) to develop the SC-CO₂ estimates and recommended four global values for use in regulatory analyses. The SC-CO₂ estimates were first released in February 2010 and updated in 2013 using new versions of each IAM. The 2010 SC-CO₂ Technical Support Document (2010 TSD) provides a complete discussion of the methods used to develop these estimates and the current SC-CO₂ TSD presents and discusses the 2013 update

¹⁰⁹ Previous analyses have commonly referred to the social cost of carbon dioxide emissions as the social cost of carbon or SCC. To more easily facilitate the inclusion of non-CO₂ GHGs in the discussion and analysis the more specific SC-CO₂ nomenclature is used to refer to the social cost of CO₂ emissions.

(including recent minor technical corrections to the estimates).¹¹⁰

The SC-CO₂ TSDs discuss a number of limitations to the SC-CO₂ analysis, including the incomplete way in which the IAMs capture catastrophic and non-catastrophic impacts, their incomplete treatment of adaptation and technological change, uncertainty in the extrapolation of damages to high temperatures, and assumptions regarding risk aversion. Currently, IAMs do not assign value to all of the important physical, ecological, and economic impacts of climate change recognized in the climate change literature due to a lack of precise information on the nature of damages and because the science incorporated into these models understandably lags behind the most recent research. Nonetheless, these estimates and the discussion of their limitations represent the best available information about the social benefits of CO₂ reductions to inform benefit-cost analysis. The EPA and other agencies continue to engage in research on modeling and valuation of climate impacts with the goal to improve these estimates and continue to consider feedback on the SC-CO₂ estimates from stakeholders through a range of channels, including public comments on Agency rulemakings, a separate Office of Management and Budget (OMB) public comment solicitation, and through regular interactions with stakeholders and research analysts implementing the SC-CO₂ methodology. See the RIA of this rule for additional details.

A challenge particularly relevant to this rule is that the IWG did not estimate the social costs of non-CO₂ GHG emissions at the time the SC-CO₂ estimates were developed. In addition, the directly modeled estimates of the social costs of non-CO₂ GHG emissions previously found in the published literature were few in number and varied considerably in terms of the models and input assumptions they employed¹¹¹ (EPA 2012). In the past, EPA has sought to understand the potential importance of monetizing non-CO₂ GHG emissions changes through sensitivity analysis using an estimate of the GWP of methane to convert

¹¹⁰ Both the 2010 SC-CO₂ TSD and the current TSD are available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/oira/social-cost-of-carbon>.

¹¹¹ U.S. EPA. 2012. Regulatory Impact Analysis Final New Source Performance Standards and Amendments to the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the Oil and Natural Gas Industry. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Health and Environmental Impacts Division. April. http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/oil_natural_gas_final_neshap_nsp_ria.pdf. Accessed March 30, 2015.

emission impacts to CO₂ equivalents, which can then be valued using the SC-CO₂ estimates. This approach approximates the social cost of methane (SC-CH₄) using estimates of the SC-CO₂ and the GWP of methane.¹¹²

The published literature documents a variety of reasons that directly modeled estimates of SC-CH₄ are an analytical improvement over the estimates from the GWP approximation approach. Specifically, several recent studies found that GWP-weighted benefit estimates for methane are likely to be lower than the estimates derived using directly modeled social cost estimates for these gases.¹¹³ The GWP reflects only the relative integrated radiative forcing of a gas over 100 years in comparison to CO₂. The directly modeled social cost estimates differ from the GWP-scaled SC-CO₂ because the relative differences in timing and magnitude of the warming between gases are explicitly modeled, the non-linear effects of temperature change on economic damages are included, and rather than treating all impacts over a hundred years equally, the modeled damages over the time horizon considered (300 years in this case) are discounted to present value terms. A detailed discussion of the limitations of the GWP approach can be found in the RIA.

In general, the commenters on previous rulemakings strongly encouraged the EPA to incorporate the monetized value of non-CO₂ GHG impacts into the benefit cost analysis. However, they noted the challenges associated with the GWP approach, as discussed above, and encouraged the use of directly modeled estimates of the SC-CH₄ to overcome those challenges.

Since then, a paper by Marten et al. (2014) has provided the first set of published SC-CH₄ estimates in the peer-reviewed literature that are consistent with the modeling assumptions underlying the SC-CO₂ estimates.^{114 115}

¹¹² For example, see (1) U.S. EPA. (2012). "Regulatory impact analysis supporting the 2012 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency final new source performance standards and amendments to the national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for the oil and natural gas industry." Retrieved from http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/oil_natural_gas_final_neshap_nsp_ria.pdf and (2) U.S. EPA. (2012). "Regulatory impact analysis: Final rulemaking for 2017–2025 light-duty vehicle greenhouse gas emission standards and corporate average fuel economy standards." Retrieved from <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/documents/420r12016.pdf>.

¹¹³ See Waldhoff et al. (2011); Marten and Newbold (2012); and Marten et al. (2014).

¹¹⁴ Marten et al. (2014) also provided the first set of SC-N₂O estimates that are consistent with the assumptions underlying the IWG SC-CO₂ estimates.

Specifically, the estimation approach of Marten et al. used the same set of three IAMs, five socioeconomic and emissions scenarios, equilibrium climate sensitivity distribution, three

constant discount rates, and aggregation approach used by the IWG to develop the SC-CO₂ estimates.

The SC-CH₄ estimates from Marten et al. (2014) are presented below in Table

8. More detailed discussion of the SC-CH₄ estimation methodology, results and a comparison to other published estimates can be found in the RIA and in Marten et al.

TABLE 8—SOCIAL COST OF CH₄, 2012–2050^a
[In 2012\$ per metric ton] (Source: Marten et al., 2014^b)

Year	SC-CH ₄			
	5% Average	3% Average	2.5% Average	3% 95th percentile
2012	\$430	\$1000	\$1400	\$2800
2015	490	1100	1500	3000
2020	580	1300	1700	3500
2025	700	1500	1900	4000
2030	820	1700	2200	4500
2035	970	1900	2500	5300
2040	1100	2200	2800	5900
2045	1300	2500	3000	6600
2050	1400	2700	3300	7200

Notes:

^a There are four different estimates of the SC-CH₄, each one emissions-year specific. The first three shown in the table are based on the average SC-CH₄ from three integrated assessment models at discount rates of 5, 3, and 2.5 percent. The fourth estimate is the 95th percentile of the SC-CH₄ across all three models at a 3 percent discount rate. See RIA for details.

^b The estimates in this table have been adjusted to reflect the minor technical corrections to the SC-CO₂ estimates described above. See the Corrigendum to Marten et al. (2014), <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14693062.2015.1070550>.

The application of these directly modeled SC-CH₄ estimates from Marten et al. (2014) in a benefit-cost analysis of a regulatory action is analogous to the use of the SC-CO₂ estimates. In addition, the limitations for the SC-CO₂ estimates discussed above likewise apply to the SC-CH₄ estimates, given the consistency in the methodology.

In early 2015, the EPA conducted a peer review of the application of the Marten et al. (2014) non-CO₂ social cost estimates in regulatory analysis and received responses that supported this application. See the RIA for a detailed discussion.

The EPA also carefully considered the full range of public comments and associated technical issues on the Marten et al. SC-CH₄ estimates received through this rulemaking. The comments

addressed the technical details of the SC-CO₂ estimates and the Marten et al. SC-CH₄ estimates as well as their application to this rulemaking analysis. The commenters also provided constructive recommendations to improve the SC-CO₂ and SC-CH₄ estimates in the future. Based on the evaluation of the public comments on this rulemaking, the favorable peer review of the Marten et al. application, and past comments urging the EPA to value non-CO₂ GHG impacts in its rulemakings, the EPA concluded that the estimates represent the best scientific information on the impacts of climate change available in a form appropriate for incorporating the damages from incremental methane emissions changes into regulatory analysis. The EPA has included those

benefits in the main benefits analysis. See the RTC document for the complete response to comments received on the SC-CH₄ as part of this rulemaking.

The methane benefits calculated using Marten et al. (2014) are presented in Table 9 for years 2020 and 2025. Applying this approach to the methane reductions estimated for the NSPS, the 2020 methane benefits vary by discount rate and range from about \$160 million to approximately \$960 million; the mean SC-CH₄ at the 3-percent discount rate results in an estimate of about \$360 million in 2020. The methane benefits increase in the 2025, ranging from \$320 million to \$1.8 billion, depending on discount rate used; the mean SC-CH₄ at the 3-percent discount rate results in an estimate of about \$690 million in 2025.

TABLE 9—ESTIMATED GLOBAL BENEFITS OF METHANE REDUCTIONS
[In millions, 2012\$]

Discount rate and statistic	Year	
	2020	2025
Million metric tonnes of methane reduced	0.28	0.46
Million metric tonnes of CO ₂ Eq.	6.9	11
5% (average)	\$160	\$320
3% (average)	\$360	\$690
2.5% (average)	\$480	\$890
3% (95th percentile)	\$960	\$1,800

¹¹⁵ Marten, A.L., E.A. Kopits, C.W. Griffiths, S.C. Newbold & A. Wolverson (2014, online publication;

2015, print publication). Incremental CH₄ and N₂O mitigation benefits consistent with the United

States Government's SC-CO₂ estimates, Climate Policy, DOI: 10.1080/14693062.2014.912981.

In addition to the limitation discussed above, and the referenced documents, there are additional impacts of individual GHGs that are not currently captured in the IAMs used in the directly modeled approach of Marten et al. (2014) and, therefore, not quantified for the rule. For example, in addition to being a GHG, methane is a precursor to ozone. The ozone generated by methane has important non-climate impacts on agriculture, ecosystems, and human health. The RIA describes the specific impacts of methane as an ozone precursor in more detail and discusses studies that have estimated monetized benefits of these methane generated ozone effects. The EPA continues to monitor developments in this area of research.

With the data available, we are not able to provide credible health benefit estimates for the reduction in exposure to HAP, ozone and PM_{2.5} for these rules, due to the differences in the locations of oil and natural gas emission points relative to existing information and the highly localized nature of air quality responses associated with HAP and VOC reductions. This is not to imply that there are no benefits of the rules; rather, it is a reflection of the difficulties in modeling the direct and indirect impacts of the reductions in emissions for this industrial sector with the data currently available.¹¹⁶ In addition to health improvements, there will be improvements in visibility effects, ecosystem effects and climate effects, as well as additional product recovery.

Although we do not have sufficient information or modeling available to provide quantitative estimates for this rulemaking, we include a qualitative assessment of the health effects associated with exposure to HAP, ozone and PM_{2.5} in the RIA for this rule. These qualitative effects are briefly summarized below, but for more detailed information, please refer to the RIA, which is available in the docket.

¹¹⁶ Previous studies have estimated the monetized benefits-per-ton of reducing VOC emissions associated with the effect that those emissions have on ambient PM_{2.5} levels and the health effects associated with PM_{2.5} exposure (Fann, Fulcher, and Hubbell, 2009). While these ranges of benefit-per-ton estimates can provide useful context, the geographic distribution of VOC emissions from the oil and gas sector are not consistent with emissions modeled in Fann, Fulcher, and Hubbell (2009). In addition, the benefit-per-ton estimates for VOC emission reductions in that study are derived from total VOC emissions across all sectors. Coupled with the larger uncertainties about the relationship between VOC emissions and PM_{2.5} and the highly localized nature of air quality responses associated with HAP and VOC reductions, these factors lead us to conclude that the available VOC benefit-per-ton estimates are not appropriate to calculate monetized benefits of these rules, even as a bounding exercise.

One of the HAP of concern from the oil and natural gas sector is benzene, which is a known human carcinogen. VOC emissions are precursors to both PM_{2.5} and ozone formation. As documented in previous analyses (U.S. EPA, 2006¹¹⁷, U.S. EPA, 2010¹¹⁸, and U.S. EPA, 2014¹¹⁹), exposure to PM_{2.5} and ozone is associated with significant public health effects. PM_{2.5} is associated with health effects, including premature mortality for adults and infants, cardiovascular morbidity such as heart attacks, and respiratory morbidity such as asthma attacks, acute bronchitis, hospital admissions and emergency room visits, work loss days, restricted activity days and respiratory symptoms, as well as visibility impairment.¹²⁰ Ozone is associated with health effects, including hospital and emergency department visits, school loss days and premature mortality, as well as injury to vegetation and climate effects.¹²¹

Finally, the control techniques to meet the standards are anticipated to have minor secondary emissions impacts, which may partially offset the direct benefits of this rule. The magnitude of these secondary air pollutant impacts is small relative to the direct emission reductions anticipated from this rule.

In particular, the EPA has estimated that an increase in flaring of natural gas in response to this rule will produce a variety of emissions, including about 1.0 million short tons of CO₂ in 2020 and about 1.2 million short tons of CO₂ in 2025. The EPA has not estimated the monetized value of the secondary emissions of CO₂ because much of the VOCs and methane that would have

been released in the absence of the flare would have eventually oxidized into CO₂ in the atmosphere. Note that the CO₂ produced from the methane oxidizing in the atmosphere is not included in the calculation of the SC-CH₄.

For VOC emissions, the oxidation period is relatively short, on the order of a couple of weeks. However, for methane, the oxidation period is longer, on the order of a decade, and the EPA recognizes that because the growth rate of the SC-CO₂ estimates are lower than their associated discount rates, the estimated impact of CO₂ produced in the future via oxidized methane from fossil-based emissions may be less than the estimated impact of CO₂ released immediately from combustion. This would imply a small disbenefit associated with the earlier release of CO₂ during combustion of the methane emissions.

In the proposal, the EPA solicited comment on the appropriateness of monetizing the impact of the earlier release of CO₂ due to combusting methane emissions from oil and gas sites and an illustrative analysis that described a potential approach to approximate this value using the SC-CO₂. The EPA did not receive any comments regarding the appropriate methodology for conducting such an analysis, but did receive one comment letter that voiced general support for monetizing the secondary impacts. In consideration of this comment and recognizing the challenges and uncertainties related to estimation of these secondary emissions impacts for this rulemaking, EPA has continued to examine this issue in the context of this regulatory analysis (*i.e.*, the combusting of fossil-based methane at oil and gas sites) and explored ways to improve the illustrative analysis. See RIA for details.

X. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Additional information about these statutes and Executive Orders can be found at <http://www2.epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive-orders>.

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review

This action is an economically significant regulatory action that was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review. Any changes made in response to OMB recommendations have been documented in the docket. The EPA prepared an analysis of the potential

¹¹⁷ U.S. EPA. *RIA. National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter*, Chapter 5. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC. October 2006. Available on the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/Chapter%205—Benefits.pdf>.

¹¹⁸ U.S. EPA. *RIA. National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone*. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC. January 2010. Available on the Internet at http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/s1-supplemental_analysis_full.pdf.

¹¹⁹ U.S. EPA. *RIA. National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone*. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC. December 2014. Available on the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/ttnecas1/regdata/RIAs/20141125ria.pdf>.

¹²⁰ U.S. EPA. *Integrated Science Assessment for Particulate Matter (Final Report)*. EPA-600/R-08-139F. National Center for Environmental Assessment—RTP Division. December 2009. Available at <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=216546>.

¹²¹ U.S. EPA. *Air Quality Criteria for Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants (Final)*. EPA/600/R-05/004aF-cF. Washington, DC: U.S. EPA. February 2006. Available on the Internet at <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/CFM/recordisplay.cfm?deid=149923>.

costs and benefits associated with this action.
 In addition, the EPA prepared a Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) of the potential costs and benefits associated

with this action. The RIA available in the docket describes in detail the empirical basis for the EPA's assumptions and characterizes the

various sources of uncertainties affecting the estimates below. Table 10 shows the results of the cost and benefits analysis for the final rule.

TABLE 10—SUMMARY OF THE MONETIZED BENEFITS, SOCIAL COSTS AND NET BENEFITS FOR THE FINAL OIL AND NATURAL GAS NSPS IN 2020 AND 2025
 [Millions of 2012\$]

	2020	2025
Total Monetized Benefits ¹	\$360 million	\$690 million.
Total Costs ²	\$320 million	\$530 million.
Net Benefits ³	\$35 million	\$170 million.
Non-monetized Benefits	Non-monetized climate benefits. Health effects of PM _{2.5} and ozone exposure from 150,000 tons of VOC in 2020 and 210,000 tons of VOC in 2025. Health effects of HAP exposure from 1,900 tons of HAP in 2020 and 3,900 tons of HAP in 2025. Health effects of ozone exposure from 300,000 tons of methane in 2020 and 510,000 tons methane in 2025. Visibility impairment. Vegetation effects.	

¹ We estimate methane benefits associated with four different values of a one ton methane reduction (model average at 2.5 percent discount rate, 3 percent, and 5 percent; 95th percentile at 3 percent). For the purposes of this table, we show the benefits associated with the model average at 3 percent discount rate, however we emphasize the importance and value of considering the full range of social cost of methane values. We provide estimates based on additional discount rates in preamble section IX.E and in the RIA. The CO₂-equivalent (CO₂ Eq.) methane emission reductions are 6.9 million metric tons in 2020 and 11 million metric tons in 2025. Also, the specific control technologies for the proposed NSPS are anticipated to have minor secondary disbenefits.

² The engineering compliance costs are annualized using a 7 percent discount rate and include estimated revenue from additional natural gas recovery as a result of the NSPS. When rounded, the cost estimates are the same for the 3 percent discount rate as they are for the 7 percent discount rate cost estimates, so rounded net benefits do not change when using a 3 percent discount rate.

³ Figures may not sum due to rounding.

B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has previously approved the information collection activities contained in 40 CFR part 60, subpart OOOO under the PRA and has assigned OMB control number 2060-0673 and ICR number 2437.01; a summary can be found at 77 FR 49537. The information collection requirements in the final action titled, Standards of Performance for Crude Oil and Natural Gas Facilities for Construction, Modification, or Reconstruction (40 CFR part 60 subpart OOOOa) have been submitted for approval to the OMB under the PRA. The ICR document prepared by the EPA has been assigned EPA ICR Number 2523.01. You can find a copy of the ICR in the docket for this rule, and is briefly summarized below.

The information to be collected for the final NSPS is based on notification, performance tests, recordkeeping and reporting requirements which will be mandatory for all operators subject to the final standards. Recordkeeping and reporting requirements are specifically authorized by section 114 of the CAA (42 U.S.C. 7414). The information will be used by the delegated authority (state agency, or Regional Administrator if there is no delegated state agency) to ensure that the standards and other

requirements are being achieved. Based on review of the recorded information at the site and the reported information, the delegated permitting authority can identify facilities that may not be in compliance and decide which facilities, records, or processes may need inspection. All information submitted to the EPA pursuant to the recordkeeping and reporting requirements for which a claim of confidentiality is made is safeguarded according to Agency policies set forth in 40 CFR part 2, subpart B.

Potential respondents under subpart OOOOa are owners or operators of new, modified or reconstructed oil and natural gas affected facilities as defined under the rule. None of the facilities in the United States are owned or operated by state, local, tribal or the Federal government. All facilities are privately owned for-profit businesses. The requirements in this action result in industry recording keeping and reporting burden associated with review of the requirements for all affected entities, gathering relevant information, performing initial performance tests and repeat performance tests if necessary, writing and submitting the notifications and reports, developing systems for the purpose of processing and maintaining information, and train personnel to be

able to respond to the collection of information.

The estimated average annual burden (averaged over the first 3 years after the effective date of the standards) for the recordkeeping and reporting requirements in subpart OOOOa for the 2,554 owners and operators that are subject to the rule is 98,438 labor hours, with an annual average cost of \$3,361,074. The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 20 hours per response. Respondents must monitor all specified criteria at each affected facility and maintain these records for 5 years. Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.3(b).

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for the EPA's regulations in 40 CFR are listed in 40 CFR part 9.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

Pursuant to sections 603 and 609(b) of the RFA, the EPA prepared an initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA) for the proposed rule and convened a Small Business Advocacy Review (SBAR) Panel to obtain advice and recommendations from small entity representatives that potentially would

be subject to the rule's requirements. Summaries of the IRFA and Panel recommendations are presented in the proposed rule at 80 FR 56593.

As required by section 604 of the RFA, the EPA prepared a final regulatory flexibility analysis (FRFA) for this action. The FRFA addresses the issues raised by public comments on the IRFA for the proposed rule. The complete FRFA is available for review in the RIA in the public docket and is summarized here.

1. Statutory Authority

The legal authority for this rule stems from section 111 of the CAA, which requires the EPA to issue "standards of performance" for new sources in the list of categories of stationary sources that cause or contribute significantly to air pollution and which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. See section III.A of this preamble for more information.

2. Significant Issues Raised and Agency Responses

The EPA received comments on the proposed standards related to the potential impacts on small entities and requests for comments that were included based on the SBAR Panel Recommendations. See sections VI and VIII of this preamble and the RTC Document in Docket ID EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505 for more detailed responses.

Low production wells: Several commenters supported the proposed exemption of low production well sites from the fugitive monitoring requirements. Commenters noted that marginal wells generate relatively low revenue and these wells are often drilled and operated by small companies.

Response: While these commenters did provide support for the proposed low production well exemption, other commenters indicated that low production well sites have the potential to emit substantial amounts of fugitive emissions, and that a significant number of wells would be excluded from fugitive emissions monitoring based on this exemption. We did not receive data showing that low production well sites have lower emissions than non-low production well sites. In fact, the data that were provided indicated that the potential emissions from these well sites could be as significant as the emissions from non-low production well sites since the type of equipment and the well pressures are more than likely the same. In discussions with stakeholders, they indicated that well site fugitive emissions are not based on production, but rather on the number of pieces of

equipment and components. Therefore, we believe that the emissions from low production and non-low production well sites are comparable and we did not finalize the proposed exclusion of low production well sites from fugitive emissions monitoring.

REC costs: Commenters stated that small operators have higher well completion costs, and typically conduct completions less frequently. Generally, small operators lack the purchasing power to get the discounted prices service companies offer to larger operators. However, small entity commenters did not provide specific cost information.

Response: The BSER analysis is based on the averages of nationwide data. It is possible for a small operator to have higher than the nationwide average completion costs, however, the daily completion cost provided by the commenters is not significantly different than the EPA's estimate. Therefore, we do not believe that the cost of RECs disfavor small businesses.

Phase-in period for RECs: Commenters stated that the EPA should create a compliance phase-in period of at least 6 months for the REC requirements, to accommodate small operators. Commenters stated that REC equipment is in short supply, and this will drive up REC costs. Commenters stated that small entities lack the purchasing power of larger operators, which makes it difficult to obtain the needed equipment before the compliance period begins.

Response: We agree that compliance with the REC requirements in the final rule could be burdensome for some in the near term due to the unavailability of REC equipment. As discussed in section VI of the preamble, the final rule provides a phase-in approach that would allow a quick build-up of the REC supplies in the near term.

Alternatives to OGI technology: Several commenters indicated that the EPA should allow alternatives to OGI technology as the cost is excessive for small operators.

Response: In the final rule, the EPA is allowing Method 21 with a repair threshold of 500 ppm as an alternative to OGI. We believe this alternative will alleviate some of the burden on small entities.

Basing monitoring frequency on the percentage of leaking components: Commenters indicated that using a percentage of components, rather than a set number of components, to determine the frequency of surveys is also unfair to small entities since a small site will have fewer fugitive emission components than a larger site.

Commenters stated that smaller entities are much more likely to operate these smaller sites, and thus are more likely to have higher frequency survey requirements under the percentage-based system.

Response: The EPA agrees that imposing a performance based monitoring schedule would require operators to develop a program that would require extensive administration to ensure compliance. We believe that the potential for a performance-based approach to encourage greater compliance is outweighed in this case by these additional burdens and the complexity it would add. Therefore, the EPA is finalizing a fixed monitoring frequency instead of performance based monitoring.

Timing of initial fugitive monitoring periods: Commenters stated that the requirement to conduct surveys for affected facilities using OGI technology within 30 days of the well completion or within 30 days of modification is overly restrictive. Additionally, commenters stated that small operators may not be able to find vendors available to survey a small number of wells within the required timeframe. One commenter stated that contractors will be in high demand and may give scheduling preference to larger clients versus small business entities.

Response: The EPA considered these and other comments and concluded that the proposed time of 30 days within a well completion or modification is not enough time to complete the necessary preparations for the initial monitoring survey. In addition, other commenters pointed out that first date of production should be the trigger, rather than the date of well completion. Therefore, for the collection of fugitive emissions components at a new or modified well site, we are finalizing that the initial monitoring survey must take place by June 3, 2017 or within 60 days of the startup of production, whichever is later. We believe this extended timeframe for compliance will alleviate some of the burden on smaller operators.

Third party compliance: Commenters believe that requiring third party compliance audits will be a significant burden on small entities. One commenter said that a third-party audit requirement will dramatically increase the costs of the program and have a negative competitive impact on smaller, less funded operators.

Response: While the EPA continues to believe that independent third party verification can furnish more, and sometimes better, data about regulatory compliance, we have explored

alternatives to the independent third party verification. Specifically, the “qualified professional engineer” model was assessed to focus on the element of engineering design. The final rule requires a professional engineer certification of technical infeasibility of connecting a pneumatic pump to an existing control device, and a professional engineer design of closed vent systems. These certifications will ensure that the owner or operator has effectively assessed appropriate factors before making a claim of infeasibility and that the closed vent system is properly designed to verify that all emissions from the unit being controlled in fact reach the control device and allow for proper control. We believe this simplified approach will reduce the burden imposed on all affected facilities, including those owned by small businesses.

3. Affected Small Entities

To identify potentially affected entities under the proposed NSPS, the EPA combined information from industry databases to identify firms drilling and completing wells in 2012, as well as identified their oil and natural gas production levels for that year.

The analysis indicates about 2,031 small entities may be subject to the requirements for hydraulically fractured and re-fractured oil well completions and fugitive emissions requirements at well sites.

4. Reporting, Recordkeeping and Other Compliance Requirements

The information to be collected for the NSPS is based on notification, performance tests, recordkeeping and reporting requirements which will be mandatory for all operators subject to the final standards. The estimated average annual burden (averaged over the first 3 years after the effective date of the standards) for the recordkeeping and reporting requirements in subpart OOOOa for the 2,554 owners and operators that are subject to the rule is 98,438 labor hours, with an annual average cost of \$3,361,074. The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 20 hours per response. Respondents must monitor all specified criteria at each affected facility and maintain these records for 5 years. Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.3(b).

The EPA summarized the potential regulatory cost impacts of the proposed rule and alternatives in Section 3 of the RIA. The analysis in the FRFA drew upon the same analysis and assumptions as the analyses presented

in the RIA. The FRFA analysis is presented in its entirety in Section 6.3 of the RIA.

The EPA based the analysis in the FRFA on impacts estimates for the proposed requirements for hydraulically fractured and re-fractured oil well completions and well site fugitive emissions, which represent about 98 percent of the estimated compliance costs of the NSPS in 2020 and 2025. Not incorporating impacts from other provisions in this analysis underestimates impacts, but the EPA believes that detailed analysis of the two provisions impacts on small entities is illustrative of impacts on small entities from the rule in its entirety. The cost of compliance for small firms is estimated to be about \$110 million in 2020 and \$190 million in 2025.

We also estimate cost-to-sales ratios for small firms. For some firms, we estimate their 2012 sales levels by multiplying their 2012 oil and natural gas production levels reported in an industry database by the assumed oil and natural gas prices at the wellhead. For natural gas, we assumed the \$4/Mcf for natural gas. For oil prices, we estimated revenues using two alternative prices, \$70/bbl and \$50/bbl. In the results, we call the case using \$70/bbl the “primary scenario” and the case using the \$50/bbl the “low oil price scenario”. For projected 2020 and 2025 potentially affected activities, we allocated compliance costs across entities based upon the costs estimated in the TSD and used in the RIA.

The percent of small firms with cost-to-sales ratios greater than 1 percent and greater than 3-percent increase from 2020 to 2025 as affected sources accumulate under the NSPS. Cost-to-sales ratios exceeding 1 percent and 3 percent. Also, cost-to-sales ratios fall as the oil price falls from the main scenario to the low oil price scenario.

The analysis above is subject to a number of caveats and limitations. These are discussed in detail in the IRFA, as well as in Section 3 of the RIA.

5. Steps Taken To Minimize Impact on Small Entities

The EPA considered three major options for this rule. The finalized option includes reduced emission completion (REC) and completion combustion requirements for a subset of newly completed oil wells that are hydraulically fractured or refractured and requirements that fugitive emissions survey and repair programs be performed semiannually at affected well sites and quarterly at affected transmission and storage or compressor stations. One option examined includes

an exemption from low production well site fugitive requirements, but was rejected because we believe that low production well sites have similar equipment and components as sites that are not categorized as low production. Without data supporting a difference in emissions between low production well sites and not low production well sites, the EPA believes exempting low production well sites would reduce the effectiveness of the rule, especially considering the high proportion of small firms in the industry. The more stringent option required quarterly monitoring for all sites under the fugitive emissions programs, which leads to greater emissions reductions, however it also increases net costs and results in lower net benefits compared to the finalized option.

Significant comments with regard to the small business analysis received by the EPA include the topics of low production well exemptions, well completion costs, compliance phase-in periods, alternatives to OGI technology, monitoring frequency and timing, and third party compliance.

Though all comments were seriously considered, the EPA is unable to incorporate all suggestions without compromising the effectiveness of the final regulation. Changes to the rule from proposal that may benefit small entities due to comments received include allowing both OGI and Method 21 as acceptable monitoring technology, replacing a performance based monitoring schedule with a fixed frequency, lengthening the time of initial fugitive monitoring from within 30 days to the later of either June 3, 2017 or within 60 days of the startup of production, whichever is later, and simplifying the third party verification of technical infeasibility requirements. Though these are not monetized, we believe the flexibility and simplifications these changes have added to the rule result in a reduced burden on small entities.

In addition, the EPA is preparing a Small Entity Compliance Guide to help small entities comply with this rule. The guide will be available on the World Wide Web 60 days after publication of the final rule at <https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/oilandgas/implement.html>.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA)

This action contains a federal mandate under UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538, that may result in expenditures of \$100 million or more for state, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or the private sector in any one year. More

specifically, this action contains a federal private sector mandate that may result in the expenditures of \$100 million or more for the private sector in any one year. Accordingly, the EPA has prepared the following written statement in compliance with sections 202 and 205 of UMRA. This rule is not subject to the requirements of section 203 of UMRA because it contains no regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments.

1. Statutory Authority

The legal authority for this rule stems from section 111 of the CAA, which requires the EPA to issue “standards of performance” for new sources in the list of categories of stationary sources that cause or contribute significantly to air pollution and which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. See section III.A of this preamble for more information.

2. Costs and Benefits

As discussed in sections II.A.3, IX.C and IX.E of this preamble, this rule results in a net benefit. Including the resources from recovered natural gas that would otherwise be vented, the quantified net benefits of the regulation are estimated to be \$35 million in 2020 and \$170 million in 2025 in 2012 dollars using a 3 percent discount rate for climate benefits. The estimated total annualized engineering costs of the final rule, accounting for the recovered natural gas are \$320 million in 2020 and \$530 million in 2025. The EPA estimates the final rule will lead to monetized benefits of about \$360 million in 2020 and \$690 million in 2025, at the model average at a 3 percent discount rate. More in depth information on costs and benefits, including non-monetized or quantified benefits, of the final regulation can be found in the RIA.

3. Effects on National Economy

As seen in section IX.D of this preamble, the EPA used the National Energy Modeling System (NEMS) to estimate the impacts of the final rule on the United States energy system. Estimates show slight declines in natural gas and crude oil drilling, and natural gas production over the 2020 to 2025 period under the rule, while wellhead natural gas prices are estimated to increase slightly over the 2020 to 2025 period under the rule. Crude oil production and crude oil wellhead prices are not estimated to change appreciably over the 2020 to 2025 period under the rule. Net imports of natural gas are estimated to increase

slightly over the 2020 to 2025 period, while net imports of crude oil are not estimated to change appreciably.

Also discussed in section IX.D, the up-front labor requirement to comply with the proposed NSPS is estimated at about 270 FTEs in 2020 and 2025. The annual labor requirement to comply with final NSPS is estimated at about 1,100 FTEs in 2020 and 1,800 FTEs in 2025. For more in depth information on both the estimated energy markets impacts and estimated job creation and employment impacts of this rule, see the RIA.

4. Regulatory Alternatives

Alternate regulatory options examined in the RIA include decreasing fugitive survey requirements to annual at well sites and semiannual at all other affected locations (termed Option 1 in the RIA), and increasing fugitive survey frequency at all wells to quarterly (termed Option 3 in the RIA). The finalized regulation results in estimated net benefits of \$35 million in 2020 and \$170 million in 2025. Reducing fugitive survey requirements, Option 1, leads to lower costs as well as lower benefits and results in estimated net benefits of \$54 million in 2020 and \$180 million in 2025. Increasing the survey frequency leads to an increase in capital costs with a non-commensurate increase in monetized benefits, resulting in estimated net benefits of –\$75 million in 2020, and –\$38 million in 2025. Both of these regulatory options result in lower net benefits in 2025 compared to the finalized regulation. For a more in depth analysis of these options, see the RIA.

E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

This action does not have federalism implications. It will not have substantial direct effects on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. These final rules primarily affect private industry and would not impose significant economic costs on state or local governments.

F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

Subject to Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249; November 9, 2000), the EPA may not issue a regulation that has tribal implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by tribal governments, or

the EPA consults with tribal officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation and develops a tribal summary impact statement.

The EPA has concluded that this action has tribal implications. However, it will neither impose substantial direct compliance costs on federally recognized tribal governments, nor preempt tribal law, thus Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule. The EPA believes that the affected facilities impacted by this rulemaking on tribal lands are owned by private entities, and tribes will not be directly impacted by the compliance costs associated with this rulemaking. There would only be tribal implications associated with this rulemaking in the case where a unit is owned by a tribal government or a tribal government is given delegated authority to enforce the rulemaking.

The EPA offered consultation with tribal officials early in the regulation development process to permit them an opportunity to have meaningful and timely input. Consultation letters were sent to the tribal leaders of 567 federally recognized tribes, provided information regarding this rule, and offered consultation. The EPA did not receive any requests for tribal consultation on this rulemaking. In addition, the EPA has conducted meaningful involvement with tribal stakeholders throughout the rulemaking process and provided an update on the Methane Strategy on the January 29, 2015 and September 10, 2015 National Tribal Air Association and EPA Air Policy monthly calls. Consistent with previous actions affecting the oil and natural gas sector, there is significant tribal interest because of the growth of the oil and natural gas production in Indian country. The EPA specifically solicited comment on the proposed action from tribal officials and considered comments received from tribal officials in the development of this final action. Please see the RTC document in the public docket.

G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

This action is subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) because it is an economically significant regulatory action as defined by Executive Order 12866, and the EPA believes that the environmental health or safety risk addressed by this action has a disproportionate effect on children. Accordingly, the Agency has evaluated the environmental health and welfare effects of climate change on children.

Greenhouse gases including methane contribute to climate change and are emitted in significant quantities by the oil and gas sector. The EPA believes that the GHG emission reductions resulting from implementation of these final rules will further improve children's health.

The assessment literature cited in the EPA's 2009 Endangerment Finding concluded that certain populations and life stages, including children, the elderly, and the poor, are most vulnerable to climate-related health effects. The assessment literature since 2009 strengthens these conclusions by providing more detailed findings regarding these groups' vulnerabilities and the projected impacts they may experience.

These assessments describe how children's unique physiological and developmental factors contribute to making them particularly vulnerable to climate change. Impacts to children are expected from heat waves, air pollution, infectious and waterborne illnesses, and mental health effects resulting from extreme weather events. In addition, children are among those especially susceptible to most allergic diseases, as well as health effects associated with heat waves, storms, and floods. Additional health concerns may arise in low income households, especially those with children, if climate change reduces food availability and increases prices, leading to food insecurity within households.

More detailed information on the impacts of climate change to human health and welfare is provided in section IV.B of this preamble.

H. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) provides that agencies will prepare and submit to the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, a Statement of Energy Effects for certain actions identified as "significant energy actions." Section 4(b) of Executive Order 13211 defines "significant energy actions" as any action by an agency (normally published in the **Federal Register**) that promulgates or is expected to lead to the promulgation of a final rule or regulation, including notices of inquiry, advance notices of proposed rulemaking, and notices of proposed rulemaking: (1)(i) That is a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866 or any successor order, and (ii) is likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply,

distribution, or use of energy; or (2) that is designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as a significant energy action.

This action is not a "significant energy action" as defined in Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001), because it is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The basis for these determinations follows.

The EPA used the NEMS to estimate the impacts of the final rule on the United States energy system. The NEMS is a publically-available model of the United States energy economy developed and maintained by the Energy Information Administration of the DOE and is used to produce the Annual Energy Outlook, a reference publication that provides detailed forecasts of the United States energy economy.

The EPA estimates that natural gas and crude oil drilling levels decline slightly over the 2020 to 2025 period under the final NSPS (by about 0.17 percent for natural gas wells and 0.02 percent for crude oil wells). Crude oil production does not vary appreciably under the rule, while natural gas production declines slightly over the 2020 to 2025 period (about 0.03 percent). Crude oil wellhead prices for onshore lower 48 production are not estimated to change appreciably over the 2020 to 2025 period. However, wellhead natural gas prices for onshore lower 48 production are estimated to increase slightly over the 2020 to 2025 period (about 0.20 percent). Net imports of natural gas are estimated to increase slightly in 2020 (by about 0.12 percent) and in 2025 (by about 0.11 percent). Crude oil net imports are not estimated to change in 2020, but decrease slightly in 2025 (by about 0.02 percent). Net imports of crude oil do not change appreciably over the 2020 to 2025 period.

Additionally, the NSPS establishes several performance standards that give regulated entities flexibility in determining how to best comply with the regulation. In an industry that is geographically and economically heterogeneous, this flexibility is an important factor in reducing regulatory burden. For more information on the estimated energy effects of this final rule, please see the Regulatory Impact Analysis, which is in the docket for this rule.

I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) and 1 CFR Part 51

This action involves technical standards. Therefore, the EPA

conducted searches for the Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New and Modified Sources through the Enhanced National Standards Systems Network (NSSN) Database managed by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). Searches were conducted for EPA Methods 1, 1A, 2, 2A, 2C, 2D, 3A, 3B, 3C, 4, 6, 10, 15, 16, 16A, 18, 21, 22, and 25A of 40 CFR part 60 Appendix A. No applicable voluntary consensus standards were identified for EPA Methods 1A, 2A, 2D, 21, and 22 and none were brought to its attention in comments. All potential standards were reviewed to determine the practicality of the voluntary consensus standards (VCS) for this rule.

Two VCS were identified as an acceptable alternative to EPA test methods for the purpose of this rule. First, ANSI/ASME PTC 19-10-1981, Flue and Exhaust Gas Analyses (Part 10) was identified to be used in lieu of EPA Methods 3B, 6, 6A, 6B, 15A and 16A manual portions only and not the instrumental portion. This standard includes manual and instructional methods of analysis for carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, hydrogen sulfide, nitrogen oxides, oxygen, and sulfur dioxide. Second, ASTM D6420-99 (2010), "Test Method for Determination of Gaseous Organic Compounds by Direct Interface Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry" is an acceptable alternative to EPA Method 18 with the following caveats, only use when the target compounds are all known and the target compounds are all listed in ASTM D6420 as measurable. ASTM D6420 should never be specified as a total VOC Method. (ASTM D6420-99 (2010) is not incorporated by reference in 40 CFR part 60.) The search identified 19 VCS that were potentially applicable for this rule in lieu of EPA reference methods. However, these have been determined to not be practical due to lack of equivalency, documentation, validation of data and other important technical and policy considerations. For additional information, please see the April 6, 2016, memo titled, "Voluntary Consensus Standard Results for Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New and Modified Sources" in the public docket.

In this rule, the EPA is finalizing regulatory text for 40 CFR part 60, subpart OOOOa that includes incorporation by reference in accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5 as discussed below. Ten standards are incorporated by reference.

- ASTM D86-96, Distillation of Petroleum Products (Approved April 10, 1996) covers the distillation of natural gasolines, motor gasolines, aviation

gasolines, aviation turbine fuels, special boiling point spirits, naphthas, white spirit, kerosines, gas oils, distillate fuel oils, and similar petroleum products, utilizing either manual or automated equipment.

- ASTM D1945–03 (Reapproved 2010), Standard Test Method for Analysis of Natural Gas by Gas Chromatography covers the determination of the chemical composition of natural gases and similar gaseous mixtures within a certain range of composition. This test method may be abbreviated for the analysis of lean natural gases containing negligible amounts of hexanes and higher hydrocarbons, or for the determination of one or more components.

- ASTM D3588–98 (Reapproved 2003), Standard Practice for Calculating Heat Value, Compressibility Factor, and Relative Density of Gaseous Fuel covers procedures for calculating heating value, relative density, and compressibility factor at base conditions for natural gas mixtures from compositional analysis. It applies to all common types of utility gaseous fuels.

- ASTM D4891–89 (Reapproved 2006), Standard Test Method for Heating Value of Gases in Natural Gas Range by Stoichiometric Combustion covers the determination of the heating value of natural gases and similar gaseous mixtures within a certain range of composition.

- ASTM D6522–00 (Reapproved December 2005), Standard Test Method for Determination of Nitrogen Oxides, Carbon Monoxide, and Oxygen Concentrations in Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired Reciprocating Engines, Combustion Turbines, Boilers, and Process Heaters Using Portable Analyzers covers the determination of nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, and oxygen concentrations in controlled and uncontrolled emissions from natural gas-fired reciprocating engines, combustion turbines, boilers, and process heaters.

- ASTM E168–92, General Techniques of Infrared Quantitative Analysis covers the techniques most often used in infrared quantitative analysis. Practices associated with the collection and analysis of data on a computer are included as well as practices that do not use a computer.

- ASTM E169–93, General Techniques of Ultraviolet Quantitative Analysis (Approved May 15, 1993) provide general information on the techniques most often used in ultraviolet and visible quantitative analysis. The purpose is to render unnecessary the repetition of these

descriptions of techniques in individual methods for quantitative analysis.

- ASTM E260–96, General Gas Chromatography Procedures (Approved April 10, 1996) is a general guide to the application of gas chromatography with packed columns for the separation and analysis of vaporizable or gaseous organic and inorganic mixtures and as a reference for the writing and reporting of gas chromatography methods.

- ASME/ANSI PTC 19.10–1981, Flue and Exhaust Gas Analyses [Part 10, Instruments and Apparatus] (Issued August 31, 1981) covers measuring the oxygen or carbon dioxide content of the exhaust gas.

- EPA–600/R–12/531, EPA Traceability Protocol for Assay and Certification of Gaseous Calibration Standards (Issued May 2012) is mandatory for certifying the calibration gases being used for the calibration and audit of ambient air quality analyzers and continuous emission monitors that are required by numerous parts of the CFR.

The EPA determined that the ASTM and ASME/ANSI standards, notwithstanding the age of the standards, are reasonably available because it they are available for purchase from the following addresses: American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), 100 Barr Harbor Drive, Post Office Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428–2959; or ProQuest, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), Three Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016–5990. The EPA determined that the EPA standard is reasonably available because it is publically available through the EPA's Web site: <http://nepis.epa.gov/Adobe/PDF/P100EKJR.pdf>.

J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

The EPA believes the human health or environmental risk addressed by this action will not have potential disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority, low-income, or indigenous populations. The EPA has determined this because the rulemaking increases the level of environmental protection for all affected populations without having any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on any population, including any minority, low-income, or indigenous populations. The EPA has provided meaningful participation opportunities for minority, low-income, indigenous

populations and tribes during the rulemaking process by conducting community calls and webinars. Documentation of these activities can be found in the public docket for this rulemaking.

K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

This action is subject to the CRA, and the EPA will submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. This action is a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 60

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping.

Dated: May 12, 2016.

Gina McCarthy,
Administrator.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, title 40, chapter I of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 60—STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 60 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4701, et seq.

■ 2. Section 60.17 is amended by:

■ a. Revising paragraph (g)(14).

■ b. Revising paragraphs (h)(19), (75), (137), (167), (184), (193), (196), and (199).

■ c. Adding paragraph (j)(2).

The revisions and addition read as follows:

§ 60.17 Incorporations by reference.

* * * * *

(g) * * *

(14) ASME/ANSI PTC 19.10–1981, Flue and Exhaust Gas Analyses [Part 10, Instruments and Apparatus], (Issued August 31, 1981), IBR approved for §§ 60.56c(b), 60.63(f), 60.106(e), 60.104a(d), (h), (i), and (j), 60.105a(d), (f), and (g), § 60.106a(a), § 60.107a(a), (c), and (d), tables 1 and 3 to subpart EEEE, tables 2 and 4 to subpart FFFF, table 2 to subpart JJJJ, § 60.285a(f), §§ 60.4415(a), 60.2145(s) and (t), 60.2710(s), (t), and (w), 60.2730(q), 60.4900(b), 60.5220(b), tables 1 and 2 to subpart LLLL, tables 2 and 3 to subpart MMMM, 60.5406(c), 60.5406a(c), 60.5407a(g), 60.5413(b), 60.5413a(b) and 60.5413a(d).

* * * * *

(h) * * *

(19) ASTM D86-96, Distillation of Petroleum Products, (Approved April 10, 1996), IBR approved for §§ 60.562-2(d), 60.593(d), 60.593a(d), 60.633(h), 60.5401(f), 60.5401a(f).

* * * * *

(75) ASTM D1945-03 (Reapproved 2010), Standard Method for Analysis of Natural Gas by Gas Chromatography, (Approved January 1, 2010), IBR approved for §§ 60.107a(d), 60.5413(d), 60.5413a(d).

* * * * *

(137) ASTM D3588-98 (Reapproved 2003), Standard Practice for Calculating Heat Value, Compressibility Factor, and Relative Density of Gaseous Fuels, (Approved May 10, 2003), IBR approved for §§ 60.107a(d), 60.5413(d), and 60.5413a(d).

* * * * *

(167) ASTM D4891-89 (Reapproved 2006) Standard Test Method for Heating Value of Gases in Natural Gas Range by Stoichiometric Combustion, (Approved June 1, 2006), IBR approved for §§ 60.107a(d), 60.5413(d), and 60.5413a(d).

* * * * *

(184) ASTM D6522-00 (Reapproved 2005), Standard Test Method for Determination of Nitrogen Oxides, Carbon Monoxide, and Oxygen Concentrations in Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired Reciprocating Engines, Combustion Turbines, Boilers, and Process Heaters Using Portable Analyzers, (Approved October 1, 2005), IBR approved for table 2 to subpart JJJJ, §§ 60.5413(b) and (d), and 60.5413a(b).

* * * * *

(193) ASTM E168-92, General Techniques of Infrared Quantitative Analysis, IBR approved for §§ 60.485a(d), 60.593(b), 60.593a(b), 60.632(f), 60.5400, 60.5400a(f).

* * * * *

(196) ASTM E169-93, General Techniques of Ultraviolet Quantitative Analysis, (Approved May 15, 1993), IBR approved for §§ 60.485a(d), 60.593(b), 60.593a(b), 60.632(f), 60.5400(f), and 60.5400a(f).

* * * * *

(199) ASTM E260-96, General Gas Chromatography Procedures, (Approved April 10, 1996), IBR approved for §§ 60.485a(d), 60.593(b), 60.593a(b), 60.632(f), 60.5400(f), 60.5400a(f) 60.5406(b), and 60.5406a(b)(3).

* * * * *

(j) * * *

(2) EPA-600/R-12/531, EPA Traceability Protocol for Assay and Certification of Gaseous Calibration

Standards, May 2012, IBR approved for §§ 60.5413(d) and 60.5413a(d).

* * * * *

■ 3. Part 60 is amended by revising the heading for Subpart OOOO to read as follows:

Subpart OOOO—Standards of Performance for Crude Oil and Natural Gas Production, Transmission and Distribution for which Construction, Modification or Reconstruction Commenced after August 23, 2011, and on or before September 18, 2015

■ 4. Section 60.5360 is revised to read as follows:

§ 60.5360 What is the purpose of this subpart?

This subpart establishes emission standards and compliance schedules for the control of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions from affected facilities that commence construction, modification or reconstruction after August 23, 2011, and on or before September 18, 2015.

- 5. Section 60.5365 is amended by:
 - a. Revising the introductory text.
 - b. Revising paragraph (e)(4).
 - c. Adding paragraph (e)(5).
 - d. Revising paragraph (h)(4).

The revisions and addition read as follows:

§ 60.5365 Am I subject to this subpart?

You are subject to the applicable provisions of this subpart if you are the owner or operator of one or more of the onshore affected facilities listed in paragraphs (a) through (g) of this section for which you commence construction, modification or reconstruction after August 23, 2011, and on or before September 18, 2015.

* * * * *

(e) * * *
(4) The following requirements apply immediately upon startup, startup of production, or return to service. A storage vessel affected facility that is reconnected to the original source of liquids is a storage vessel affected facility subject to the same requirements that applied before being removed from service. Any storage vessel that is used to replace any storage vessel affected facility is subject to the same requirements that apply to the storage vessel affected facility being replaced.
(5) A storage vessel with a capacity greater than 100,000 gallons used to recycle water that has been passed through two stage separation is not a storage vessel affected facility.

(h) * * *

(4) A gas well facility initially constructed after August 23, 2011, and

on or before September 18, 2015 is considered an affected facility regardless of this provision.

■ 6. Section 60.5370 is amended by revising paragraph (b) and adding paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 60.5370 When must I comply with this subpart?

* * * * *

(b) At all times, including periods of startup, shutdown, and malfunction, owners and operators shall maintain and operate any affected facility including associated air pollution control equipment in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions. Determination of whether acceptable operating and maintenance procedures are being used will be based on information available to the Administrator which may include but is not limited to, monitoring results, opacity observations, review of operating and maintenance procedures, and inspection of the source.

* * * * *

(d) You are deemed to be in compliance with this subpart if you are in compliance with all applicable provisions of subpart OOOOa of this part.

§ 60.5410 [Amended]

■ 7. Section 60.5410 is amended by removing and reserving paragraph (b)(6).

■ 8. Section 60.5411 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(3)(i)(A) and (c)(3)(i)(A) to read as follows:

§ 60.5411 What additional requirements must I meet to determine initial compliance for my covers and closed vent systems routing materials from storage vessels and centrifugal compressor wet seal degassing systems?

* * * * *

- (a) * * *
- (3) * * *
- (i) * * *

(A) You must properly install, calibrate, maintain, and operate a flow indicator at the inlet to the bypass device that could divert the stream away from the control device or process to the atmosphere that is capable of taking periodic readings as specified in § 60.5416(a)(4) and either sounds an alarm, or initiates notification via remote alarm to the nearest field office, when the bypass device is open such that the stream is being, or could be, diverted away from the control device or process to the atmosphere. You must maintain records of each time the alarm is activated according to § 60.5420(c)(8).

* * * * *

- (c) * * *
- (3) * * *
- (i) * * *

(A) You must properly install, calibrate, maintain, and operate a flow indicator at the inlet to the bypass device that could divert the stream away from the control device or process to the atmosphere and that either sounds an alarm, or initiates notification via remote alarm to the nearest field office, when the bypass device is open such that the stream is being, or could be, diverted away from the control device or process to the atmosphere. You must maintain records of each time the alarm is activated according to § 60.5420(c)(8).

* * * * *

- 9. Section 60.5412 is amended by:
 - a. Revising paragraphs (a)(1)(ii) and (d)(1) introductory text; and
 - b. Adding paragraph (d)(1)(iv).
 The revisions and addition read as follows:

§ 60.5412 What additional requirements must I meet for determining initial compliance with control devices used to comply with the emission standards for my storage vessel or centrifugal compressor affected facility?

* * * * *

- (a) * * *
- (1) * * *

(ii) You must reduce the concentration of TOC in the exhaust gases at the outlet to the device to a level equal to or less than 275 parts per million by volume as propane on a wet basis corrected to 3 percent oxygen as determined in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413.

* * * * *

- (d) * * *

(1) Each enclosed combustion device (e.g., thermal vapor incinerator, catalytic vapor incinerator, boiler, or process heater) must be designed to reduce the mass content of VOC emissions by 95.0 percent or greater. Each flare must be designed and operated in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413(a)(1). You must follow the requirements in paragraphs (d)(1)(i) through (iv) of this section.

* * * * *

(iv) Each enclosed combustion control device (e.g., thermal vapor incinerator, catalytic vapor incinerator, boiler, or process heater) must be designed and operated in accordance with one of the performance requirements specified in paragraphs (d)(1)(iv)(A) through (D) of this section.

(A) You must reduce the mass content of VOC in the gases vented to the device by 95.0 percent by weight or greater as determined in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413.

(B) You must reduce the concentration of TOC in the exhaust gases at the outlet to the device to a level equal to or less than 275 parts per million by volume as propane on a wet basis corrected to 3 percent oxygen as determined in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413.

(C) You must operate at a minimum temperature of 760 °Celsius, provided the control device has demonstrated, during the performance test conducted under § 60.5413, that combustion zone temperature is an indicator of destruction efficiency.

(D) If a boiler or process heater is used as the control device, then you must introduce the vent stream into the flame zone of the boiler or process heater.

* * * * *

- 10. Section 60.5413 is amended by revising paragraphs (d)(9)(iv) and (e)(3) to read as follows:

§ 60.5413 What are the performance testing procedures for control devices used to demonstrate compliance at my storage vessel or centrifugal compressor affected facility?

* * * * *

- (d) * * *
- (9) * * *

(iv) Calibration gases must be propane in air and be certified through EPA Protocol 1—“EPA Traceability Protocol for Assay and Certification of Gaseous Calibration Standards,” (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17).

* * * * *

- (e) * * *

(3) Devices must be operated with no visible emissions, except for periods not to exceed a total of 1 minute during any 15-minute period. A visible emissions test conducted according to section 11 of EPA Method 22, 40 CFR part 60, appendix A, must be performed at least once every calendar month, separated by at least 15 days between each test. The observation period shall be 15 minutes.

* * * * *

- 11. Section 60.5415 is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(2)(vii)(B) and (c)(4) to read as follows:

§ 60.5415 How do I demonstrate continuous compliance with the standards for my gas well affected facility, my centrifugal compressor affected facility, my stationary reciprocating compressor affected facility, my pneumatic controller affected facility, my storage vessel affected facility, and my affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?

* * * * *

- (b) * * *
- (2) * * *
- (vii) * * *

(B) Devices must be operated with no visible emissions, except for periods not to exceed a total of 1 minute during any 15-minute period. A visible emissions test conducted according to section 11 of Method 22, 40 CFR part 60, appendix A, must be performed at least once every calendar month, separated by at least 15 days between each test. The observation period shall be 15 minutes.

* * * * *

- (c) * * *

(4) You must operate the rod packing emissions collection system under negative pressure and continuously comply with the closed vent requirements in § 60.5416(a) and (b).

* * * * *

- 12. Section 60.5416 is amended by revising paragraph (c)(3)(i) to read as follows:

§ 60.5416 What are the initial and continuous cover and closed vent system inspection and monitoring requirements for my storage vessel and centrifugal compressor affected facilities?

* * * * *

- (c) * * *
- (3) * * *

(i) You must properly install, calibrate and maintain a flow indicator at the inlet to the bypass device that could divert the stream away from the control device or process to the atmosphere. Set the flow indicator to trigger an audible alarm, or initiate notification via remote alarm to the nearest field office, when the bypass device is open such that the stream is being, or could be, diverted away from the control device or process to the atmosphere. You must maintain records of each time the alarm is activated according to § 60.5420(c)(8).

* * * * *

- 13. Section 60.5420 is amended by:
 - a. Revising paragraph (c) introductory text; and
 - b. Revising paragraph (c)(6); and
 - c. Adding paragraph (c)(14).
 The revision and addition reads as follows:

§ 60.5420 What are my notification, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements?

* * * * *

(c) *Recordkeeping requirements.* You must maintain the records identified as specified in § 60.7(f) and in paragraphs (c)(1) through (14) of this section. All records required by this subpart must be maintained either onsite or at the nearest local field office for at least 5 years.

* * * * *

(6) Records of each closed vent system inspection required under

§ 60.5416(a)(1) and (2) for centrifugal or reciprocating compressors or § 60.5416(c)(1) for storage vessels.

(14) A log of records as specified in §§ 60.5412(d)(1)(iii) and 60.5413(e)(4) for all inspection, repair and maintenance activities for each control device failing the visible emissions test.

■ 14. Section 60.5430 is amended by:

■ a. Adding, in alphabetical order, a definition for the term “capital expenditure;” and

■ b. Revising the definition for “group 2 storage vessel.”

■ The addition and revision read as follows:

§ 60.5430 What definitions apply to this subpart?

Capital expenditure means, in addition to the definition in 40 CFR 60.2, an expenditure for a physical or operational change to an existing facility that:

(1) Exceeds P, the product of the facility’s replacement cost, R, and an adjusted annual asset guideline repair allowance, A, as reflected by the following equation: $P = R \times A$, where

(i) The adjusted annual asset guideline repair allowance, A, is the product of the percent of the replacement cost, Y, and the applicable basic annual asset guideline repair allowance, B, divided by 100 as reflected by the following equation:

$$A = Y \times (B \div 100);$$

(ii) The percent Y is determined from the following equation: $Y = 1.0 - 0.575 \log X$, where X is 2011 minus the year of construction; and

(iii) The applicable basic annual asset guideline repair allowance, B, is 4.5.

(2) [Reserved]

Group 2 storage vessel means a storage vessel, as defined in this section, for which construction, modification or reconstruction has commenced after April 12, 2013, and on or before September 18, 2015.

■ 15. Amend Table 3 to Subpart OOOO by revising entries “§ 60.15” and “§ 60.18” to read as follows:

TABLE 3 TO SUBPART OOOO OF PART 60—APPLICABILITY OF GENERAL PROVISIONS TO SUBPART OOOO

General provisions citation	Subject of citation	Applies to subpart?	Explanation
§ 60.15	Reconstruction	Yes	Except that § 60.15(d) does not apply to gas wells, pneumatic controllers, centrifugal compressors, reciprocating compressors or storage vessels.
§ 60.18	General control device requirements.	Yes	Except that the period of visible emissions shall not exceed a total of 1 minute during any 15-minute period instead of 5 minutes during any 2 consecutive hours as required in § 60.18(c).

■ 16. Add subpart OOOOa, consisting of sections 60.5360a through 60.5499a, to part 60 to read as follows:

Subpart OOOOa—Standards of Performance for Crude Oil and Natural Gas Facilities for which Construction, Modification, or Reconstruction Commenced after September 18, 2015

Sec.

- 60.5360a What is the purpose of this subpart?
- 60.5365a Am I subject to this subpart?
- 60.5370a When must I comply with this subpart?
- 60.5375a What GHG and VOC standards apply to well affected facilities?
- 60.5380a What GHG and VOC standards apply to centrifugal compressor affected facilities?
- 60.5385a What GHG and VOC standards apply to reciprocating compressor affected facilities?
- 60.5390a What GHG and VOC standards apply to pneumatic controller affected facilities?
- 60.5393a What GHG and VOC standards apply to pneumatic pump affected facilities?
- 60.5395a What VOC standards apply to storage vessel affected facilities?
- 60.5397a What fugitive emissions GHG and VOC standards apply to the affected

- facility which is the collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site and the affected facility which is the collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station?
- 60.5398a What are the alternative means of emission limitations for GHG and VOC from well completions, reciprocating compressors, the collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site and the collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station?
- 60.5400a What equipment leak GHG and VOC standards apply to affected facilities at an onshore natural gas processing plant?
- 60.5401a What are the exceptions to the equipment leak GHG and VOC standards for affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?
- 60.5402a What are the alternative means of emission limitations for GHG and VOC equipment leaks from onshore natural gas processing plants?
- 60.5405a What standards apply to sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?
- 60.5406a What test methods and procedures must I use for my sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?
- 60.5407a What are the requirements for monitoring of emissions and operations from my sweetening unit affected

- facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?
- 60.5408a What is an optional procedure for measuring hydrogen sulfide in acid gas—Tutwiler Procedure?
- 60.5410a How do I demonstrate initial compliance with the standards for my well, centrifugal compressor, reciprocating compressor, pneumatic controller, pneumatic pump, storage vessel, collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site, and collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station, and equipment leaks and sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?
- 60.5411a What additional requirements must I meet to determine initial compliance for my covers and closed vent systems routing emissions from centrifugal compressor wet seal fluid degassing systems, reciprocating compressors, pneumatic pump and storage vessels?
- 60.5412a What additional requirements must I meet for determining initial compliance with control devices used to comply with the emission standards for my centrifugal compressor, and storage vessel affected facilities?
- 60.5413a What are the performance testing procedures for control devices used to demonstrate compliance at my

- centrifugal compressor, pneumatic pump and storage vessel affected facilities?
- 60.5415a How do I demonstrate continuous compliance with the standards for my well, centrifugal compressor, reciprocating compressor, pneumatic controller, pneumatic pump, storage vessel, collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site, and collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station affected facilities, and affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?
- 60.5416a What are the initial and continuous cover and closed vent system inspection and monitoring requirements for my centrifugal compressor, reciprocating compressor, pneumatic pump, and storage vessel affected facilities?
- 60.5417a What are the continuous control device monitoring requirements for my centrifugal compressor, pneumatic pump, and storage vessel affected facilities?
- 60.5420a What are my notification, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements?
- 60.5421a What are my additional recordkeeping requirements for my affected facility subject to GHG and VOC requirements for onshore natural gas processing plants?
- 60.5422a What are my additional reporting requirements for my affected facility subject to GHG and VOC requirements for onshore natural gas processing plants?
- 60.5423a What additional recordkeeping and reporting requirements apply to my sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?
- 60.5425a What parts of the General Provisions apply to me?
- 60.5430a What definitions apply to this subpart?
- 60.5432a How do I determine whether a well is a low pressure well using the low pressure well equation?
- 60.5433a—60.5499a [Reserved]
- Table 1 to Subpart OOOOa of Part 60
Required Minimum Initial SO₂ Emission Reduction Efficiency (Zi)
- Table 2 to Subpart OOOOa of Part 60
Required Minimum SO₂ Emission Reduction Efficiency (Zc)
- Table 3 to Subpart OOOOa of Part 60
Applicability of General Provisions to Subpart OOOOa

Subpart OOOOa—Standards of Performance for Crude Oil and Natural Gas Facilities for which Construction, Modification or Reconstruction Commenced After September 18, 2015

§ 60.5360a What is the purpose of this subpart?

(a) This subpart establishes emission standards and compliance schedules for the control of the pollutant greenhouse gases (GHG). The greenhouse gas standard in this subpart is in the form of a limitation on emissions of methane from affected facilities in the crude oil

and natural gas source category that commence construction, modification, or reconstruction after September 18, 2015. This subpart also establishes emission standards and compliance schedules for the control of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions from affected facilities in the crude oil and natural gas source category that commence construction, modification or reconstruction after September 18, 2015. The effective date of the rule is August 2, 2016.

(b) *Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and title V thresholds for Greenhouse Gases.* (1) For the purposes of 40 CFR 51.166(b)(49)(ii), with respect to GHG emissions from affected facilities, the “pollutant that is subject to the standard promulgated under section 111 of the Act” shall be considered to be the pollutant that otherwise is subject to regulation under the Act as defined in 40 CFR 51.166(b)(48) and in any State Implementation Plan (SIP) approved by the EPA that is interpreted to incorporate, or specifically incorporates, § 51.166(b)(48).

(2) For the purposes of 40 CFR 52.21(b)(50)(ii), with respect to GHG emissions from affected facilities, the “pollutant that is subject to the standard promulgated under section 111 of the Act” shall be considered to be the pollutant that otherwise is subject to regulation under the Clean Air Act as defined in 40 CFR 52.21(b)(49).

(3) For the purposes of 40 CFR 70.2, with respect to greenhouse gas emissions from affected facilities, the “pollutant that is subject to any standard promulgated under section 111 of the Act” shall be considered to be the pollutant that otherwise is “subject to regulation” as defined in 40 CFR 70.2.

(4) For the purposes of 40 CFR 71.2, with respect to greenhouse gas emissions from affected facilities, the “pollutant that is subject to any standard promulgated under section 111 of the Act” shall be considered to be the pollutant that otherwise is “subject to regulation” as defined in 40 CFR 71.2.

§ 60.5365a Am I subject to this subpart?

You are subject to the applicable provisions of this subpart if you are the owner or operator of one or more of the onshore affected facilities listed in paragraphs (a) through (j) of this section for which you commence construction, modification, or reconstruction after September 18, 2015.

(a) Each well affected facility, which is a single well that conducts a well completion operation following hydraulic fracturing or refracturing. The

provisions of this paragraph do not affect the affected facility status of well sites for the purposes of § 60.5397a. The provisions of paragraphs (a)(1) through (4) of this section apply to wells that are hydraulically refractured: (1) A well that conducts a well completion operation following hydraulic refracturing is not an affected facility, provided that the requirements of § 60.5375a(a)(1) through (4) are met. However, hydraulic refracturing of a well constitutes a modification of the well site for purposes of paragraph (i)(3)(iii) of this section, regardless of affected facility status of the well itself.

(2) A well completion operation following hydraulic refracturing not conducted pursuant to § 60.5375a(a)(1) through (4) is a modification to the well.

(3) Except as provided in § 60.5365a(i)(3)(iii), refracturing of a well, by itself, does not affect the modification status of other equipment, process units, storage vessels, compressors, pneumatic pumps, or pneumatic controllers.

(4) A well initially constructed after September 18, 2015, that conducts a well completion operation following hydraulic refracturing is considered an affected facility regardless of this provision.

(b) Each centrifugal compressor affected facility, which is a single centrifugal compressor using wet seals. A centrifugal compressor located at a well site, or an adjacent well site and servicing more than one well site, is not an affected facility under this subpart.

(c) Each reciprocating compressor affected facility, which is a single reciprocating compressor. A reciprocating compressor located at a well site, or an adjacent well site and servicing more than one well site, is not an affected facility under this subpart.

(d) Each pneumatic controller affected facility:

(1) Each pneumatic controller affected facility not located at a natural gas processing plant, which is a single continuous bleed natural gas-driven pneumatic controller operating at a natural gas bleed rate greater than 6 scfh.

(2) Each pneumatic controller affected facility located at a natural gas processing plant, which is a single continuous bleed natural gas-driven pneumatic controller.

(e) Each storage vessel affected facility, which is a single storage vessel with the potential for VOC emissions equal to or greater than 6 tpy as determined according to this section. The potential for VOC emissions must be calculated using a generally accepted model or calculation methodology,

based on the maximum average daily throughput determined for a 30-day period of production prior to the applicable emission determination deadline specified in this subsection. The determination may take into account requirements under a legally and practically enforceable limit in an operating permit or other requirement established under a federal, state, local or tribal authority.

(1) For each new, modified or reconstructed storage vessel you must determine the potential for VOC emissions within 30 days after liquids first enter the storage vessel, except as provided in paragraph (e)(3)(iv) of this section. For each new, modified or reconstructed storage vessel receiving liquids pursuant to the standards for well affected facilities in § 60.5375a, including wells subject to § 60.5375a(f), you must determine the potential for VOC emissions within 30 days after startup of production of the well.

(2) A storage vessel affected facility that subsequently has its potential for VOC emissions decrease to less than 6 tpy shall remain an affected facility under this subpart.

(3) For storage vessels not subject to a legally and practically enforceable limit in an operating permit or other requirement established under federal, state, local or tribal authority, any vapor from the storage vessel that is recovered and routed to a process through a VRU designed and operated as specified in this section is not required to be included in the determination of VOC potential to emit for purposes of determining affected facility status, provided you comply with the requirements in paragraphs (e)(3)(i) through (iv) of this section.

(i) You meet the cover requirements specified in § 60.5411a(b).

(ii) You meet the closed vent system requirements specified in § 60.5411a(c) and (d).

(iii) You must maintain records that document compliance with paragraphs (e)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(iv) In the event of removal of apparatus that recovers and routes vapor to a process, or operation that is inconsistent with the conditions specified in paragraphs (e)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section, you must determine the storage vessel's potential for VOC emissions according to this section within 30 days of such removal or operation.

(4) The following requirements apply immediately upon startup, startup of production, or return to service. A storage vessel affected facility that is reconnected to the original source of liquids is a storage vessel affected

facility subject to the same requirements that applied before being removed from service. Any storage vessel that is used to replace any storage vessel affected facility is subject to the same requirements that apply to the storage vessel affected facility being replaced.

(5) A storage vessel with a capacity greater than 100,000 gallons used to recycle water that has been passed through two stage separation is not a storage vessel affected facility.

(f) The group of all equipment within a process unit is an affected facility.

(1) Addition or replacement of equipment for the purpose of process improvement that is accomplished without a capital expenditure shall not by itself be considered a modification under this subpart.

(2) Equipment associated with a compressor station, dehydration unit, sweetening unit, underground storage vessel, field gas gathering system, or liquefied natural gas unit is covered by §§ 60.5400a, 60.5401a, 60.5402a, 60.5421a, and 60.5422a if it is located at an onshore natural gas processing plant. Equipment not located at the onshore natural gas processing plant site is exempt from the provisions of §§ 60.5400a, 60.5401a, 60.5402a, 60.5421a, and 60.5422a.

(3) The equipment within a process unit of an affected facility located at onshore natural gas processing plants and described in paragraph (f) of this section are exempt from this subpart if they are subject to and controlled according to subparts VVa, GGG, or GGGa of this part.

(g) Sweetening units located at onshore natural gas processing plants that process natural gas produced from either onshore or offshore wells.

(1) Each sweetening unit that processes natural gas is an affected facility; and

(2) Each sweetening unit that processes natural gas followed by a sulfur recovery unit is an affected facility.

(3) Facilities that have a design capacity less than 2 long tons per day (LT/D) of hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) in the acid gas (expressed as sulfur) are required to comply with recordkeeping and reporting requirements specified in § 60.5423a(c) but are not required to comply with §§ 60.5405a through 60.5407a and §§ 60.5410a(g) and 60.5415a(g).

(4) Sweetening facilities producing acid gas that is completely re-injected into oil-or-gas-bearing geologic strata or that is otherwise not released to the atmosphere are not subject to §§ 60.5405a through 60.5407a, 60.5410a(g), 60.5415a(g), and 60.5423a.

(h) Each pneumatic pump affected facility:

(1) For natural gas processing plants, each pneumatic pump affected facility, which is a single natural gas-driven diaphragm pump.

(2) For well sites, each pneumatic pump affected facility, which is a single natural gas-driven diaphragm pump. A single natural gas-driven diaphragm pump that is in operation less than 90 days per calendar year is not an affected facility under this subpart provided the owner/operator keeps records of the days of operation each calendar year and submits such records to the EPA Administrator (or delegated enforcement authority) upon request. For the purposes of this section, any period of operation during a calendar day counts toward the 90 calendar day threshold.

(i) Except as provided in § 60.5365a(i)(2), the collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site, as defined in § 60.5430a, is an affected facility.

(1) [Reserved]

(2) A well site that only contains one or more wellheads is not an affected facility under this subpart. The affected facility status of a separate tank battery surface site has no effect on the affected facility status of a well site that only contains one or more wellheads.

(3) For purposes of § 60.5397a, a "modification" to a well site occurs when:

(i) A new well is drilled at an existing well site;

(ii) A well at an existing well site is hydraulically fractured; or

(iii) A well at an existing well site is hydraulically refractured.

(j) The collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station, as defined in § 60.5430a, is an affected facility. For purposes of § 60.5397a, a "modification" to a compressor station occurs when:

(1) An additional compressor is installed at a compressor station; or

(2) One or more compressors at a compressor station is replaced by one or more compressors of greater total horsepower than the compressor(s) being replaced. When one or more compressors is replaced by one or more compressors of an equal or smaller total horsepower than the compressor(s) being replaced, installation of the replacement compressor(s) does not trigger a modification of the compressor station for purposes of § 60.5397a.

§ 60.5370a When must I comply with this subpart?

(a) You must be in compliance with the standards of this subpart no later

than August 2, 2016 or upon startup, whichever is later.

(b) At all times, including periods of startup, shutdown, and malfunction, owners and operators shall maintain and operate any affected facility including associated air pollution control equipment in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions. Determination of whether acceptable operating and maintenance procedures are being used will be based on information available to the Administrator which may include, but is not limited to, monitoring results, opacity observations, review of operating and maintenance procedures, and inspection of the source. The provisions for exemption from compliance during periods of startup, shutdown and malfunctions provided for in 40 CFR 60.8(c) do not apply to this subpart.

(c) You are exempt from the obligation to obtain a permit under 40 CFR part 70 or 40 CFR part 71, provided you are not otherwise required by law to obtain a permit under 40 CFR 70.3(a) or 40 CFR 71.3(a). Notwithstanding the previous sentence, you must continue to comply with the provisions of this subpart.

§ 60.5375a What GHG and VOC standards apply to well affected facilities?

If you are the owner or operator of a well affected facility as described in § 60.5365a(a) that also meets the criteria for a well affected facility in § 60.5365(a) of subpart OOOO of this part, you must reduce GHG (in the form of a limitation on emissions of methane) and VOC emissions by complying with paragraphs (a) through (g) of this section. If you own or operate a well affected facility as described in § 60.5365a(a) that does not meet the criteria for a well affected facility in § 60.5365(a) of subpart OOOO of this part, you must reduce GHG and VOC emissions by complying with paragraphs (f)(3), (f)(4) or (g) for each well completion operation with hydraulic fracturing prior to November 30, 2016, and you must comply with paragraphs (a) through (g) of this section for each well completion operation with hydraulic fracturing on or after November 30, 2016.

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (f) and (g) of this section, for each well completion operation with hydraulic fracturing you must comply with the requirements in paragraphs (a)(1) through (4) of this section. You must maintain a log as specified in paragraph (b) of this section.

(1) For each stage of the well completion operation, as defined in § 60.5430a, follow the requirements specified in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) During the initial flowback stage, route the flowback into one or more well completion vessels or storage vessels and commence operation of a separator unless it is technically infeasible for a separator to function. Any gas present in the initial flowback stage is not subject to control under this section.

(ii) During the separation flowback stage, route all recovered liquids from the separator to one or more well completion vessels or storage vessels, re-inject the recovered liquids into the well or another well, or route the recovered liquids to a collection system. Route the recovered gas from the separator into a gas flow line or collection system, re-inject the recovered gas into the well or another well, use the recovered gas as an onsite fuel source, or use the recovered gas for another useful purpose that a purchased fuel or raw material would serve. If it is technically infeasible to route the recovered gas as required above, follow the requirements in paragraph (a)(3) of this section. If, at any time during the separation flowback stage, it is technically infeasible for a separator to function, you must comply with paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section.

(iii) You must have a separator onsite during the entirety of the flowback period, except as provided in paragraphs (a)(1)(iii)(A) through (C) of this section.

(A) A well that is not hydraulically fractured or refractured with liquids, or that does not generate condensate, intermediate hydrocarbon liquids, or produced water such that there is no liquid collection system at the well site is not required to have a separator onsite.

(B) If conditions allow for liquid collection, then the operator must immediately stop the well completion operation, install a separator, and restart the well completion operation in accordance with § 60.5375a(a)(1).

(C) The owner or operator of a well that meets the criteria of paragraph (a)(1)(iii)(A) or (B) of this section must submit the report in § 60.5420a(b)(2) and maintain the records in § 60.5420a(c)(1)(iii).

(2) [Reserved]

(3) If it is technically infeasible to route the recovered gas as required in § 60.5375a(a)(1)(ii), then you must capture and direct recovered gas to a completion combustion device, except in conditions that may result in a fire

hazard or explosion, or where high heat emissions from a completion combustion device may negatively impact tundra, permafrost or waterways. Completion combustion devices must be equipped with a reliable continuous pilot flame.

(4) You have a general duty to safely maximize resource recovery and minimize releases to the atmosphere during flowback and subsequent recovery.

(b) You must maintain a log for each well completion operation at each well affected facility. The log must be completed on a daily basis for the duration of the well completion operation and must contain the records specified in § 60.5420a(c)(1)(iii).

(c) You must demonstrate initial compliance with the standards that apply to well affected facilities as required by § 60.5410a(a).

(d) You must demonstrate continuous compliance with the standards that apply to well affected facilities as required by § 60.5415a(a).

(e) You must perform the required notification, recordkeeping and reporting as required by § 60.5420a(a)(2), (b)(1) and (2), and (c)(1).

(f) For each well affected facility specified in paragraphs (f)(1) and (2) of this section, you must comply with the requirements of paragraphs (f)(3) and (4) of this section.

(1) Each well completion operation with hydraulic fracturing at a wildcat or delineation well.

(2) Each well completion operation with hydraulic fracturing at a non-wildcat low pressure well or non-delineation low pressure well.

(3) You must comply with either paragraph (f)(3)(i) or (f)(3)(ii) of this section, unless you meet the requirements in paragraph (g) of this section. You must also comply with paragraph (b) of this section.

(i) Route all flowback to a completion combustion device, except in conditions that may result in a fire hazard or explosion, or where high heat emissions from a completion combustion device may negatively impact tundra, permafrost or waterways. Completion combustion devices must be equipped with a reliable continuous pilot flame.

(ii) Route all flowback into one or more well completion vessels and commence operation of a separator unless it is technically infeasible for a separator to function. Any gas present in the flowback before the separator can function is not subject to control under this section. Capture and direct recovered gas to a completion combustion device, except in conditions

that may result in a fire hazard or explosion, or where high heat emissions from a completion combustion device may negatively impact tundra, permafrost or waterways. Completion combustion devices must be equipped with a reliable continuous pilot flame. (4) You must submit the notification as specified in § 60.5420a(a)(2), submit annual reports as specified in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (2) and maintain records specified in § 60.5420a(c)(1)(iii) for each wildcat and delineation well. You must submit the notification as specified in § 60.5420a(a)(2), submit annual reports as specified in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (2), and maintain records as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(1)(iii) and (vii) for each low pressure well.

(g) For each well affected facility with less than 300 scf of gas per stock tank barrel of oil produced, you must comply with paragraphs (g)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) You must maintain records specified in § 60.5420a(c)(1)(vi).

(2) You must submit reports specified in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (2).

§ 60.5380a What GHG and VOC standards apply to centrifugal compressor affected facilities?

You must comply with the GHG and VOC standards in paragraphs (a) through (d) of this section for each centrifugal compressor affected facility.

(a)(1) You must reduce methane and VOC emissions from each centrifugal compressor wet seal fluid degassing system by 95.0 percent.

(2) If you use a control device to reduce emissions, you must equip the wet seal fluid degassing system with a cover that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(b). The cover must be connected through a closed vent system that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(a) and (d) and the closed vent system must be routed to a control device that meets the conditions specified in § 60.5412a(a), (b) and (c). As an alternative to routing the closed vent system to a control device, you may route the closed vent system to a process.

(b) You must demonstrate initial compliance with the standards that apply to centrifugal compressor affected facilities as required by § 60.5410a(b).

(c) You must demonstrate continuous compliance with the standards that apply to centrifugal compressor affected facilities as required by § 60.5415a(b).

(d) You must perform the reporting as required by § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (3), and the recordkeeping as required by § 60.5420a(c)(2), (6) through (11), and (17), as applicable.

§ 60.5385a What GHG and VOC standards apply to reciprocating compressor affected facilities?

You must reduce GHG (in the form of a limitation on emissions of methane) and VOC emissions by complying with the standards in paragraphs (a) through (d) of this section for each reciprocating compressor affected facility.

(a) You must replace the reciprocating compressor rod packing according to either paragraph (a)(1) or (2) of this section, or you must comply with paragraph (a)(3) of this section.

(1) On or before the compressor has operated for 26,000 hours. The number of hours of operation must be continuously monitored beginning upon initial startup of your reciprocating compressor affected facility, or the date of the most recent reciprocating compressor rod packing replacement, whichever is later.

(2) Prior to 36 months from the date of the most recent rod packing replacement, or 36 months from the date of startup for a new reciprocating compressor for which the rod packing has not yet been replaced.

(3) Collect the methane and VOC emissions from the rod packing using a rod packing emissions collection system that operates under negative pressure and route the rod packing emissions to a process through a closed vent system that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(a) and (d).

(b) You must demonstrate initial compliance with standards that apply to reciprocating compressor affected facilities as required by § 60.5410a(c).

(c) You must demonstrate continuous compliance with standards that apply to reciprocating compressor affected facilities as required by § 60.5415a(c).

(d) You must perform the reporting as required by § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (4) and the recordkeeping as required by § 60.5420a(c)(3), (6) through (9), and (17), as applicable.

§ 60.5390a What GHG and VOC standards apply to pneumatic controller affected facilities?

For each pneumatic controller affected facility you must comply with the GHG and VOC standards, based on natural gas as a surrogate for GHG and VOC, in either paragraph (b)(1) or (c)(1) of this section, as applicable. Pneumatic controllers meeting the conditions in paragraph (a) of this section are exempt from this requirement.

(a) The requirements of paragraph (b)(1) or (c)(1) of this section are not required if you determine that the use of a pneumatic controller affected facility with a bleed rate greater than the applicable standard is required based on

functional needs, including but not limited to response time, safety and positive actuation. However, you must tag such pneumatic controller with the month and year of installation, reconstruction or modification, and identification information that allows traceability to the records for that pneumatic controller, as required in § 60.5420a(c)(4)(ii).

(b)(1) Each pneumatic controller affected facility at a natural gas processing plant must have a bleed rate of zero.

(2) Each pneumatic controller affected facility at a natural gas processing plant must be tagged with the month and year of installation, reconstruction or modification, and identification information that allows traceability to the records for that pneumatic controller as required in § 60.5420a(c)(4)(iv).

(c)(1) Each pneumatic controller affected facility at a location other than at a natural gas processing plant must have a bleed rate less than or equal to 6 standard cubic feet per hour.

(2) Each pneumatic controller affected facility at a location other than at a natural gas processing plant must be tagged with the month and year of installation, reconstruction or modification, and identification information that allows traceability to the records for that controller as required in § 60.5420a(c)(4)(iii).

(d) You must demonstrate initial compliance with standards that apply to pneumatic controller affected facilities as required by § 60.5410a(d).

(e) You must demonstrate continuous compliance with standards that apply to pneumatic controller affected facilities as required by § 60.5415a(d).

(f) You must perform the reporting as required by § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (5) and the recordkeeping as required by § 60.5420a(c)(4).

§ 60.5393a What GHG and VOC standards apply to pneumatic pump affected facilities?

For each pneumatic pump affected facility you must comply with the GHG and VOC standards, based on natural gas as a surrogate for GHG and VOC, in either paragraph (a) or (b) of this section, as applicable, on or after November 30, 2016.

(a) Each pneumatic pump affected facility at a natural gas processing plant must have a natural gas emission rate of zero.

(b) For each pneumatic pump affected facility at a well site you must comply with paragraph (b)(1) or (2) of this section.

(1) If the pneumatic pump affected facility is located at a greenfield site as

defined in § 60.5430a, you must reduce natural gas emissions by 95.0 percent, except as provided in paragraphs (b)(3) and (4) of this section.

(2) If the pneumatic pump affected facility is not located at a greenfield site as defined in § 60.5430a, you must reduce natural gas emissions by 95.0 percent, except as provided in paragraphs (b)(3), (4) and (5) of this section.

(3) You are not required to install a control device solely for the purpose of complying with the 95.0 percent reduction requirement of paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this section. If you do not have a control device installed on site by the compliance date and you do not have the ability to route to a process, then you must comply instead with the provisions of paragraphs (b)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) Submit a certification in accordance with § 60.5420a(b)(8)(i)(A) in your next annual report, certifying that there is no available control device or process on site and maintain the records in § 60.5420a(c)(16)(i) and (ii).

(ii) If you subsequently install a control device or have the ability to route to a process, you are no longer required to comply with paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this section and must submit the information in § 60.5420a(b)(8)(ii) in your next annual report and maintain the records in § 60.5420a(c)(16)(i), (ii), and (iii). You must be in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (b)(2) of this section within 30 days of startup of the control device or within 30 days of the ability to route to a process.

(4) If the control device available on site is unable to achieve a 95 percent reduction and there is no ability to route the emissions to a process, you must still route the pneumatic pump affected facility's emissions to that existing control device. If you route the pneumatic pump affected facility to a control device installed on site that is designed to achieve less than a 95 percent reduction, you must submit the information specified in § 60.5420a(b)(8)(i)(C) in your next annual report and maintain the records in § 60.5420a(c)(16)(iii).

(5) If an owner or operator at a non-greenfield site determines, through an engineering assessment, that routing a pneumatic pump to a control device or a process is technically infeasible, the requirements specified in paragraph (b)(5)(i) through (iv) of this section must be met.

(i) The owner or operator shall conduct the assessment of technical infeasibility in accordance with the criteria in paragraph (b)(5)(iii) of this

section and have it certified by a qualified professional engineer in accordance with paragraph (b)(5)(ii) of this section.

(ii) The following certification, signed and dated by the qualified professional engineer shall state: "I certify that the assessment of technical infeasibility was prepared under my direction or supervision. I further certify that the assessment was conducted and this report was prepared pursuant to the requirements of § 60.5393a(b)(5)(iii). Based on my professional knowledge and experience, and inquiry of personnel involved in the assessment, the certification submitted herein is true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are penalties for knowingly submitting false information."

(iii) The assessment of technical feasibility to route emissions from the pneumatic pump to an existing control device onsite or to a process shall include, but is not limited to, safety considerations, distance from the control device, pressure losses and differentials in the closed vent system and the ability of the control device to handle the pneumatic pump emissions which are routed to them. The assessment of technical infeasibility shall be prepared under the direction or supervision of the qualified professional engineer who signs the certification in accordance with paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section.

(iv) The owner or operator shall maintain the records § 60.5420a(c)(16)(iv).

(6) If the pneumatic pump is routed to a control device or a process and the control device or process is subsequently removed from the location or is no longer available, you are no longer required to be in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this section, and instead must comply with paragraph (b)(3) of this section and report the change in next annual report in accordance with § 60.5420a(b)(8)(ii).

(c) If you use a control device or route to a process to reduce emissions, you must connect the pneumatic pump affected facility through a closed vent system that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(a) and (d).

(d) You must demonstrate initial compliance with standards that apply to pneumatic pump affected facilities as required by § 60.5410a(e).

(e) You must perform the reporting as required by § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (8) and the recordkeeping as required by § 60.5420a(c)(6) through (10), (16), and (17), as applicable.

§ 60.5395a What VOC standards apply to storage vessel affected facilities?

Except as provided in paragraph (e) of this section, you must comply with the VOC standards in this section for each storage vessel affected facility.

(a) You must comply with the requirements of paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section. After 12 consecutive months of compliance with paragraph (a)(2) of this section, you may continue to comply with paragraph (a)(2) of this section, or you may comply with paragraph (a)(3) of this section, if applicable. If you choose to meet the requirements in paragraph (a)(3) of this section, you are not required to comply with the requirements of paragraph (a)(2) of this section except as provided in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(1) Determine the potential for VOC emissions in accordance with § 60.5365a(e).

(2) Reduce VOC emissions by 95.0 percent within 60 days after startup. For storage vessel affected facilities receiving liquids pursuant to the standards for well affected facilities in § 60.5375a(a)(1)(i) or (ii), you must achieve the required emissions reductions within 60 days after startup of production as defined in § 60.5430a.

(3) Maintain the uncontrolled actual VOC emissions from the storage vessel affected facility at less than 4 tpy without considering control. Prior to using the uncontrolled actual VOC emission rate for compliance purposes, you must demonstrate that the uncontrolled actual VOC emissions have remained less than 4 tpy as determined monthly for 12 consecutive months. After such demonstration, you must determine the uncontrolled actual VOC emission rate each month. The uncontrolled actual VOC emissions must be calculated using a generally accepted model or calculation methodology, and the calculations must be based on the average throughput for the month. You may no longer comply with this paragraph and must instead comply with paragraph (a)(2) of this section if your storage vessel affected facility meets the conditions specified in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) or (ii) of this section.

(i) If a well feeding the storage vessel affected facility undergoes fracturing or refracturing, you must comply with paragraph (a)(2) of this section as soon as liquids from the well following fracturing or refracturing are routed to the storage vessel affected facility.

(ii) If the monthly emissions determination required in this section indicates that VOC emissions from your storage vessel affected facility increase

to 4 tpy or greater and the increase is not associated with fracturing or refracturing of a well feeding the storage vessel affected facility, you must comply with paragraph (a)(2) of this section within 30 days of the monthly determination.

(b) *Control requirements.* (1) Except as required in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, if you use a control device to reduce VOC emissions from your storage vessel affected facility, you must equip the storage vessel with a cover that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(b) and is connected through a closed vent system that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(c) and (d), and you must route emissions to a control device that meets the conditions specified in § 60.5412a(c) or (d). As an alternative to routing the closed vent system to a control device, you may route the closed vent system to a process.

(2) If you use a floating roof to reduce emissions, you must meet the requirements of § 60.112b(a)(1) or (2) and the relevant monitoring, inspection, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Kb.

(c) Requirements for storage vessel affected facilities that are removed from service or returned to service. If you remove a storage vessel affected facility from service, you must comply with paragraphs (c)(1) through (3) of this section. A storage vessel is not an affected facility under this subpart for the period that it is removed from service.

(1) For a storage vessel affected facility to be removed from service, you must comply with the requirements of paragraphs (c)(1)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) You must completely empty and degas the storage vessel, such that the storage vessel no longer contains crude oil, condensate, produced water or intermediate hydrocarbon liquids. A storage vessel where liquid is left on walls, as bottom clingage or in pools due to floor irregularity is considered to be completely empty.

(ii) You must submit a notification as required in § 60.5420a(b)(6)(v) in your next annual report, identifying each storage vessel affected facility removed from service during the reporting period and the date of its removal from service.

(2) If a storage vessel identified in paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of this section is returned to service, you must determine its affected facility status as provided in § 60.5365a(e).

(3) For each storage vessel affected facility returned to service during the reporting period, you must submit a

notification in your next annual report as required in § 60.5420a(b)(6)(vi), identifying each storage vessel affected facility and the date of its return to service.

(d) Compliance, notification, recordkeeping, and reporting. You must comply with paragraphs (d)(1) through (3) of this section.

(1) You must demonstrate initial compliance with standards as required by § 60.5410a(h) and (i).

(2) You must demonstrate continuous compliance with standards as required by § 60.5415a(e)(3).

(3) You must perform the required reporting as required by § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (6) and the recordkeeping as required by § 60.5420a(c)(5) through (8), (12) through (14), and (17), as applicable.

(e) *Exemptions.* This subpart does not apply to storage vessels subject to and controlled in accordance with the requirements for storage vessels in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Kb, and 40 CFR part 63, subparts G, CC, HH, or WW.

§ 60.5397a What fugitive emissions GHG and VOC standards apply to the affected facility which is the collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site and the affected facility which is the collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station?

For each affected facility under § 60.5365a(i) and (j), you must reduce GHG (in the form of a limitation on emissions of methane) and VOC emissions by complying with the requirements of paragraphs (a) through (j) of this section. These requirements are independent of the closed vent system and cover requirements in § 60.5411a.

(a) You must monitor all fugitive emission components, as defined in § 60.5430a, in accordance with paragraphs (b) through (g) of this section. You must repair all sources of fugitive emissions in accordance with paragraph (h) of this section. You must keep records in accordance with paragraph (i) of this section and report in accordance with paragraph (j) of this section. For purposes of this section, fugitive emissions are defined as: Any visible emission from a fugitive emissions component observed using optical gas imaging or an instrument reading of 500 ppm or greater using Method 21.

(b) You must develop an emissions monitoring plan that covers the collection of fugitive emissions components at well sites and compressor stations within each company-defined area in accordance with paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section.

(c) Fugitive emissions monitoring plans must include the elements specified in paragraphs (c)(1) through (8) of this section, at a minimum.

(1) Frequency for conducting surveys. Surveys must be conducted at least as frequently as required by paragraphs (f) and (g) of this section.

(2) Technique for determining fugitive emissions (*i.e.*, Method 21 at 40 CFR part 60, appendix A-7, or optical gas imaging).

(3) Manufacturer and model number of fugitive emissions detection equipment to be used.

(4) Procedures and timeframes for identifying and repairing fugitive emissions components from which fugitive emissions are detected, including timeframes for fugitive emission components that are unsafe to repair. Your repair schedule must meet the requirements of paragraph (h) of this section at a minimum.

(5) Procedures and timeframes for verifying fugitive emission component repairs.

(6) Records that will be kept and the length of time records will be kept.

(7) If you are using optical gas imaging, your plan must also include the elements specified in paragraphs (c)(7)(i) through (vii) of this section.

(i) Verification that your optical gas imaging equipment meets the specifications of paragraphs (c)(7)(i)(A) and (B) of this section. This verification is an initial verification and may either be performed by the facility, by the manufacturer, or by a third party. For the purposes of complying with the fugitives emissions monitoring program with optical gas imaging, a fugitive emission is defined as any visible emissions observed using optical gas imaging.

(A) Your optical gas imaging equipment must be capable of imaging gases in the spectral range for the compound of highest concentration in the potential fugitive emissions.

(B) Your optical gas imaging equipment must be capable of imaging a gas that is half methane, half propane at a concentration of 10,000 ppm at a flow rate of ≤ 60 g/hr from a quarter inch diameter orifice.

(ii) Procedure for a daily verification check.

(iii) Procedure for determining the operator's maximum viewing distance from the equipment and how the operator will ensure that this distance is maintained.

(iv) Procedure for determining maximum wind speed during which monitoring can be performed and how the operator will ensure monitoring

occurs only at wind speeds below this threshold.

(v) Procedures for conducting surveys, including the items specified in paragraphs (c)(7)(v)(A) through (C) of this section.

(A) How the operator will ensure an adequate thermal background is present in order to view potential fugitive emissions.

(B) How the operator will deal with adverse monitoring conditions, such as wind.

(C) How the operator will deal with interferences (e.g., steam).

(vi) Training and experience needed prior to performing surveys.

(vii) Procedures for calibration and maintenance. At a minimum, procedures must comply with those recommended by the manufacturer.

(8) If you are using Method 21 of appendix A-7 of this part, your plan must also include the elements specified in paragraphs (c)(8)(i) and (ii) of this section. For the purposes of complying with the fugitive emissions monitoring program using Method 21 a fugitive emission is defined as an instrument reading of 500 ppm or greater.

(i) Verification that your monitoring equipment meets the requirements specified in Section 6.0 of Method 21 at 40 CFR part 60, appendix A-7. For purposes of instrument capability, the fugitive emissions definition shall be 500 ppm or greater methane using a FID-based instrument. If you wish to use an analyzer other than a FID-based instrument, you must develop a site-specific fugitive emission definition that would be equivalent to 500 ppm methane using a FID-based instrument (e.g., 10.6 eV PID with a specified isobutylene concentration as the fugitive emission definition would provide equivalent response to your compound of interest).

(ii) Procedures for conducting surveys. At a minimum, the procedures shall ensure that the surveys comply with the relevant sections of Method 21 at 40 CFR part 60, appendix A-7, including Section 8.3.1.

(d) Each fugitive emissions monitoring plan must include the elements specified in paragraphs (d)(1) through (4) of this section, at a minimum, as applicable.

(1) Sitemap.

(2) A defined observation path that ensures that all fugitive emissions components are within sight of the path. The observation path must account for interferences.

(3) If you are using Method 21, your plan must also include a list of fugitive emissions components to be monitored

and method for determining location of fugitive emissions components to be monitored in the field (e.g. tagging, identification on a process and instrumentation diagram, etc.).

(4) Your plan must also include the written plan developed for all of the fugitive emission components designated as difficult-to-monitor in accordance with paragraph (g)(3)(i) of this section, and the written plan for fugitive emission components designated as unsafe-to-monitor in accordance with paragraph (g)(3)(ii) of this section.

(e) Each monitoring survey shall observe each fugitive emissions component, as defined in § 60.5430a, for fugitive emissions.

(f)(1) You must conduct an initial monitoring survey within 60 days of the startup of production, as defined in § 60.5430a, for each collection of fugitive emissions components at a new well site or by June 3, 2017, whichever is later. For a modified collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site, the initial monitoring survey must be conducted within 60 days of the first day of production for each collection of fugitive emission components after the modification or by June 3, 2017, whichever is later.

(2) You must conduct an initial monitoring survey within 60 days of the startup of a new compressor station for each new collection of fugitive emissions components at the new compressor station or by June 3, 2017, whichever is later. For a modified collection of fugitive components at a compressor station, the initial monitoring survey must be conducted within 60 days of the modification or by June 3, 2017, whichever is later.

(g) A monitoring survey of each collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site or at a compressor station must be performed at the frequencies specified in paragraphs (g)(1) and (2) of this section, with the exceptions noted in paragraphs (g)(3) and (4) of this section.

(1) A monitoring survey of each collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site within a company-defined area must be conducted at least semiannually after the initial survey. Consecutive semiannual monitoring surveys must be conducted at least 4 months apart.

(2) A monitoring survey of the collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station within a company-defined area must be conducted at least quarterly after the initial survey. Consecutive quarterly monitoring surveys must be conducted at least 60 days apart.

(3) Fugitive emissions components that cannot be monitored without elevating the monitoring personnel more than 2 meters above the surface may be designated as difficult-to-monitor. Fugitive emissions components that are designated difficult-to-monitor must meet the specifications of paragraphs (g)(3)(i) through (iv) of this section.

(i) A written plan must be developed for all of the fugitive emissions components designated difficult-to-monitor. This written plan must be incorporated into the fugitive emissions monitoring plan required by paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section.

(ii) The plan must include the identification and location of each fugitive emissions component designated as difficult-to-monitor.

(iii) The plan must include an explanation of why each fugitive emissions component designated as difficult-to-monitor is difficult-to-monitor.

(iv) The plan must include a schedule for monitoring the difficult-to-monitor fugitive emissions components at least once per calendar year.

(4) Fugitive emissions components that cannot be monitored because monitoring personnel would be exposed to immediate danger while conducting a monitoring survey may be designated as unsafe-to-monitor. Fugitive emissions components that are designated unsafe-to-monitor must meet the specifications of paragraphs (g)(4)(i) through (iv) of this section.

(i) A written plan must be developed for all of the fugitive emissions components designated unsafe-to-monitor. This written plan must be incorporated into the fugitive emissions monitoring plan required by paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section.

(ii) The plan must include the identification and location of each fugitive emissions component designated as unsafe-to-monitor.

(iii) The plan must include an explanation of why each fugitive emissions component designated as unsafe-to-monitor is unsafe-to-monitor.

(iv) The plan must include a schedule for monitoring the fugitive emissions components designated as unsafe-to-monitor.

(5) The requirements of paragraph (g)(2) of this section are waived for any collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station located within an area that has an average calendar month temperature below 0 °Fahrenheit for two of three consecutive calendar months of a quarterly monitoring period. The calendar month temperature average for

each month within the quarterly monitoring period must be determined using historical monthly average temperatures over the previous three years as reported by a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration source or other source approved by the Administrator. The requirements of paragraph (g)(2) of this section shall not be waived for two consecutive quarterly monitoring periods.

(h) Each identified source of fugitive emissions shall be repaired or replaced in accordance with paragraphs (h)(1) and (2) of this section. For fugitive emissions components also subject to the repair provisions of §§ 60.5416a(b)(9) through (12) and (c)(4) through (7), those provisions apply instead to those closed vent system and covers, and the repair provisions of paragraphs (h)(1) and (2) of this section do not apply to those closed vent systems and covers.

(1) Each identified source of fugitive emissions shall be repaired or replaced as soon as practicable, but no later than 30 calendar days after detection of the fugitive emissions.

(2) If the repair or replacement is technically infeasible, would require a vent blowdown, a compressor station shutdown, a well shutdown or well shut-in, or would be unsafe to repair during operation of the unit, the repair or replacement must be completed during the next compressor station shutdown, well shutdown, well shut-in, after an unscheduled, planned or emergency vent blowdown or within 2 years, whichever is earlier.

(3) Each repaired or replaced fugitive emissions component must be resurveyed as soon as practicable, but no later than 30 days after being repaired, to ensure that there are no fugitive emissions.

(i) For repairs that cannot be made during the monitoring survey when the fugitive emissions are initially found, the operator may resurvey the repaired fugitive emissions components using either Method 21 or optical gas imaging within 30 days of finding such fugitive emissions.

(ii) For each repair that cannot be made during the monitoring survey when the fugitive emissions are initially found, a digital photograph must be taken of that component or the component must be tagged for identification purposes. The digital photograph must include the date that the photograph was taken, must clearly identify the component by location within the site (e.g., the latitude and longitude of the component or by other descriptive landmarks visible in the picture).

(iii) Operators that use Method 21 to resurvey the repaired fugitive emissions components are subject to the resurvey provisions specified in paragraphs (h)(3)(iii)(A) and (B) of this section.

(A) A fugitive emissions component is repaired when the Method 21 instrument indicates a concentration of less than 500 ppm above background or when no soap bubbles are observed when the alternative screening procedures specified in section 8.3.3 of Method 21 are used.

(B) Operators must use the Method 21 monitoring requirements specified in paragraph (c)(8)(ii) of this section or the alternative screening procedures specified in section 8.3.3 of Method 21.

(iv) Operators that use optical gas imaging to resurvey the repaired fugitive emissions components, are subject to the resurvey provisions specified in paragraphs (h)(3)(iv)(A) and (B) of this section.

(A) A fugitive emissions component is repaired when the optical gas imaging instrument shows no indication of visible emissions.

(B) Operators must use the optical gas imaging monitoring requirements specified in paragraph (c)(7) of this section.

(i) Records for each monitoring survey shall be maintained as specified § 60.5420a(c)(15).

(j) Annual reports shall be submitted for each collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site and each collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station that include the information specified in § 60.5420a(b)(7). Multiple collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site or at a compressor station may be included in a single annual report.

§ 60.5398a What are the alternative means of emission limitations for GHG and VOC from well completions, reciprocating compressors, the collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site and the collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station?

(a) If, in the Administrator's judgment, an alternative means of emission limitation will achieve a reduction in GHG (in the form of a limitation on emission of methane) and VOC emissions at least equivalent to the reduction in GHG and VOC emissions achieved under § 60.5375a, § 60.5385a, and § 60.5397a, the Administrator will publish, in the **Federal Register**, a notice permitting the use of that alternative means for the purpose of compliance with § 60.5375a, § 60.5385a, and § 60.5397a. The notice may condition permission on requirements related to the operation and maintenance of the alternative means.

(b) Any notice under paragraph (a) of this section must be published only after notice and an opportunity for a public hearing.

(c) The Administrator will consider applications under this section from either owners or operators of affected facilities.

(d) Determination of equivalence to the design, equipment, work practice or operational requirements of this section will be evaluated by the following guidelines:

(1) The applicant must collect, verify and submit test data, covering a period of at least 12 months to demonstrate the equivalence of the alternative means of emission limitation. The application must include the following information:

(i) A description of the technology or process.

(ii) The monitoring instrument and measurement technology or process.

(iii) A description of performance based procedures (i.e., method) and data quality indicators for precision and bias; the method detection limit of the technology or process.

(iv) For affected facilities under § 60.5397a, the action criteria and level at which a fugitive emission exists.

(v) Any initial and ongoing quality assurance/quality control measures.

(vi) Timeframes for conducting ongoing quality assurance/quality control.

(vii) Field data verifying viability and detection capabilities of the technology or process.

(viii) Frequency of measurements.

(ix) Minimum data availability.

(x) Any restrictions for using the technology or process.

(xi) Operation and maintenance procedures and other provisions necessary to ensure reduction in methane and VOC emissions at least equivalent to the reduction in methane and VOC emissions achieved under § 60.5397a.

(xii) Initial and continuous compliance procedures, including recordkeeping and reporting.

(2) For each determination of equivalency requested, the emission reduction achieved by the design, equipment, work practice or operational requirements shall be demonstrated.

(3) For each affected facility for which a determination of equivalency is requested, the emission reduction achieved by the alternative means of emission limitation shall be demonstrated.

(4) Each owner or operator applying for a determination of equivalence to a work practice standard shall commit in writing to work practice(s) that provide for emission reductions equal to or

greater than the emission reductions achieved by the required work practice.

(e) After notice and opportunity for public hearing, the Administrator will determine the equivalence of a means of emission limitation and will publish the determination in the **Federal Register**.

(f) An application submitted under this section will be evaluated as set forth in paragraphs (f)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) The Administrator will compare the demonstrated emission reduction for the alternative means of emission limitation to the demonstrated emission reduction for the design, equipment, work practice or operational requirements and, if applicable, will consider the commitment in paragraph (d) of this section.

(2) The Administrator may condition the approval of the alternative means of emission limitation on requirements that may be necessary to ensure operation and maintenance to achieve the same emissions reduction as the design, equipment, work practice or operational requirements. (g) Any equivalent means of emission limitations approved under this section shall constitute a required work practice, equipment, design or operational standard within the meaning of section 111(h)(1) of the CAA.

§ 60.5400a What equipment leak GHG and VOC standards apply to affected facilities at an onshore natural gas processing plant?

This section applies to the group of all equipment, except compressors, within a process unit.

(a) You must comply with the requirements of §§ 60.482–1a(a), (b), and (d), 60.482–2a, and 60.482–4a through 60.482–11a, except as provided in § 60.5401a.

(b) You may elect to comply with the requirements of §§ 60.483–1a and 60.483–2a, as an alternative.

(c) You may apply to the Administrator for permission to use an alternative means of emission limitation that achieves a reduction in emissions of methane and VOC at least equivalent to that achieved by the controls required in this subpart according to the requirements of § 60.5402a.

(d) You must comply with the provisions of § 60.485a except as provided in paragraph (f) of this section.

(e) You must comply with the provisions of §§ 60.486a and 60.487a except as provided in §§ 60.5401a, 60.5421a, and 60.5422a.

(f) You must use the following provision instead of § 60.485a(d)(1): Each piece of equipment is presumed to be in VOC service or in wet gas service

unless an owner or operator demonstrates that the piece of equipment is not in VOC service or in wet gas service. For a piece of equipment to be considered not in VOC service, it must be determined that the VOC content can be reasonably expected never to exceed 10.0 percent by weight. For a piece of equipment to be considered in wet gas service, it must be determined that it contains or contacts the field gas before the extraction step in the process. For purposes of determining the percent VOC content of the process fluid that is contained in or contacts a piece of equipment, procedures that conform to the methods described in ASTM E169–93, E168–92, or E260–96 (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17) must be used.

§ 60.5401a What are the exceptions to the equipment leak GHG and VOC standards for affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?

(a) You may comply with the following exceptions to the provisions of § 60.5400a(a) and (b).

(b)(1) Each pressure relief device in gas/vapor service may be monitored quarterly and within 5 days after each pressure release to detect leaks by the methods specified in § 60.485a(b) except as provided in § 60.5400a(c) and in paragraph (b)(4) of this section, and § 60.482–4a(a) through (c) of subpart VVa of this part.

(2) If an instrument reading of 500 ppm or greater is measured, a leak is detected.

(3)(i) When a leak is detected, it must be repaired as soon as practicable, but no later than 15 calendar days after it is detected, except as provided in § 60.482–9a.

(ii) A first attempt at repair must be made no later than 5 calendar days after each leak is detected.

(4)(i) Any pressure relief device that is located in a nonfractionating plant that is monitored only by non-plant personnel may be monitored after a pressure release the next time the monitoring personnel are onsite, instead of within 5 days as specified in paragraph (b)(1) of this section and § 60.482–4a(b)(1).

(ii) No pressure relief device described in paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section may be allowed to operate for more than 30 days after a pressure release without monitoring.

(c) Sampling connection systems are exempt from the requirements of § 60.482–5a.

(d) Pumps in light liquid service, valves in gas/vapor and light liquid service, pressure relief devices in gas/

vapor service, and connectors in gas/vapor service and in light liquid service that are located at a nonfractionating plant that does not have the design capacity to process 283,200 standard cubic meters per day (scmd) (10 million standard cubic feet per day) or more of field gas are exempt from the routine monitoring requirements of §§ 60.482–2a(a)(1), 60.482–7a(a), 60.482–11a(a), and paragraph (b)(1) of this section.

(e) Pumps in light liquid service, valves in gas/vapor and light liquid service, pressure relief devices in gas/vapor service, and connectors in gas/vapor service and in light liquid service within a process unit that is located in the Alaskan North Slope are exempt from the routine monitoring requirements of §§ 60.482–2a(a)(1), 60.482–7a(a), 60.482–11a(a), and paragraph (b)(1) of this section.

(f) An owner or operator may use the following provisions instead of § 60.485a(e):

(1) Equipment is in heavy liquid service if the weight percent evaporated is 10 percent or less at 150 °Celsius (302 °Fahrenheit) as determined by ASTM Method D86–96 (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17).

(2) Equipment is in light liquid service if the weight percent evaporated is greater than 10 percent at 150 °Celsius (302 °Fahrenheit) as determined by ASTM Method D86–96 (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17).

(g) An owner or operator may use the following provisions instead of § 60.485a(b)(2): A calibration drift assessment shall be performed, at a minimum, at the end of each monitoring day. Check the instrument using the same calibration gas(es) that were used to calibrate the instrument before use. Follow the procedures specified in Method 21 of appendix A–7 of this part, Section 10.1, except do not adjust the meter readout to correspond to the calibration gas value. Record the instrument reading for each scale used as specified in § 60.486a(e)(8). Divide these readings by the initial calibration values for each scale and multiply by 100 to express the calibration drift as a percentage. If any calibration drift assessment shows a negative drift of more than 10 percent from the initial calibration value, then all equipment monitored since the last calibration with instrument readings below the appropriate leak definition and above the leak definition multiplied by (100 minus the percent of negative drift/ divided by 100) must be re-monitored. If any calibration drift assessment shows a positive drift of more than 10 percent from the initial calibration value, then, at the owner/operator's discretion, all

equipment since the last calibration with instrument readings above the appropriate leak definition and below the leak definition multiplied by 100 plus the percent of positive drift/ divided by 100) may be re-monitored.

§ 60.5402a What are the alternative means of emission limitations for GHG and VOC equipment leaks from onshore natural gas processing plants?

(a) If, in the Administrator's judgment, an alternative means of emission limitation will achieve a reduction in GHG and VOC emissions at least equivalent to the reduction in GHG and VOC emissions achieved under any design, equipment, work practice or operational standard, the Administrator will publish, in the **Federal Register**, a notice permitting the use of that alternative means for the purpose of compliance with that standard. The notice may condition permission on requirements related to the operation and maintenance of the alternative means.

(b) Any notice under paragraph (a) of this section must be published only after notice and an opportunity for a public hearing.

(c) The Administrator will consider applications under this section from either owners or operators of affected facilities, or manufacturers of control equipment.

(d) An application submitted under paragraph (c) of this section must meet the following criteria:

(1) The applicant must collect, verify and submit test data, covering a period of at least 12 months, necessary to support the finding in paragraph (a) of this section.

(2) The application must include operation, maintenance and other provisions necessary to assure reduction in methane and VOC emissions at least equivalent to the reduction in methane and VOC emissions achieved under the design, equipment, work practice or operational standard in paragraph (a) of this section by including the information specified in paragraphs (d)(1)(i) through (x) of this section.

(i) A description of the technology or process.

(ii) The monitoring instrument and measurement technology or process.

(iii) A description of performance based procedures (i.e. method) and data quality indicators for precision and bias; the method detection limit of the technology or process.

(iv) The action criteria and level at which a fugitive emission exists.

(v) Any initial and ongoing quality assurance/quality control measures.

(vi) Timeframes for conducting ongoing quality assurance/quality control.

(vii) Field data verifying viability and detection capabilities of the technology or process.

(viii) Frequency of measurements.

(ix) Minimum data availability.

(x) Any restrictions for using the technology or process.

(3) The application must include initial and continuous compliance procedures including recordkeeping and reporting.

§ 60.5405a What standards apply to sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?

(a) During the initial performance test required by § 60.8(b), you must achieve at a minimum, an SO₂ emission reduction efficiency (Z_i) to be determined from Table 1 of this subpart based on the sulfur feed rate (X) and the sulfur content of the acid gas (Y) of the affected facility.

(b) After demonstrating compliance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, you must achieve at a minimum, an SO₂ emission reduction efficiency (Z_c) to be determined from Table 2 of this subpart based on the sulfur feed rate (X) and the sulfur content of the acid gas (Y) of the affected facility.

§ 60.5406a What test methods and procedures must I use for my sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?

(a) In conducting the performance tests required in § 60.8, you must use the test methods in appendix A of this part or other methods and procedures as specified in this section, except as provided in § 60.8(b).

(b) During a performance test required by § 60.8, you must determine the minimum required reduction efficiencies (Z) of SO₂ emissions as required in § 60.5405a(a) and (b) as follows:

(1) The average sulfur feed rate (X) must be computed as follows:

$$X = KQ_a Y$$

Where:

X = average sulfur feed rate, Mg/D (LT/D).

Q_a = average volumetric flow rate of acid gas from sweetening unit, dscm/day (dscf/day).

Y = average H₂S concentration in acid gas feed from sweetening unit, percent by volume, expressed as a decimal.

K = (32 kg S/kg-mole)/((24.04 dscm/kg-mole)(1000 kg S/Mg)).

= 1.331 × 10⁻³ Mg/dscm, for metric units.

= (32 lb S/lb-mole)/((385.36 dscf/lb-mole)(2240 lb S/long ton)).

= 3.707 × 10⁻⁵ long ton/dscf, for English units.

(2) You must use the continuous readings from the process flowmeter to determine the average volumetric flow rate (Q_a) in dscm/day (dscf/day) of the acid gas from the sweetening unit for each run.

(3) You must use the Tutwiler procedure in § 60.5408a or a chromatographic procedure following ASTM E260-96 (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17) to determine the H₂S concentration in the acid gas feed from the sweetening unit (Y). At least one sample per hour (at equally spaced intervals) must be taken during each 4-hour run. The arithmetic mean of all samples must be the average H₂S concentration (Y) on a dry basis for the run. By multiplying the result from the Tutwiler procedure by 1.62 × 10⁻³, the units gr/100 scf are converted to volume percent.

(4) Using the information from paragraphs (b)(1) and (3) of this section, Tables 1 and 2 of this subpart must be used to determine the required initial (Z_i) and continuous (Z_c) reduction efficiencies of SO₂ emissions.

(c) You must determine compliance with the SO₂ standards in § 60.5405a(a) or (b) as follows:

(1) You must compute the emission reduction efficiency (R) achieved by the sulfur recovery technology for each run using the following equation:

$$R = (100S)/(S + E)$$

(2) You must use the level indicators or manual soundings to measure the liquid sulfur accumulation rate in the product storage vessels. You must use readings taken at the beginning and end of each run, the tank geometry, sulfur density at the storage temperature, and sample duration to determine the sulfur production rate (S) in kg/hr (lb/hr) for each run.

(3) You must compute the emission rate of sulfur for each run as follows:

$$E = C_e Q_{sd} / K_1$$

Where:

E = emission rate of sulfur per run, kg/hr.

C_e = concentration of sulfur equivalent (SO₂+ reduced sulfur), g/dscm (lb/dscf).

Q_{sd} = volumetric flow rate of effluent gas, dscm/hr (dscf/hr).

K₁ = conversion factor, 1000 g/kg (7000 gr/lb).

(4) The concentration (C_e) of sulfur equivalent must be the sum of the SO₂ and TRS concentrations, after being converted to sulfur equivalents. For each run and each of the test methods specified in this paragraph (c) of this section, you must use a sampling time of at least 4 hours. You must use Method 1 of appendix A-1 of this part to select the sampling site. The sampling point in the duct must be at

the centroid of the cross-section if the area is less than 5 m² (54 ft²) or at a point no closer to the walls than 1 m (39 in) if the cross-sectional area is 5 m² or more, and the centroid is more than 1 m (39 in) from the wall.

(i) You must use Method 6 of appendix A-4 of this part to determine the SO₂ concentration. You must take eight samples of 20 minutes each at 30-minute intervals. The arithmetic average must be the concentration for the run. The concentration must be multiplied by 0.5×10^{-3} to convert the results to sulfur equivalent. In place of Method 6 of Appendix A of this part, you may use ANSI/ASME PTC 19.10-1981, Part 10 (manual portion only) (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17).

(ii) You must use Method 15 of appendix A-5 of this part to determine the TRS concentration from reduction-type devices or where the oxygen content of the effluent gas is less than 1.0 percent by volume. The sampling rate must be at least 3 liters/min (0.1 ft³/min) to insure minimum residence time in the sample line. You must take sixteen samples at 15-minute intervals. The arithmetic average of all the samples must be the concentration for the run. The concentration in ppm reduced sulfur as sulfur must be multiplied by 1.333×10^{-3} to convert the results to sulfur equivalent.

(iii) You must use Method 16A of appendix A-6 of this part or Method 15 of appendix A-5 of this part or ANSI/ASME PTC 19.10-1981, Part 10 (manual portion only) (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17) to determine the reduced sulfur concentration from oxidation-type devices or where the oxygen content of the effluent gas is greater than 1.0 percent by volume. You must take eight samples of 20 minutes each at 30-minute intervals. The arithmetic average must be the concentration for the run. The concentration in ppm reduced sulfur as sulfur must be multiplied by 1.333×10^{-3} to convert the results to sulfur equivalent.

(iv) You must use Method 2 of appendix A-1 of this part to determine the volumetric flow rate of the effluent gas. A velocity traverse must be conducted at the beginning and end of each run. The arithmetic average of the two measurements must be used to calculate the volumetric flow rate (Q_{sd}) for the run. For the determination of the effluent gas molecular weight, a single integrated sample over the 4-hour period may be taken and analyzed or grab samples at 1-hour intervals may be taken, analyzed, and averaged. For the moisture content, you must take two samples of at least 0.10 dscm (3.5 dscf)

and 10 minutes at the beginning of the 4-hour run and near the end of the time period. The arithmetic average of the two runs must be the moisture content for the run.

§ 60.5407a What are the requirements for monitoring of emissions and operations from my sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?

(a) If your sweetening unit affected facility is located at an onshore natural gas processing plant and is subject to the provisions of § 60.5405a(a) or (b) you must install, calibrate, maintain, and operate monitoring devices or perform measurements to determine the following operations information on a daily basis:

(1) The accumulation of sulfur product over each 24-hour period. The monitoring method may incorporate the use of an instrument to measure and record the liquid sulfur production rate, or may be a procedure for measuring and recording the sulfur liquid levels in the storage vessels with a level indicator or by manual soundings, with subsequent calculation of the sulfur production rate based on the tank geometry, stored sulfur density, and elapsed time between readings. The method must be designed to be accurate within ± 2 percent of the 24-hour sulfur accumulation.

(2) The H₂S concentration in the acid gas from the sweetening unit for each 24-hour period. At least one sample per 24-hour period must be collected and analyzed using the equation specified in § 60.5406a(b)(1). The Administrator may require you to demonstrate that the H₂S concentration obtained from one or more samples over a 24-hour period is within ± 20 percent of the average of 12 samples collected at equally spaced intervals during the 24-hour period. In instances where the H₂S concentration of a single sample is not within ± 20 percent of the average of the 12 equally spaced samples, the Administrator may require a more frequent sampling schedule.

(3) The average acid gas flow rate from the sweetening unit. You must install and operate a monitoring device to continuously measure the flow rate of acid gas. The monitoring device reading must be recorded at least once per hour during each 24-hour period. The average acid gas flow rate must be computed from the individual readings.

(4) The sulfur feed rate (\bar{X}). For each 24-hour period, you must compute \bar{X} using the equation specified in § 60.5406a(b)(1).

(5) The required sulfur dioxide emission reduction efficiency for the 24-hour period. You must use the sulfur

feed rate and the H₂S concentration in the acid gas for the 24-hour period, as applicable, to determine the required reduction efficiency in accordance with the provisions of § 60.5405a(b).

(b) Where compliance is achieved through the use of an oxidation control system or a reduction control system followed by a continually operated incineration device, you must install, calibrate, maintain, and operate monitoring devices and continuous emission monitors as follows:

(1) A continuous monitoring system to measure the total sulfur emission rate (E) of SO₂ in the gases discharged to the atmosphere. The SO₂ emission rate must be expressed in terms of equivalent sulfur mass flow rates (kg/hr (lb/hr)). The span of this monitoring system must be set so that the equivalent emission limit of § 60.5405a(b) will be between 30 percent and 70 percent of the measurement range of the instrument system.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (b)(3) of this section: A monitoring device to measure the temperature of the gas leaving the combustion zone of the incinerator, if compliance with § 60.5405a(a) is achieved through the use of an oxidation control system or a reduction control system followed by a continually operated incineration device. The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate to within ± 1 percent of the temperature being measured.

(3) When performance tests are conducted under the provision of § 60.8 to demonstrate compliance with the standards under § 60.5405a, the temperature of the gas leaving the incinerator combustion zone must be determined using the monitoring device. If the volumetric ratio of sulfur dioxide to sulfur dioxide plus total reduced sulfur (expressed as SO₂) in the gas leaving the incinerator is equal to or less than 0.98, then temperature monitoring may be used to demonstrate that sulfur dioxide emission monitoring is sufficient to determine total sulfur emissions. At all times during the operation of the facility, you must maintain the average temperature of the gas leaving the combustion zone of the incinerator at or above the appropriate level determined during the most recent performance test to ensure the sulfur compound oxidation criteria are met. Operation at lower average temperatures may be considered by the Administrator to be unacceptable operation and maintenance of the affected facility. You may request that the minimum incinerator temperature be reestablished by conducting new performance tests under § 60.8.

(4) Upon promulgation of a performance specification of continuous monitoring systems for total reduced sulfur compounds at sulfur recovery plants, you may, as an alternative to paragraph (b)(2) of this section, install, calibrate, maintain, and operate a continuous emission monitoring system for total reduced sulfur compounds as required in paragraph (d) of this section in addition to a sulfur dioxide emission monitoring system. The sum of the equivalent sulfur mass emission rates from the two monitoring systems must be used to compute the total sulfur emission rate (E).

(c) Where compliance is achieved through the use of a reduction control system not followed by a continually operated incineration device, you must install, calibrate, maintain, and operate a continuous monitoring system to measure the emission rate of reduced sulfur compounds as SO₂ equivalent in the gases discharged to the atmosphere. The SO₂ equivalent compound emission rate must be expressed in terms of equivalent sulfur mass flow rates (kg/hr (lb/hr)). The span of this monitoring system must be set so that the equivalent emission limit of § 60.5405a(b) will be between 30 and 70 percent of the measurement range of the system. This requirement becomes effective upon promulgation of a performance specification for continuous monitoring systems for total reduced sulfur compounds at sulfur recovery plants.

(d) For those sources required to comply with paragraph (b) or (c) of this section, you must calculate the average sulfur emission reduction efficiency achieved (R) for each 24-hour clock interval. The 24-hour interval may begin and end at any selected clock time, but must be consistent. You must compute the 24-hour average reduction efficiency (R) based on the 24-hour average sulfur production rate (S) and sulfur emission rate (E), using the equation in § 60.5406a(c)(1).

(1) You must use data obtained from the sulfur production rate monitoring device specified in paragraph (a) of this section to determine S.

(2) You must use data obtained from the sulfur emission rate monitoring systems specified in paragraphs (b) or (c) of this section to calculate a 24-hour average for the sulfur emission rate (E). The monitoring system must provide at least one data point in each successive 15-minute interval. You must use at least two data points to calculate each 1-hour average. You must use a minimum of 18 1-hour averages to compute each 24-hour average.

(e) In lieu of complying with paragraphs (b) or (c) of this section, those sources with a design capacity of less than 152 Mg/D (150 LT/D) of H₂S expressed as sulfur may calculate the sulfur emission reduction efficiency achieved for each 24-hour period by:

$$R = \frac{K_2 S}{X}$$

Where:

R = The sulfur dioxide removal efficiency achieved during the 24-hour period, percent.

K₂ = Conversion factor, 0.02400 Mg/D per kg/hr (0.01071 LT/D per lb/hr).

S = The sulfur production rate during the 24-hour period, kg/hr (lb/hr).

X = The sulfur feed rate in the acid gas, Mg/D (LT/D).

(f) The monitoring devices required in paragraphs (b)(1), (b)(3) and (c) of this section must be calibrated at least annually according to the manufacturer's specifications, as required by § 60.13(b).

(g) The continuous emission monitoring systems required in paragraphs (b)(1), (b)(3), and (c) of this section must be subject to the emission monitoring requirements of § 60.13 of the General Provisions. For conducting the continuous emission monitoring system performance evaluation required by § 60.13(c), Performance Specification 2 of appendix B of this part must apply, and Method 6 of appendix A-4 of this part must be used for systems required by paragraph (b) of this section. In place of Method 6 of appendix A-4 of this part, ASME PTC 19.10-1981 (incorporated by reference—see § 60.17) may be used.

§ 60.5408a What is an optional procedure for measuring hydrogen sulfide in acid gas—Tutwiler Procedure?

The Tutwiler procedure may be found in the Gas Engineers Handbook, Fuel Gas Engineering practices, The Industrial Press, 93 Worth Street, New York, NY, 1966, First Edition, Second Printing, page 6/25 (Docket A-80-20-A, Entry II-I-67).

(a) When an instantaneous sample is desired and H₂S concentration is 10 grains per 1000 cubic foot or more, a 100 ml Tutwiler burette is used. For concentrations less than 10 grains, a 500 ml Tutwiler burette and more dilute solutions are used. In principle, this method consists of titrating hydrogen sulfide in a gas sample directly with a standard solution of iodine.

(b) *Apparatus.* (See Figure 1 of this subpart.) A 100 or 500 ml capacity Tutwiler burette, with two-way glass stopcock at bottom and three-way stopcock at top that connect either with

inlet tubulature or glass-stoppered cylinder, 10 ml capacity, graduated in 0.1 ml subdivision; rubber tubing connecting burette with leveling bottle.

(c) *Reagents.* (1) Iodine stock solution, 0.1N. Weight 12.7 g iodine, and 20 to 25 g cp potassium iodide (KI) for each liter of solution. Dissolve KI in as little water as necessary; dissolve iodine in concentrated KI solution, make up to proper volume, and store in glass-stoppered brown glass bottle.

(2) Standard iodine solution, 1 ml=0.001771 g I. Transfer 33.7 ml of above 0.1N stock solution into a 250 ml volumetric flask; add water to mark and mix well. Then, for 100 ml sample of gas, 1 ml of standard iodine solution is equivalent to 100 grains H₂S per cubic feet of gas.

(3) Starch solution. Rub into a thin paste about one teaspoonful of wheat starch with a little water; pour into about a pint of boiling water; stir; let cool and decant off clear solution. Make fresh solution every few days.

(d) *Procedure.* Fill leveling bulb with starch solution. Raise (L), open cock (G), open (F) to (A), and close (F) when solutions starts to run out of gas inlet. Close (G). Purge gas sampling line and connect with (A). Lower (L) and open (F) and (G). When liquid level is several ml past the 100 ml mark, close (G) and (F), and disconnect sampling tube. Open (G) and bring starch solution to 100 ml mark by raising (L); then close (G). Open (F) momentarily, to bring gas in burette to atmospheric pressure, and close (F). Open (G), bring liquid level down to 10 ml mark by lowering (L). Close (G), clamp rubber tubing near (E) and disconnect it from burette. Rinse graduated cylinder with a standard iodine solution (0.00171 g I per ml); fill cylinder and record reading. Introduce successive small amounts of iodine through (F); shake well after each addition; continue until a faint permanent blue color is obtained. Record reading; subtract from previous reading, and call difference D.

(e) With every fresh stock of starch solution perform a blank test as follows: Introduce fresh starch solution into burette up to 100 ml mark. Close (F) and (G). Lower (L) and open (G). When liquid level reaches the 10 ml mark, close (G). With air in burette, titrate as during a test and up to same end point. Call ml of iodine used C. Then,

$$\text{Grains H}_2\text{S per 100 cubic foot of gas} = 100 (D-C)$$

(f) Greater sensitivity can be attained if a 500 ml capacity Tutwiler burette is used with a more dilute (0.001N) iodine solution. Concentrations less than 1.0 grains per 100 cubic foot can be

determined in this way. Usually, the starch-iodine end point is much less distinct, and a blank determination of

end point, with H₂S-free gas or air, is required.

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P




Figure 1. Tutwiler burette (lettered items mentioned in text).

BILLING CODE 6560-50-C

§ 60.5410a How do I demonstrate initial compliance with the standards for my well, centrifugal compressor, reciprocating compressor, pneumatic controller, pneumatic pump, storage vessel, collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site, collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station, and equipment leaks and sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?

You must determine initial compliance with the standards for each affected facility using the requirements in paragraphs (a) through (j) of this section. The initial compliance period begins on August 2, 2016, or upon initial startup, whichever is later, and ends no later than 1 year after the initial startup date for your affected facility or no later than 1 year after August 2, 2016. The initial compliance period may be less than one full year.

(a) To achieve initial compliance with the methane and VOC standards for each well completion operation conducted at your well affected facility you must comply with paragraphs (a)(1) through (4) of this section.

(1) You must submit the notification required in § 60.5420a(a)(2).

(2) You must submit the initial annual report for your well affected facility as required in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (2).

(3) You must maintain a log of records as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(1)(i) through (iv), as applicable, for each well completion operation conducted during the initial compliance period. If you meet the exemption for wells with a GOR less than 300 scf per stock barrel of oil produced, you do not have to maintain the records in § 60.5420a(c)(1)(i) through (iv) and must maintain the record in § 60.5420a(c)(1)(vi).

(4) For each well affected facility subject to both § 60.5375a(a)(1) and (3), as an alternative to retaining the records specified in § 60.5420a(c)(1)(i) through (iv), you may maintain records in accordance with § 60.5420a(c)(1)(v) of one or more digital photographs with the date the photograph was taken and the latitude and longitude of the well site imbedded within or stored with the digital file showing the equipment for storing or re-injecting recovered liquid, equipment for routing recovered gas to the gas flow line and the completion combustion device (if applicable) connected to and operating at each well completion operation that occurred during the initial compliance period. As an alternative to imbedded latitude and longitude within the digital photograph, the digital photograph may consist of a photograph of the equipment connected

and operating at each well completion operation with a photograph of a separately operating GPS device within the same digital picture, provided the latitude and longitude output of the GPS unit can be clearly read in the digital photograph.

(b)(1) To achieve initial compliance with standards for your centrifugal compressor affected facility you must reduce methane and VOC emissions from each centrifugal compressor wet seal fluid degassing system by 95.0 percent or greater as required by § 60.5380a(a) and as demonstrated by the requirements of § 60.5413a.

(2) If you use a control device to reduce emissions, you must equip the wet seal fluid degassing system with a cover that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(b) that is connected through a closed vent system that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(a) and (d) and is routed to a control device that meets the conditions specified in § 60.5412a(a), (b) and (c). As an alternative to routing the closed vent system to a control device, you may route the closed vent system to a process.

(3) You must conduct an initial performance test as required in § 60.5413a within 180 days after initial startup or by August 2, 2016, whichever is later, and you must comply with the continuous compliance requirements in § 60.5415a(b).

(4) You must conduct the initial inspections required in § 60.5416a(a) and (b).

(5) You must install and operate the continuous parameter monitoring systems in accordance with § 60.5417a(a) through (g), as applicable.

(6) [Reserved]

(7) You must submit the initial annual report for your centrifugal compressor affected facility as required in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (3).

(8) You must maintain the records as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(2), (6) through (11), and (17), as applicable.

(c) To achieve initial compliance with the standards for each reciprocating compressor affected facility you must comply with paragraphs (c)(1) through (4) of this section.

(1) If complying with § 60.5385a(a)(1) or (2), during the initial compliance period, you must continuously monitor the number of hours of operation or track the number of months since the last rod packing replacement.

(2) If complying with § 60.5385a(a)(3), you must operate the rod packing emissions collection system under negative pressure and route emissions to a process through a closed vent system

that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(a) and (d).

(3) You must submit the initial annual report for your reciprocating compressor as required in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (4).

(4) You must maintain the records as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(3) for each reciprocating compressor affected facility.

(d) To achieve initial compliance with methane and VOC emission standards for your pneumatic controller affected facility you must comply with the requirements specified in paragraphs (d)(1) through (6) of this section, as applicable.

(1) You must demonstrate initial compliance by maintaining records as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(4)(ii) of your determination that the use of a pneumatic controller affected facility with a bleed rate greater than the applicable standard is required as specified in § 60.5390a(b)(1) or (c)(1).

(2) If you own or operate a pneumatic controller affected facility located at a natural gas processing plant, your pneumatic controller must be driven by a gas other than natural gas, resulting in zero natural gas emissions.

(3) If you own or operate a pneumatic controller affected facility located other than at a natural gas processing plant, the controller manufacturer's design specifications for the controller must indicate that the controller emits less than or equal to 6 standard cubic feet of gas per hour.

(4) You must tag each new pneumatic controller affected facility according to the requirements of § 60.5390a(b)(2) or (c)(2).

(5) You must include the information in paragraph (d)(1) of this section and a listing of the pneumatic controller affected facilities specified in paragraphs (d)(2) and (3) of this section in the initial annual report submitted for your pneumatic controller affected facilities constructed, modified or reconstructed during the period covered by the annual report according to the requirements of § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (5).

(6) You must maintain the records as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(4) for each pneumatic controller affected facility.

(e) To achieve initial compliance with emission standards for your pneumatic pump affected facility you must comply with the requirements specified in paragraphs (e)(1) through (7) of this section, as applicable.

(1) If you own or operate a pneumatic pump affected facility located at a natural gas processing plant, your pneumatic pump must be driven by a gas other than natural gas, resulting in zero natural gas emissions.

(2) If you own or operate a pneumatic pump affected facility not located at a natural gas processing plant, you must reduce emissions in accordance § 60.5393a(b)(1) or (b)(2), and you must collect the pneumatic pump emissions through a closed vent system that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(a) and (d).

(3) If you own or operate a pneumatic pump affected facility not located at a natural gas processing plant and there is no control device or process available on site, you must submit the certification in 60.5420a(b)(8)(i)(A).

(4) If you own or operate a pneumatic pump affected facility not located at a natural gas processing plant or a greenfield site, and you are unable to route to an existing control device due to technical infeasibility, and you are unable to route to a process, you must submit the certification in § 60.5420a(b)(8)(i)(B).

(5) If you own or operate a pneumatic pump affected facility not located other than at a natural gas processing plant and you reduce emissions in accordance with § 60.5393a(b)(4), you must collect the pneumatic pump emissions through a closed vent system that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(c) and (d).

(6) You must submit the initial annual report for your pneumatic pump affected facility required in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (8).

(7) You must maintain the records as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(6), (8) through (10), (16), and (17), as applicable, for each pneumatic pump affected facility.

(f) For affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants, initial compliance with the methane and VOC standards is demonstrated if you are in compliance with the requirements of § 60.5400a.

(g) For sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants, initial compliance is demonstrated according to paragraphs (g)(1) through (3) of this section.

(1) To determine compliance with the standards for SO₂ specified in § 60.5405a(a), during the initial performance test as required by § 60.8, the minimum required sulfur dioxide emission reduction efficiency (Z_i) is compared to the emission reduction efficiency (R) achieved by the sulfur recovery technology as specified in paragraphs (g)(1)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) If $R \geq Z_i$, your affected facility is in compliance.

(ii) If $R < Z_i$, your affected facility is not in compliance.

(2) The emission reduction efficiency (R) achieved by the sulfur reduction

technology must be determined using the procedures in § 60.5406a(c)(1).

(3) You must submit the results of paragraphs (g)(1) and (2) of this section in the initial annual report submitted for your sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants.

(h) For each storage vessel affected facility, you must comply with paragraphs (h)(1) through (6) of this section. You must demonstrate initial compliance by August 2, 2016, or within 60 days after startup, whichever is later.

(1) You must determine the potential VOC emission rate as specified in § 60.5365a(e).

(2) You must reduce VOC emissions in accordance with § 60.5395a(a).

(3) If you use a control device to reduce emissions, you must equip the storage vessel with a cover that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(b) and is connected through a closed vent system that meets the requirements of § 60.5411a(c) and (d) to a control device that meets the conditions specified in § 60.5412a(d) within 60 days after startup for storage vessels constructed, modified or reconstructed at well sites with no other wells in production, or upon startup for storage vessels constructed, modified or reconstructed at well sites with one or more wells already in production.

(4) You must conduct an initial performance test as required in § 60.5413a within 180 days after initial startup or within 180 days of August 2, 2016, whichever is later, and you must comply with the continuous compliance requirements in § 60.5415a(e).

(5) You must submit the information required for your storage vessel affected facility in your initial annual report as specified in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (6).

(6) You must maintain the records required for your storage vessel affected facility, as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(5) through (8), (12) through (14), and (17), as applicable, for each storage vessel affected facility.

(i) For each storage vessel affected facility that complies by using a floating roof, you must submit a statement that you are complying with § 60.112(b)(a)(1) or (2) in accordance with § 60.5395a(b)(2) with the initial annual report specified in § 60.5420a(b).

(j) To achieve initial compliance with the fugitive emission standards for each collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site and each collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station, you must comply with paragraphs (j)(1) through (5) of this section.

(1) You must develop a fugitive emissions monitoring plan as required in § 60.5397a(b)(c), and (d).

(2) You must conduct an initial monitoring survey as required in § 60.5397a(f).

(3) You must maintain the records specified in § 60.5420a(c)(15).

(4) You must repair each identified source of fugitive emissions for each affected facility as required in § 60.5397a(h).

(5) You must submit the initial annual report for each collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site and each collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station compressor station as required in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (7).

§ 60.5411a What additional requirements must I meet to determine initial compliance for my covers and closed vent systems routing emissions from centrifugal compressor wet seal fluid degassing systems, reciprocating compressors, pneumatic pumps and storage vessels?

You must meet the applicable requirements of this section for each cover and closed vent system used to comply with the emission standards for your centrifugal compressor wet seal degassing systems, reciprocating compressors, pneumatic pumps and storage vessels.

(a) Closed vent system requirements for reciprocating compressors, centrifugal compressor wet seal degassing systems and pneumatic pumps.

(1) You must design the closed vent system to route all gases, vapors, and fumes emitted from the reciprocating compressor rod packing emissions collection system, the wet seal fluid degassing system or pneumatic pump to a control device or to a process. For reciprocating and centrifugal compressors, the closed vent system must route all gases, vapors, and fumes to a control device that meets the requirements specified in § 60.5412a(a) through (c).

(2) You must design and operate the closed vent system with no detectable emissions as demonstrated by § 60.5416a(b).

(3) You must meet the requirements specified in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section if the closed vent system contains one or more bypass devices that could be used to divert all or a portion of the gases, vapors, or fumes from entering the control device.

(i) Except as provided in paragraph (a)(3)(ii) of this section, you must comply with either paragraph (a)(3)(i)(A) or (B) of this section for each bypass device.

(A) You must properly install, calibrate, maintain, and operate a flow indicator at the inlet to the bypass device that could divert the stream away from the control device or process to the atmosphere that is capable of taking periodic readings as specified in § 60.5416a(a)(4)(i) and sounds an alarm, or initiates notification via remote alarm to the nearest field office, when the bypass device is open such that the stream is being, or could be, diverted away from the control device or process to the atmosphere. You must maintain records of each time the alarm is activated according to § 60.5420a(c)(8).

(B) You must secure the bypass device valve installed at the inlet to the bypass device in the non-diverting position using a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration.

(i) Low leg drains, high point bleeds, analyzer vents, open-ended valves or lines, and safety devices are not subject to the requirements of paragraph (a)(3)(i) of this section.

(b) Cover requirements for storage vessels and centrifugal compressor wet seal fluid degassing systems.

(1) The cover and all openings on the cover (e.g., access hatches, sampling ports, pressure relief devices and gauge wells) shall form a continuous impermeable barrier over the entire surface area of the liquid in the storage vessel or wet seal fluid degassing system.

(2) Each cover opening shall be secured in a closed, sealed position (e.g., covered by a gasketed lid or cap) whenever material is in the unit on which the cover is installed except during those times when it is necessary to use an opening as follows:

(i) To add material to, or remove material from the unit (this includes openings necessary to equalize or balance the internal pressure of the unit following changes in the level of the material in the unit);

(ii) To inspect or sample the material in the unit;

(iii) To inspect, maintain, repair, or replace equipment located inside the unit; or

(iv) To vent liquids, gases, or fumes from the unit through a closed vent system designed and operated in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (a) or (c), and (d), of this section to a control device or to a process.

(3) Each storage vessel thief hatch shall be equipped, maintained and operated with a weighted mechanism or equivalent, to ensure that the lid remains properly seated and sealed under normal operating conditions, including such times when working,

standing/breathing, and flash emissions may be generated. You must select gasket material for the hatch based on composition of the fluid in the storage vessel and weather conditions.

(c) Closed vent system requirements for storage vessel affected facilities using a control device or routing emissions to a process.

(1) You must design the closed vent system to route all gases, vapors, and fumes emitted from the material in the storage vessel to a control device that meets the requirements specified in § 60.5412a(c) and (d), or to a process.

(2) You must design and operate a closed vent system with no detectable emissions, as determined using olfactory, visual and auditory inspections.

(3) You must meet the requirements specified in paragraphs (c)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section if the closed vent system contains one or more bypass devices that could be used to divert all or a portion of the gases, vapors, or fumes from entering the control device or to a process.

(i) Except as provided in paragraph (c)(3)(ii) of this section, you must comply with either paragraph (c)(3)(i)(A) or (B) of this section for each bypass device.

(A) You must properly install, calibrate, maintain, and operate a flow indicator at the inlet to the bypass device that could divert the stream away from the control device or process to the atmosphere that sounds an alarm, or initiates notification via remote alarm to the nearest field office, when the bypass device is open such that the stream is being, or could be, diverted away from the control device or process to the atmosphere. You must maintain records of each time the alarm is activated according to § 60.5420a(c)(8).

(B) You must secure the bypass device valve installed at the inlet to the bypass device in the non-diverting position using a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration.

(ii) Low leg drains, high point bleeds, analyzer vents, open-ended valves or lines, and safety devices are not subject to the requirements of paragraph (c)(3)(i) of this section.

(d) Closed vent systems requirements for centrifugal compressor wet seal fluid degassing systems, reciprocating compressors, pneumatic pumps and storage vessels using a control device or routing emissions to a process.

(1) You must conduct an assessment that the closed vent system is of sufficient design and capacity to ensure that all emissions from the storage vessel are routed to the control device and that the control device is of

sufficient design and capacity to accommodate all emissions from the affected facility and have it certified by a qualified professional engineer in accordance with paragraphs (d)(1)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) You must provide the following certification, signed and dated by the qualified professional engineer: "I certify that the closed vent system design and capacity assessment was prepared under my direction or supervision. I further certify that the closed vent system design and capacity assessment was conducted and this report was prepared pursuant to the requirements of subpart OOOOa of 40 CFR part 60. Based on my professional knowledge and experience, and inquiry of personnel involved in the assessment, the certification submitted herein is true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are penalties for knowingly submitting false information."

(ii) The assessment shall be prepared under the direction or supervision of the qualified professional engineer who signs the certification in paragraph (d)(1)(i) of this section.

§ 60.5412a What additional requirements must I meet for determining initial compliance with control devices used to comply with the emission standards for my centrifugal compressor, and storage vessel affected facilities?

You must meet the applicable requirements of this section for each control device used to comply with the emission standards for your centrifugal compressor affected facility, or storage vessel affected facility.

(a) Each control device used to meet the emission reduction standard in § 60.5380a(a)(1) for your centrifugal compressor affected facility must be installed according to paragraphs (a)(1) through (3) of this section. As an alternative, you may install a control device model tested under § 60.5413a(d), which meets the criteria in § 60.5413a(d)(11) and meet the continuous compliance requirements in § 60.5413a(e).

(1) Each combustion device (e.g., thermal vapor incinerator, catalytic vapor incinerator, boiler, or process heater) must be designed and operated in accordance with one of the performance requirements specified in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) through (iv) of this section.

(i) You must reduce the mass content of methane and VOC in the gases vented to the device by 95.0 percent by weight or greater as determined in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413a(b), with the exceptions noted in § 60.5413a(a).

(ii) You must reduce the concentration of TOC in the exhaust gases at the outlet to the device to a level equal to or less than 275 parts per million by volume as propane on a wet basis corrected to 3 percent oxygen as determined in accordance with the applicable requirements of § 60.5413a(b), with the exceptions noted in § 60.5413a(a).

(iii) You must operate at a minimum temperature of 760 °Celsius, provided the control device has demonstrated, during the performance test conducted under § 60.5413a(b), that combustion zone temperature is an indicator of destruction efficiency.

(iv) If a boiler or process heater is used as the control device, then you must introduce the vent stream into the flame zone of the boiler or process heater.

(2) Each vapor recovery device (*e.g.*, carbon adsorption system or condenser) or other non-destructive control device must be designed and operated to reduce the mass content of methane and VOC in the gases vented to the device by 95.0 percent by weight or greater as determined in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413a(b). As an alternative to the performance testing requirements, you may demonstrate initial compliance by conducting a design analysis for vapor recovery devices according to the requirements of § 60.5413a(c).

(3) You must design and operate a flare in accordance with the requirements of § 60.18(b), and you must conduct the compliance determination using Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part to determine visible emissions.

(b) You must operate each control device installed on your centrifugal compressor affected facility in accordance with the requirements specified in paragraphs (b)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) You must operate each control device used to comply with this subpart at all times when gases, vapors, and fumes are vented from the wet seal fluid degassing system affected facility as required under § 60.5380a(a)(1) through the closed vent system to the control device. You may vent more than one affected facility to a control device used to comply with this subpart.

(2) For each control device monitored in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5417a(a) through (g), you must demonstrate compliance according to the requirements of § 60.5415a(b)(2), as applicable.

(c) For each carbon adsorption system used as a control device to meet the requirements of paragraph (a)(2) or

(d)(2) of this section, you must manage the carbon in accordance with the requirements specified in paragraphs (c)(1) or (2) of this section.

(1) Following the initial startup of the control device, you must replace all carbon in the control device with fresh carbon on a regular, predetermined time interval that is no longer than the carbon service life established according to § 60.5413a(c)(2) or (3) or according to the design required in paragraph (d)(2) of this section, for the carbon adsorption system. You must maintain records identifying the schedule for replacement and records of each carbon replacement as required in § 60.5420a(c)(10) and (12).

(2) You must either regenerate, reactivate, or burn the spent carbon removed from the carbon adsorption system in one of the units specified in paragraphs (c)(2)(i) through (vi) of this section.

(i) Regenerate or reactivate the spent carbon in a unit for which you have been issued a final permit under 40 CFR part 270 that implements the requirements of 40 CFR part 264, subpart X.

(ii) Regenerate or reactivate the spent carbon in a unit equipped with an operating organic air emission controls in accordance with an emissions standard for VOC under another subpart in 40 CFR part 63 or this part.

(iii) Burn the spent carbon in a hazardous waste incinerator for which the owner or operator complies with the requirements of 40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE and has submitted a Notification of Compliance under 40 CFR 63.1207(j).

(iv) Burn the spent carbon in a hazardous waste boiler or industrial furnace for which the owner or operator complies with the requirements of 40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE and has submitted a Notification of Compliance under 40 CFR 63.1207(j).

(v) Burn the spent carbon in an industrial furnace for which you have been issued a final permit under 40 CFR part 270 that implements the requirements of 40 CFR part 266, subpart H.

(vi) Burn the spent carbon in an industrial furnace that you have designed and operated in accordance with the interim status requirements of 40 CFR part 266, subpart H.

(d) Each control device used to meet the emission reduction standard in § 60.5395a(a)(2) for your storage vessel affected facility must be installed according to paragraphs (d)(1) through (4) of this section, as applicable. As an alternative to paragraph (d)(1) of this section, you may install a control device model tested under § 60.5413a(d),

which meets the criteria in § 60.5413a(d)(11) and meet the continuous compliance requirements in § 60.5413a(e).

(1) For each combustion control device (*e.g.*, thermal vapor incinerator, catalytic vapor incinerator, boiler, or process heater) you must meet the requirements in paragraphs (d)(1)(i) through (iv) of this section.

(i) Ensure that each enclosed combustion control device is maintained in a leak free condition.

(ii) Install and operate a continuous burning pilot flame.

(iii) Operate the combustion control device with no visible emissions, except for periods not to exceed a total of 1 minute during any 15 minute period. A visible emissions test using section 11 of EPA Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part must be performed at least once every calendar month, separated by at least 15 days between each test. The observation period shall be 15 minutes. Devices failing the visible emissions test must follow manufacturer's repair instructions, if available, or best combustion engineering practice as outlined in the unit inspection and maintenance plan, to return the unit to compliant operation. All inspection, repair and maintenance activities for each unit must be recorded in a maintenance and repair log and must be available for inspection. Following return to operation from maintenance or repair activity, each device must pass a Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part visual observation as described in this paragraph.

(iv) Each enclosed combustion control device (*e.g.*, thermal vapor incinerator, catalytic vapor incinerator, boiler, or process heater) must be designed and operated in accordance with one of the performance requirements specified in paragraphs (A) through (D) of this section.

(A) You must reduce the mass content of VOC in the gases vented to the device by 95.0 percent by weight or greater as determined in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413a(b).

(B) You must reduce the concentration of TOC in the exhaust gases at the outlet to the device to a level equal to or less than 275 parts per million by volume as propane on a wet basis corrected to 3 percent oxygen as determined in accordance with the applicable requirements of § 60.5413a(b).

(C) You must operate at a minimum temperature of 760 °Celsius, provided the control device has demonstrated, during the performance test conducted under § 60.5413a(b), that combustion

zone temperature is an indicator of destruction efficiency.

(D) If a boiler or process heater is used as the control device, then you must introduce the vent stream into the flame zone of the boiler or process heater.

(2) Each vapor recovery device (e.g., carbon adsorption system or condenser) or other non-destructive control device must be designed and operated to reduce the mass content of VOC in the gases vented to the device by 95.0 percent by weight or greater. A carbon replacement schedule must be included in the design of the carbon adsorption system.

(3) You must design and operate a flare in accordance with the requirements of § 60.18(b), and you must conduct the compliance determination using Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part to determine visible emissions.

(4) You must operate each control device used to comply with this subpart at all times when gases, vapors, and fumes are vented from the storage vessel affected facility through the closed vent system to the control device. You may vent more than one affected facility to a control device used to comply with this subpart.

§ 60.5413a What are the performance testing procedures for control devices used to demonstrate compliance at my centrifugal compressor and storage vessel affected facilities?

This section applies to the performance testing of control devices used to demonstrate compliance with the emissions standards for your centrifugal compressor affected facility or storage vessel affected facility. You must demonstrate that a control device achieves the performance requirements of § 60.5412a(a)(1) or (2) or (d)(1) or (2) using the performance test methods and procedures specified in this section. For condensers and carbon adsorbers, you may use a design analysis as specified in paragraph (c) of this section in lieu of complying with paragraph (b) of this section. In addition, this section contains the requirements for enclosed combustion control device performance tests conducted by the manufacturer applicable to storage vessel and centrifugal compressor affected facilities.

(a) Performance test exemptions. You are exempt from the requirements to conduct performance tests and design analyses if you use any of the control devices described in paragraphs (a)(1) through (7) of this section.

(1) A flare that is designed and operated in accordance with § 60.18(b). You must conduct the compliance

determination using Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part to determine visible emissions.

(2) A boiler or process heater with a design heat input capacity of 44 megawatts or greater.

(3) A boiler or process heater into which the vent stream is introduced with the primary fuel or is used as the primary fuel.

(4) A boiler or process heater burning hazardous waste for which you have been issued a final permit under 40 CFR part 270 and comply with the requirements of 40 CFR part 266, subpart H; you have certified compliance with the interim status requirements of 40 CFR part 266, subpart H; you have submitted a Notification of Compliance under 40 CFR 63.1207(j) and comply with the requirements of 40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE; or you comply with 40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE and will submit a Notification of Compliance under 40 CFR 63.1207(j) by the date specified in § 60.5420(b)(9) for submitting the initial performance test report.

(5) A hazardous waste incinerator for which you have submitted a Notification of Compliance under 40 CFR 63.1207(j), or for which you will submit a Notification of Compliance under 40 CFR 63.1207(j) by the date specified in § 60.5420a(b)(9) for submitting the initial performance test report, and you comply with the requirements of 40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE.

(6) A performance test is waived in accordance with § 60.8(b).

(7) A control device whose model can be demonstrated to meet the performance requirements of § 60.5412a(a)(1) or (d)(1) through a performance test conducted by the manufacturer, as specified in paragraph (d) of this section.

(b) Test methods and procedures. You must use the test methods and procedures specified in paragraphs (b)(1) through (5) of this section, as applicable, for each performance test conducted to demonstrate that a control device meets the requirements of § 60.5412a(a)(1) or (2) or (d)(1) or (2). You must conduct the initial and periodic performance tests according to the schedule specified in paragraph (b)(5) of this section. Each performance test must consist of a minimum of 3 test runs. Each run must be at least 1 hour long.

(1) You must use Method 1 or 1A of appendix A-1 of this part, as appropriate, to select the sampling sites specified in paragraphs (b)(1)(i) and (ii) of this section. Any references to

particulate mentioned in Methods 1 and 1A do not apply to this section.

(i) Sampling sites must be located at the inlet of the first control device and at the outlet of the final control device to determine compliance with a control device percent reduction requirement.

(ii) The sampling site must be located at the outlet of the combustion device to determine compliance with a TOC exhaust gas concentration limit.

(2) You must determine the gas volumetric flowrate using Method 2, 2A, 2C, or 2D of appendix A-2 of this part, as appropriate.

(3) To determine compliance with the control device percent reduction performance requirement in § 60.5412a(a)(1)(i), (a)(2) or (d)(1)(iv)(A), you must use Method 25A of appendix A-7 of this part. You must use Method 4 of appendix A-3 of this part to convert the Method 25A results to a dry basis. You must use the procedures in paragraphs (b)(3)(i) through (iii) of this section to calculate percent reduction efficiency.

(i) You must compute the mass rate of TOC using the following equations:

$$E_i = K_2 C_i M_p Q_i$$

$$E_o = K_2 C_o M_p Q_o$$

Where:

E_i , E_o = Mass rate of TOC at the inlet and outlet of the control device, respectively, dry basis, kilograms per hour.

K_2 = Constant, 2.494×10^{-6} (parts per million) (gram-mole per standard cubic meter) (kilogram/gram) (minute/hour), where standard temperature (gram-mole per standard cubic meter) is 20 °Celsius.

C_i , C_o = Concentration of TOC, as propane, of the gas stream as measured by Method 25A at the inlet and outlet of the control device, respectively, dry basis, parts per million by volume.

M_p = Molecular weight of propane, 44.1 gram/gram-mole.

Q_i , Q_o = Flowrate of gas stream at the inlet and outlet of the control device, respectively, dry standard cubic meter per minute.

(ii) You must calculate the percent reduction in TOC as follows:

$$R_{cd} = \frac{E_i - E_o}{E_i} * 100\%$$

Where:

R_{cd} = Control efficiency of control device, percent.

E_i , = Mass rate of TOC at the inlet to the control device as calculated under paragraph (b)(3)(i) of this section, kilograms per hour.

E_o = Mass rate of TOC at the outlet of the control device, as calculated under paragraph (b)(3)(i) of this section, kilograms per hour.

(iii) If the vent stream entering a boiler or process heater with a design

capacity less than 44 megawatts is introduced with the combustion air or as a secondary fuel, you must determine the weight-percent reduction of total TOC across the device by comparing the TOC in all combusted vent streams and primary and secondary fuels with the TOC exiting the device, respectively.

(4) You must use Method 25A of appendix A-7 of this part to measure TOC, as propane, to determine compliance with the TOC exhaust gas concentration limit specified in § 60.5412a(a)(1)(ii) or (d)(1)(iv)(B). You may also use Method 18 of appendix A-6 of this part to measure methane and ethane. You may subtract the measured concentration of methane and ethane from the Method 25A measurement to demonstrate compliance with the concentration limit. You must determine the concentration in parts per million by volume on a wet basis and correct it to 3 percent oxygen, using the procedures in paragraphs (b)(4)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) If you use Method 18 to determine methane and ethane, you must take either an integrated sample or a minimum of four grab samples per hour. If grab sampling is used, then the samples must be taken at approximately equal intervals in time, such as 15-minute intervals during the run. You must determine the average methane and ethane concentration per run. The samples must be taken during the same time as the Method 25A sample.

(ii) You may subtract the concentration of methane and ethane from the Method 25A TOC, as propane, concentration for each run.

(iii) You must correct the TOC concentration (minus methane and ethane, if applicable) to 3 percent oxygen as specified in paragraphs (b)(4)(iii)(A) and (B) of this section.

(A) You must use the emission rate correction factor for excess air, integrated sampling and analysis procedures of Method 3A or 3B of appendix A-2 of this part, ASTM D6522-00 (Reapproved 2005), or ANSI/ASME PTC 19.10-1981, Part 10 (manual portion only) (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17) to determine the oxygen concentration. The samples must be taken during the same time that the samples are taken for determining TOC concentration.

(B) You must correct the TOC concentration for percent oxygen as follows:

$$C_c = C_m \left(\frac{17.9}{20.9 - \%O_{2m}} \right)$$

Where:

C_c = TOC concentration, as propane, corrected to 3 percent oxygen, parts per million by volume on a wet basis.

C_m = TOC concentration, as propane, (minus methane and ethane, if applicable), parts per million by volume on a wet basis.

$\%O_{2m}$ = Concentration of oxygen, percent by volume as measured, wet.

(5) You must conduct performance tests according to the schedule specified in paragraphs (b)(5)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) You must conduct an initial performance test within 180 days after initial startup for your affected facility. You must submit the performance test results as required in § 60.5420a(b)(9).

(ii) You must conduct periodic performance tests for all control devices required to conduct initial performance tests except as specified in paragraphs (b)(5)(ii)(A) and (B) of this section. You must conduct the first periodic performance test no later than 60 months after the initial performance test required in paragraph (b)(5)(i) of this section. You must conduct subsequent periodic performance tests at intervals no longer than 60 months following the previous periodic performance test or whenever you desire to establish a new operating limit. You must submit the periodic performance test results as specified in § 60.5420a(b)(9).

(A) A control device whose model is tested under, and meets the criteria of paragraph (d) of this section. For centrifugal compressor affected facilities, if you do not continuously monitor the gas flow rate in accordance with § 60.5417a(d)(1)(viii), then you must comply with the periodic performance testing requirements of paragraph (b)(5)(ii).

(B) A combustion control device tested under paragraph (b) of this section that meets the outlet TOC performance level specified in § 60.5412a(a)(1)(ii) or (d)(1)(iv)(B) and that establishes a correlation between firebox or combustion chamber temperature and the TOC performance level. For centrifugal compressor affected facilities, you must establish a limit on temperature in accordance with § 60.5417a(f) and continuously monitor the temperature as required by § 60.5417a(d).

(c) *Control device design analysis to meet the requirements of § 60.5412a(a)(2) or (d)(2).* (1) For a condenser, the design analysis must include an analysis of the vent stream composition, constituent concentrations, flowrate, relative humidity and temperature and must establish the design outlet organic compound concentration level, design average temperature of the condenser

exhaust vent stream and the design average temperatures of the coolant fluid at the condenser inlet and outlet.

(2) For a regenerable carbon adsorption system, the design analysis shall include the vent stream composition, constituent concentrations, flowrate, relative humidity and temperature and shall establish the design exhaust vent stream organic compound concentration level, adsorption cycle time, number and capacity of carbon beds, type and working capacity of activated carbon used for the carbon beds, design total regeneration stream flow over the period of each complete carbon bed regeneration cycle, design carbon bed temperature after regeneration, design carbon bed regeneration time and design service life of the carbon.

(3) For a nonregenerable carbon adsorption system, such as a carbon canister, the design analysis shall include the vent stream composition, constituent concentrations, flowrate, relative humidity and temperature and shall establish the design exhaust vent stream organic compound concentration level, capacity of the carbon bed, type and working capacity of activated carbon used for the carbon bed and design carbon replacement interval based on the total carbon working capacity of the control device and source operating schedule. In addition, these systems shall incorporate dual carbon canisters in case of emission breakthrough occurring in one canister.

(4) If you and the Administrator do not agree on a demonstration of control device performance using a design analysis, then you must perform a performance test in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (b) of this section to resolve the disagreement. The Administrator may choose to have an authorized representative observe the performance test.

(d) *Performance testing for combustion control devices—manufacturers' performance test.* (1) This paragraph (d) applies to the performance testing of a combustion control device conducted by the device manufacturer. The manufacturer must demonstrate that a specific model of control device achieves the performance requirements in paragraph (d)(11) of this section by conducting a performance test as specified in paragraphs (d)(2) through (10) of this section. You must submit a test report for each combustion control device in accordance with the requirements in paragraph (d)(12) of this section.

(2) Performance testing must consist of three 1-hour (or longer) test runs for each of the four firing rate settings

specified in paragraphs (d)(2)(i) through (iv) of this section, making a total of 12 test runs per test. Propene (propylene) gas must be used for the testing fuel. All fuel analyses must be performed by an independent third-party laboratory (not affiliated with the control device manufacturer or fuel supplier).

(i) 90–100 percent of maximum design rate (fixed rate).

(ii) 70–100–70 percent (ramp up, ramp down). Begin the test at 70 percent of the maximum design rate. During the first 5 minutes, incrementally ramp the firing rate to 100 percent of the maximum design rate. Hold at 100 percent for 5 minutes. In the 10–15 minute time range, incrementally ramp back down to 70 percent of the maximum design rate. Repeat three more times for a total of 60 minutes of sampling.

(iii) 30–70–30 percent (ramp up, ramp down). Begin the test at 30 percent of the maximum design rate. During the first 5 minutes, incrementally ramp the firing rate to 70 percent of the maximum design rate. Hold at 70 percent for 5 minutes. In the 10–15 minute time range, incrementally ramp back down to 30 percent of the maximum design rate. Repeat three more times for a total of 60 minutes of sampling.

(iv) 0–30–0 percent (ramp up, ramp down). Begin the test at the minimum firing rate. During the first 5 minutes, incrementally ramp the firing rate to 30 percent of the maximum design rate. Hold at 30 percent for 5 minutes. In the 10–15 minute time range, incrementally ramp back down to the minimum firing rate. Repeat three more times for a total of 60 minutes of sampling.

(3) All models employing multiple enclosures must be tested simultaneously and with all burners operational. Results must be reported for each enclosure individually and for the average of the emissions from all interconnected combustion enclosures/chambers. Control device operating data must be collected continuously throughout the performance test using an electronic Data Acquisition System. A graphic presentation or strip chart of the control device operating data and emissions test data must be included in the test report in accordance with paragraph (d)(12) of this section. Inlet fuel meter data may be manually recorded provided that all inlet fuel data readings are included in the final report.

(4) Inlet testing must be conducted as specified in paragraphs (d)(4)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) The inlet gas flow metering system must be located in accordance with Method 2A of appendix A–1 of this part (or other approved procedure) to

measure inlet gas flow rate at the control device inlet location. You must position the fitting for filling fuel sample containers a minimum of eight pipe diameters upstream of any inlet gas flow monitoring meter.

(ii) Inlet flow rate must be determined using Method 2A of appendix A–1 of this part. Record the start and stop reading for each 60-minute THC test. Record the gas pressure and temperature at 5-minute intervals throughout each 60-minute test.

(5) Inlet gas sampling must be conducted as specified in paragraphs (d)(5)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) At the inlet gas sampling location, securely connect a Silonite-coated stainless steel evacuated canister fitted with a flow controller sufficient to fill the canister over a 3-hour period. Filling must be conducted as specified in paragraphs (d)(5)(i)(A) through (C) of this section.

(A) Open the canister sampling valve at the beginning of each test run, and close the canister at the end of each test run.

(B) Fill one canister across the three test runs such that one composite fuel sample exists for each test condition.

(C) Label the canisters individually and record sample information on a chain of custody form.

(ii) Analyze each inlet gas sample using the methods in paragraphs (d)(5)(ii)(A) through (C) of this section. You must include the results in the test report required by paragraph (d)(12) of this section.

(A) Hydrocarbon compounds containing between one and five atoms of carbon plus benzene using ASTM D1945–03 (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17).

(B) Hydrogen (H₂), carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO₂), nitrogen (N₂), oxygen (O₂) using ASTM D1945–03 (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17).

(C) Higher heating value using ASTM D3588–98 or ASTM D4891–89 (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17).

(6) Outlet testing must be conducted in accordance with the criteria in paragraphs (d)(6)(i) through (v) of this section.

(i) Sample and flow rate must be measured in accordance with paragraphs (d)(6)(i)(A) and (B) of this section.

(A) The outlet sampling location must be a minimum of four equivalent stack diameters downstream from the highest peak flame or any other flow disturbance, and a minimum of one equivalent stack diameter upstream of the exit or any other flow disturbance.

A minimum of two sample ports must be used.

(B) Flow rate must be measured using Method 1 of appendix A–1 of this part for determining flow measurement traverse point location, and Method 2 of appendix A–1 of this part for measuring duct velocity. If low flow conditions are encountered (*i.e.*, velocity pressure differentials less than 0.05 inches of water) during the performance test, a more sensitive manometer must be used to obtain an accurate flow profile.

(ii) Molecular weight and excess air must be determined as specified in paragraph (d)(7) of this section.

(iii) Carbon monoxide must be determined as specified in paragraph (d)(8) of this section.

(iv) THC must be determined as specified in paragraph (d)(9) of this section.

(v) Visible emissions must be determined as specified in paragraph (d)(10) of this section.

(7) Molecular weight and excess air determination must be performed as specified in paragraphs (d)(7)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) An integrated bag sample must be collected during the moisture test required by Method 4 of appendix A–3 of this part following the procedure specified in (d)(7)(i)(A) and (B) of this section. Analyze the bag sample using a gas chromatograph-thermal conductivity detector (GC–TCD) analysis meeting the criteria in paragraphs (d)(7)(i)(C) and (D) of this section.

(A) Collect the integrated sample throughout the entire test, and collect representative volumes from each traverse location.

(B) Purge the sampling line with stack gas before opening the valve and beginning to fill the bag. Clearly label each bag and record sample information on a chain of custody form.

(C) The bag contents must be vigorously mixed prior to the gas chromatograph analysis.

(D) The GC–TCD calibration procedure in Method 3C of appendix A–2 of this part must be modified by using EPA Alt-045 as follows: For the initial calibration, triplicate injections of any single concentration must agree within 5 percent of their mean to be valid. The calibration response factor for a single concentration re-check must be within 10 percent of the original calibration response factor for that concentration. If this criterion is not met, repeat the initial calibration using at least three concentration levels.

(ii) Calculate and report the molecular weight of oxygen, carbon dioxide, methane and nitrogen in the integrated bag sample and include in the test

report specified in paragraph (d)(12) of this section. Moisture must be determined using Method 4 of appendix A-3 of this part. Traverse both ports with the sampling train required by Method 4 of appendix A-3 of this part during each test run. Ambient air must not be introduced into the integrated bag sample required by Method 3C of appendix A-2 of this part during the port change.

(iii) Excess air must be determined using resultant data from the EPA Method 3C tests and EPA Method 3B of appendix A-2 of this part, equation 3B-1, or ANSI/ASME PTC 19.10-1981, Part 10 (manual portion only) (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17).

(8) Carbon monoxide must be determined using Method 10 of appendix A-4 of this part. Run the test simultaneously with Method 25A of appendix A-7 of this part using the same sampling points. An instrument range of 0-10 parts per million by volume-dry (ppmvd) is recommended.

(9) Total hydrocarbon determination must be performed as specified by in paragraphs (d)(9)(i) through (vii) of this section.

(i) Conduct THC sampling using Method 25A of appendix A-7 of this part, except that the option for locating the probe in the center 10 percent of the stack is not allowed. The THC probe must be traversed to 16.7 percent, 50 percent, and 83.3 percent of the stack diameter during each test run.

(ii) A valid test must consist of three Method 25A tests, each no less than 60 minutes in duration.

(iii) A 0-10 parts per million by volume-wet (ppmvw) (as propane) measurement range is preferred; as an alternative a 0-30 ppmvw (as carbon) measurement range may be used.

(iv) Calibration gases must be propane in air and be certified through EPA Protocol 1—"EPA Traceability Protocol for Assay and Certification of Gaseous Calibration Standards," (incorporated by reference as specified in § 60.17).

(v) THC measurements must be reported in terms of ppmvw as propane.

(vi) THC results must be corrected to 3 percent CO₂, as measured by Method 3C of appendix A-2 of this part. You must use the following equation for this diluent concentration correction:

$$C_{\text{corr}} = C_{\text{meas}} \left(\frac{3}{\text{CO}_{2\text{meas}}} \right)$$

Where:

C_{meas} = The measured concentration of the pollutant.

CO_{2meas} = The measured concentration of the CO₂ diluent.

3 = The corrected reference concentration of CO₂ diluent.

C_{corr} = The corrected concentration of the pollutant.

(vii) Subtraction of methane or ethane from the THC data is not allowed in determining results.

(10) Visible emissions must be determined using Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part. The test must be performed continuously during each test run. A digital color photograph of the exhaust point, taken from the position of the observer and annotated with date and time, must be taken once per test run and the 12 photos included in the test report specified in paragraph (d)(12) of this section.

(11) *Performance test criteria.* (i) The control device model tested must meet the criteria in paragraphs (d)(11)(i)(A) through (D) of this section. These criteria must be reported in the test report required by paragraph (d)(12) of this section.

(A) Results from Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part determined under paragraph (d)(10) of this section with no indication of visible emissions.

(B) Average results from Method 25A of appendix A-7 of this part determined under paragraph (d)(9) of this section equal to or less than 10.0 ppmvw THC as propane corrected to 3.0 percent CO₂.

(C) Average CO emissions determined under paragraph (d)(8) of this section equal to or less than 10 parts ppmvd, corrected to 3.0 percent CO₂.

(D) Excess air determined under paragraph (d)(7) of this section equal to or greater than 150 percent.

(ii) The manufacturer must determine a maximum inlet gas flow rate which must not be exceeded for each control device model to achieve the criteria in paragraph (d)(11)(iii) of this section. The maximum inlet gas flow rate must be included in the test report required by paragraph (d)(12) of this section.

(iii) A manufacturer must demonstrate a destruction efficiency of at least 95 percent for THC, as propane. A control device model that demonstrates a destruction efficiency of 95 percent for THC, as propane, will meet the control requirement for 95 percent destruction of VOC and methane (if applicable) required under this subpart.

(12) The owner or operator of a combustion control device model tested under this paragraph must submit the information listed in paragraphs (d)(12)(i) through (vi) of this section in the test report required by this section in accordance with § 60.5420a(b)(10). Owners or operators who claim that any of the performance test information being submitted is confidential business information (CBI) must submit a complete file including information

claimed to be CBI, on a compact disc, flash drive, or other commonly used electronic storage media to the EPA. The electronic media must be clearly marked as CBI and mailed to Attn: CBI Document Control Officer; Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS) CBIO Room 521; 109 T.W. Alexander Drive; RTP, NC 27711. The same file with the CBI omitted must be submitted to *Oil_and_Gas_PT@EPA.GOV*.

(i) A full schematic of the control device and dimensions of the device components.

(ii) The maximum net heating value of the device.

(iii) The test fuel gas flow range (in both mass and volume). Include the maximum allowable inlet gas flow rate.

(iv) The air/stream injection/assist ranges, if used.

(v) The test conditions listed in paragraphs (d)(12)(v)(A) through (O) of this section, as applicable for the tested model.

(A) Fuel gas delivery pressure and temperature.

(B) Fuel gas moisture range.

(C) Purge gas usage range.

(D) Condensate (liquid fuel) separation range.

(E) Combustion zone temperature range. This is required for all devices that measure this parameter.

(F) Excess air range.

(G) Flame arrestor(s).

(H) Burner manifold.

(I) Pilot flame indicator.

(J) Pilot flame design fuel and calculated or measured fuel usage.

(K) Tip velocity range.

(L) Momentum flux ratio.

(M) Exit temperature range.

(N) Exit flow rate.

(O) Wind velocity and direction.

(vi) The test report must include all calibration quality assurance/quality control data, calibration gas values, gas cylinder certification, strip charts, or other graphic presentations of the data annotated with test times and calibration values.

(e) *Continuous compliance for combustion control devices tested by the manufacturer in accordance with paragraph (d) of this section.* This paragraph (e) applies to the demonstration of compliance for a combustion control device tested under the provisions in paragraph (d) of this section. Owners or operators must demonstrate that a control device achieves the performance criteria in paragraph (d)(11) of this section by installing a device tested under paragraph (d) of this section, complying with the criteria specified in paragraphs (e)(1) through (8) of this section,

maintaining the records specified in § 60.5420a(c)(2) or (c)(5)(vi) and submitting the report specified in § 60.5420a(b)(10).

(1) The inlet gas flow rate must be equal to or less than the maximum specified by the manufacturer.

(2) A pilot flame must be present at all times of operation.

(3) Devices must be operated with no visible emissions, except for periods not to exceed a total of 1 minute during any 15-minute period. A visible emissions test conducted according to section 11 of EPA Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part must be performed at least once every calendar month, separated by at least 15 days between each test. The observation period shall be 15 minutes.

(4) Devices failing the visible emissions test must follow manufacturer's repair instructions, if available, or best combustion engineering practice as outlined in the unit inspection and maintenance plan, to return the unit to compliant operation. All repairs and maintenance activities for each unit must be recorded in a maintenance and repair log and must be available for inspection.

(5) Following return to operation from maintenance or repair activity, each device must pass a visual observation according to EPA Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part as described in paragraph (e)(3) of this section.

(6) If the owner or operator operates a combustion control device model tested under this section, an electronic copy of the performance test results required by this section shall be submitted via email to *Oil_and_Gas_PT@EPA.GOV* unless the test results for that model of combustion control device are posted at the following Web site: *epa.gov/airquality/oilandgas/*.

(7) Ensure that each enclosed combustion control device is maintained in a leak free condition.

(8) Operate each control device following the manufacturer's written operating instructions, procedures and maintenance schedule to ensure good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions.

§ 60.5415a How do I demonstrate continuous compliance with the standards for my well, centrifugal compressor, reciprocating compressor, pneumatic controller, pneumatic pump, storage vessel, collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site, and collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station affected facilities, and affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?

(a) For each well affected facility, you must demonstrate continuous

compliance by submitting the reports required by § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (2) and maintaining the records for each completion operation specified in § 60.5420a(c)(1).

(b) For each centrifugal compressor affected facility and each pneumatic pump affected facility, you must demonstrate continuous compliance according to paragraph (b)(3) of this section. For each centrifugal compressor affected facility, you also must demonstrate continuous compliance according to paragraphs (b)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) You must reduce methane and VOC emissions from the wet seal fluid degassing system by 95.0 percent or greater.

(2) For each control device used to reduce emissions, you must demonstrate continuous compliance with the performance requirements of § 60.5412a(a) using the procedures specified in paragraphs (b)(2)(i) through (vii) of this section. If you use a condenser as the control device to achieve the requirements specified in § 60.5412a(a)(2), you may demonstrate compliance according to paragraph (b)(2)(viii) of this section. You may switch between compliance with paragraphs (b)(2)(i) through (vii) of this section and compliance with paragraph (b)(2)(viii) of this section only after at least 1 year of operation in compliance with the selected approach. You must provide notification of such a change in the compliance method in the next annual report, following the change.

(i) You must operate below (or above) the site specific maximum (or minimum) parameter value established according to the requirements of § 60.5417a(f)(1).

(ii) You must calculate the daily average of the applicable monitored parameter in accordance with § 60.5417a(e) except that the inlet gas flow rate to the control device must not be averaged.

(iii) Compliance with the operating parameter limit is achieved when the daily average of the monitoring parameter value calculated under paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section is either equal to or greater than the minimum monitoring value or equal to or less than the maximum monitoring value established under paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this section. When performance testing of a combustion control device is conducted by the device manufacturer as specified in § 60.5413a(d), compliance with the operating parameter limit is achieved when the criteria in § 60.5413a(e) are met.

(iv) You must operate the continuous monitoring system required in § 60.5417a(a) at all times the affected source is operating, except for periods of monitoring system malfunctions, repairs associated with monitoring system malfunctions and required monitoring system quality assurance or quality control activities (including, as applicable, system accuracy audits and required zero and span adjustments). A monitoring system malfunction is any sudden, infrequent, not reasonably preventable failure of the monitoring system to provide valid data.

Monitoring system failures that are caused in part by poor maintenance or careless operation are not malfunctions. You are required to complete monitoring system repairs in response to monitoring system malfunctions and to return the monitoring system to operation as expeditiously as practicable.

(v) You may not use data recorded during monitoring system malfunctions, repairs associated with monitoring system malfunctions, or required monitoring system quality assurance or control activities in calculations used to report emissions or operating levels. You must use all the data collected during all other required data collection periods to assess the operation of the control device and associated control system.

(vi) Failure to collect required data is a deviation of the monitoring requirements, except for periods of monitoring system malfunctions, repairs associated with monitoring system malfunctions and required quality monitoring system quality assurance or quality control activities (including, as applicable, system accuracy audits and required zero and span adjustments).

(vii) If you use a combustion control device to meet the requirements of § 60.5412a(a)(1) and you demonstrate compliance using the test procedures specified in § 60.5413a(b), or you use a flare designed and operated in accordance with § 60.18(b), you must comply with paragraphs (b)(2)(vii)(A) through (D) of this section.

(A) A pilot flame must be present at all times of operation.

(B) Devices must be operated with no visible emissions, except for periods not to exceed a total of 1 minute during any 15-minute period. A visible emissions test conducted according to section 11 of EPA Method 22, 40 CFR part 60, appendix A, must be performed at least once every calendar month, separated by at least 15 days between each test. The observation period shall be 15 minutes.

(C) Devices failing the visible emissions test must follow manufacturer's repair instructions, if available, or best combustion engineering practice as outlined in the unit inspection and maintenance plan, to return the unit to compliant operation. All repairs and maintenance activities for each unit must be recorded in a maintenance and repair log and must be available for inspection.

(D) Following return to operation from maintenance or repair activity, each device must pass a Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part visual observation as described in paragraph (b)(2)(vii)(B) of this section.

(viii) If you use a condenser as the control device to achieve the percent reduction performance requirements specified in § 60.5412a(a)(2), you must demonstrate compliance using the procedures in paragraphs (b)(2)(viii)(A) through (E) of this section.

(A) You must establish a site-specific condenser performance curve according to § 60.5417a(f)(2).

(B) You must calculate the daily average condenser outlet temperature in accordance with § 60.5417a(e).

(C) You must determine the condenser efficiency for the current operating day using the daily average condenser outlet temperature calculated under paragraph (b)(2)(viii)(B) of this section and the condenser performance curve established under paragraph (b)(2)(viii)(A) of this section.

(D) Except as provided in paragraphs (b)(2)(viii)(D)(1) and (2) of this section, at the end of each operating day, you must calculate the 365-day rolling average TOC emission reduction, as appropriate, from the condenser efficiencies as determined in paragraph (b)(2)(viii)(C) of this section.

(1) After the compliance dates specified in § 60.5370a(a), if you have less than 120 days of data for determining average TOC emission reduction, you must calculate the average TOC emission reduction for the first 120 days of operation after the compliance date. You have demonstrated compliance with the overall 95.0 percent reduction requirement if the 120-day average TOC emission reduction is equal to or greater than 95.0 percent.

(2) After 120 days and no more than 364 days of operation after the compliance date specified in § 60.5370a(a), you must calculate the average TOC emission reduction as the TOC emission reduction averaged over the number of days between the current day and the applicable compliance date. You have demonstrated compliance with the overall 95.0 percent reduction

requirement if the average TOC emission reduction is equal to or greater than 95.0 percent.

(E) If you have data for 365 days or more of operation, you have demonstrated compliance with the TOC emission reduction if the rolling 365-day average TOC emission reduction calculated in paragraph (b)(2)(viii)(D) of this section is equal to or greater than 95.0 percent.

(3) You must submit the annual reports required by 60.5420a(b)(1) and (3) and maintain the records as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(2), (6) through (11), and (17), as applicable.

(c) For each reciprocating compressor affected facility complying with § 60.5385a(a)(1) or (2), you must demonstrate continuous compliance according to paragraphs (c)(1) through (3) of this section. For each reciprocating compressor affected facility complying with § 60.5385a(a)(3), you must demonstrate continuous compliance according to paragraph (c)(4) of this section.

(1) You must continuously monitor the number of hours of operation for each reciprocating compressor affected facility or track the number of months since initial startup or the date of the most recent reciprocating compressor rod packing replacement, whichever is later.

(2) You must submit the annual reports as required in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (4) and maintain records as required in § 60.5420a(c)(3).

(3) You must replace the reciprocating compressor rod packing on or before the total number of hours of operation reaches 26,000 hours or the number of months since the most recent rod packing replacement reaches 36 months.

(4) You must operate the rod packing emissions collection system under negative pressure and continuously comply with the cover and closed vent requirements in § 60.5416a(a) and (b).

(d) For each pneumatic controller affected facility, you must demonstrate continuous compliance according to paragraphs (d)(1) through (3) of this section.

(1) You must continuously operate the pneumatic controllers as required in § 60.5390a(a), (b), or (c).

(2) You must submit the annual reports as required in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (5).

(3) You must maintain records as required in § 60.5420a(c)(4).

(e) You must demonstrate continuous compliance according to paragraph (e)(3) of this section for each storage vessel affected facility, for which you are using a control device or routing

emissions to a process to meet the requirement of § 60.5395a(a)(2).

(1)–(2) [Reserved]

(3) For each storage vessel affected facility, you must comply with paragraphs (e)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) You must reduce VOC emissions as specified in § 60.5395a(a)(2).

(ii) For each control device installed to meet the requirements of § 60.5395a(a)(2), you must demonstrate continuous compliance with the performance requirements of § 60.5412a(d) for each storage vessel affected facility using the procedure specified in paragraph (e)(3)(ii)(A) and either (e)(3)(ii)(B) or (e)(3)(ii)(C) of this section.

(A) You must comply with § 60.5416a(c) for each cover and closed vent system.

(B) You must comply with § 60.5417a(h) for each control device.

(C) Each closed vent system that routes emissions to a process must be operated as specified in § 60.5411a(c)(2) and (3).

(f) For affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants, continuous compliance with methane and VOC requirements is demonstrated if you are in compliance with the requirements of § 60.5400a.

(g) For each sweetening unit affected facility at onshore natural gas processing plants, you must demonstrate continuous compliance with the standards for SO₂ specified in § 60.5405a(b) according to paragraphs (g)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) The minimum required SO₂ emission reduction efficiency (Z_c) is compared to the emission reduction efficiency (R) achieved by the sulfur recovery technology.

(i) If $R \geq Z_c$, your affected facility is in compliance.

(ii) If $R < Z_c$, your affected facility is not in compliance.

(2) The emission reduction efficiency (R) achieved by the sulfur reduction technology must be determined using the procedures in § 60.5406a(c)(1).

(h) For each collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site and each collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station, you must demonstrate continuous compliance with the fugitive emission standards specified in § 60.5397a according to paragraphs (h)(1) through (4) of this section.

(1) You must conduct periodic monitoring surveys as required in § 60.5397a(g).

(2) You must repair or replace each identified source of fugitive emissions as required in § 60.5397a(h).

(3) You must maintain records as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(15).

(4) You must submit annual reports for collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site and each collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station as required in § 60.5420a(b)(1) and (7).

§ 60.5416a What are the initial and continuous cover and closed vent system inspection and monitoring requirements for my centrifugal compressor, reciprocating compressor, pneumatic pump and storage vessel affected facilities?

For each closed vent system or cover at your storage vessel, centrifugal compressor, reciprocating compressor and pneumatic pump affected facilities, you must comply with the applicable requirements of paragraphs (a) through (c) of this section.

(a) Inspections for closed vent systems and covers installed on each centrifugal compressor, reciprocating compressor or pneumatic pump affected facility. Except as provided in paragraphs (b)(11) and (12) of this section, you must inspect each closed vent system according to the procedures and schedule specified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section, inspect each cover according to the procedures and schedule specified in paragraph (a)(3) of this section, and inspect each bypass device according to the procedures of paragraph (a)(4) of this section.

(1) For each closed vent system joint, seam, or other connection that is permanently or semi-permanently sealed (e.g., a welded joint between two sections of hard piping or a bolted and gasketed ducting flange), you must meet the requirements specified in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) Conduct an initial inspection according to the test methods and procedures specified in paragraph (b) of this section to demonstrate that the closed vent system operates with no detectable emissions. You must maintain records of the inspection results as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(6).

(ii) Conduct annual visual inspections for defects that could result in air emissions. Defects include, but are not limited to, visible cracks, holes, or gaps in piping; loose connections; liquid leaks; or broken or missing caps or other closure devices. You must monitor a component or connection using the test methods and procedures in paragraph (b) of this section to demonstrate that it operates with no detectable emissions following any time the component is repaired or replaced or the connection is unsealed. You must maintain records of the inspection results as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(6).

(2) For closed vent system components other than those specified in paragraph (a)(1) of this section, you must meet the requirements of paragraphs (a)(2)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) Conduct an initial inspection according to the test methods and procedures specified in paragraph (b) of this section to demonstrate that the closed vent system operates with no detectable emissions. You must maintain records of the inspection results as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(6).

(ii) Conduct annual inspections according to the test methods and procedures specified in paragraph (b) of this section to demonstrate that the components or connections operate with no detectable emissions. You must maintain records of the inspection results as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(6).

(iii) Conduct annual visual inspections for defects that could result in air emissions. Defects include, but are not limited to, visible cracks, holes, or gaps in ductwork; loose connections; liquid leaks; or broken or missing caps or other closure devices. You must maintain records of the inspection results as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(6).

(3) For each cover, you must meet the requirements in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) Conduct visual inspections for defects that could result in air emissions. Defects include, but are not limited to, visible cracks, holes, or gaps in the cover, or between the cover and the separator wall; broken, cracked, or otherwise damaged seals or gaskets on closure devices; and broken or missing hatches, access covers, caps, or other closure devices. In the case where the storage vessel is buried partially or entirely underground, you must inspect only those portions of the cover that extend to or above the ground surface, and those connections that are on such portions of the cover (e.g., fill ports, access hatches, gauge wells, etc.) and can be opened to the atmosphere.

(ii) You must initially conduct the inspections specified in paragraph (a)(3)(i) of this section following the installation of the cover. Thereafter, you must perform the inspection at least once every calendar year, except as provided in paragraphs (b)(11) and (12) of this section. You must maintain records of the inspection results as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(7).

(4) For each bypass device, except as provided for in § 60.5411a(c)(3)(ii), you must meet the requirements of paragraphs (a)(4)(i) or (ii) of this section.

(i) Set the flow indicator to take a reading at least once every 15 minutes at the inlet to the bypass device that

could divert the steam away from the control device to the atmosphere.

(ii) If the bypass device valve installed at the inlet to the bypass device is secured in the non-diverting position using a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration, visually inspect the seal or closure mechanism at least once every month to verify that the valve is maintained in the non-diverting position and the vent stream is not diverted through the bypass device. You must maintain records of the inspections according to § 60.5420a(c)(8).

(b) No detectable emissions test methods and procedures. If you are required to conduct an inspection of a closed vent system or cover at your centrifugal compressor, reciprocating compressor, or pneumatic pump affected facility as specified in paragraphs (a)(1), (2), or (3) of this section, you must meet the requirements of paragraphs (b)(1) through (13) of this section.

(1) You must conduct the no detectable emissions test procedure in accordance with Method 21 of appendix A-7 of this part.

(2) The detection instrument must meet the performance criteria of Method 21 of appendix A-7 of this part, except that the instrument response factor criteria in section 8.1.1 of Method 21 must be for the average composition of the fluid and not for each individual organic compound in the stream.

(3) You must calibrate the detection instrument before use on each day of its use by the procedures specified in Method 21 of appendix A-7 of this part.

(4) Calibration gases must be as specified in paragraphs (b)(4)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) Zero air (less than 10 parts per million by volume hydrocarbon in air).

(ii) A mixture of methane in air at a concentration less than 10,000 parts per million by volume.

(5) You may choose to adjust or not adjust the detection instrument readings to account for the background organic concentration level. If you choose to adjust the instrument readings for the background level, you must determine the background level value according to the procedures in Method 21 of appendix A-7 of this part.

(6) Your detection instrument must meet the performance criteria specified in paragraphs (b)(6)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) Except as provided in paragraph (b)(6)(ii) of this section, the detection instrument must meet the performance criteria of Method 21 of appendix A-7 of this part, except the instrument response factor criteria in section 8.1.1

of Method 21 must be for the average composition of the process fluid, not each individual volatile organic compound in the stream. For process streams that contain nitrogen, air, or other inerts that are not organic hazardous air pollutants or volatile organic compounds, you must calculate the average stream response factor on an inert-free basis.

(ii) If no instrument is available that will meet the performance criteria specified in paragraph (b)(6)(i) of this section, you may adjust the instrument readings by multiplying by the average response factor of the process fluid, calculated on an inert-free basis, as described in paragraph (b)(6)(i) of this section.

(7) You must determine if a potential leak interface operates with no detectable emissions using the applicable procedure specified in paragraph (b)(7)(i) or (ii) of this section.

(i) If you choose not to adjust the detection instrument readings for the background organic concentration level, then you must directly compare the maximum organic concentration value measured by the detection instrument to the applicable value for the potential leak interface as specified in paragraph (b)(8) of this section.

(ii) If you choose to adjust the detection instrument readings for the background organic concentration level, you must compare the value of the arithmetic difference between the maximum organic concentration value measured by the instrument and the background organic concentration value as determined in paragraph (b)(5) of this section with the applicable value for the potential leak interface as specified in paragraph (b)(8) of this section.

(8) A potential leak interface is determined to operate with no detectable organic emissions if the organic concentration value determined in paragraph (b)(7) of this section is less than 500 parts per million by volume.

(9) *Repairs.* In the event that a leak or defect is detected, you must repair the leak or defect as soon as practicable according to the requirements of paragraphs (b)(9)(i) and (ii) of this section, except as provided in paragraph (b)(10) of this section.

(i) A first attempt at repair must be made no later than 5 calendar days after the leak is detected.

(ii) Repair must be completed no later than 15 calendar days after the leak is detected.

(10) *Delay of repair.* Delay of repair of a closed vent system or cover for which leaks or defects have been detected is allowed if the repair is technically infeasible without a shutdown, or if you

determine that emissions resulting from immediate repair would be greater than the fugitive emissions likely to result from delay of repair. You must complete repair of such equipment by the end of the next shutdown.

(11) *Unsafe to inspect requirements.* You may designate any parts of the closed vent system or cover as unsafe to inspect if the requirements in paragraphs (b)(11)(i) and (ii) of this section are met. Unsafe to inspect parts are exempt from the inspection requirements of paragraphs (a)(1) through (3) of this section.

(i) You determine that the equipment is unsafe to inspect because inspecting personnel would be exposed to an imminent or potential danger as a consequence of complying with paragraphs (a)(1), (2), or (3) of this section.

(ii) You have a written plan that requires inspection of the equipment as frequently as practicable during safe-to-inspect times.

(12) *Difficult to inspect requirements.* You may designate any parts of the closed vent system or cover as difficult to inspect, if the requirements in paragraphs (b)(12)(i) and (ii) of this section are met. Difficult to inspect parts are exempt from the inspection requirements of paragraphs (a)(1) through (3) of this section.

(i) You determine that the equipment cannot be inspected without elevating the inspecting personnel more than 2 meters above a support surface.

(ii) You have a written plan that requires inspection of the equipment at least once every 5 years.

(13) *Records.* Records shall be maintained as specified in this section and in § 60.5420a(c)(9).

(c) *Cover and closed vent system inspections for storage vessel affected facilities.* If you install a control device or route emissions to a process, you must inspect each closed vent system according to the procedures and schedule specified in paragraphs (c)(1) of this section, inspect each cover according to the procedures and schedule specified in paragraph (c)(2) of this section, and inspect each bypass device according to the procedures of paragraph (c)(3) of this section. You must also comply with the requirements of (c)(4) through (7) of this section.

(1) For each closed vent system, you must conduct an inspection at least once every calendar month as specified in paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) You must maintain records of the inspection results as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(6).

(ii) Conduct olfactory, visual and auditory inspections for defects that could result in air emissions. Defects include, but are not limited to, visible cracks, holes, or gaps in piping; loose connections; liquid leaks; or broken or missing caps or other closure devices.

(iii) Monthly inspections must be separated by at least 14 calendar days.

(2) For each cover, you must conduct inspections at least once every calendar month as specified in paragraphs (c)(2)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) You must maintain records of the inspection results as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(7).

(ii) Conduct olfactory, visual and auditory inspections for defects that could result in air emissions. Defects include, but are not limited to, visible cracks, holes, or gaps in the cover, or between the cover and the separator wall; broken, cracked, or otherwise damaged seals or gaskets on closure devices; and broken or missing hatches, access covers, caps, or other closure devices. In the case where the storage vessel is buried partially or entirely underground, you must inspect only those portions of the cover that extend to or above the ground surface, and those connections that are on such portions of the cover (e.g., fill ports, access hatches, gauge wells, etc.) and can be opened to the atmosphere.

(iii) Monthly inspections must be separated by at least 14 calendar days.

(3) For each bypass device, except as provided for in § 60.5411a(c)(3)(ii), you must meet the requirements of paragraphs (c)(3)(i) or (ii) of this section.

(i) You must properly install, calibrate and maintain a flow indicator at the inlet to the bypass device that could divert the stream away from the control device or process to the atmosphere. Set the flow indicator to trigger an audible alarm, or initiate notification via remote alarm to the nearest field office, when the bypass device is open such that the stream is being, or could be, diverted away from the control device or process to the atmosphere. You must maintain records of each time the alarm is sounded according to § 60.5420a(c)(8).

(ii) If the bypass device valve installed at the inlet to the bypass device is secured in the non-diverting position using a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration, visually inspect the seal or closure mechanism at least once every month to verify that the valve is maintained in the non-diverting position and the vent stream is not diverted through the bypass device. You must maintain records of the inspections and records of each time the key is checked out, if applicable, according to § 60.5420a(c)(8).

(4) *Repairs.* In the event that a leak or defect is detected, you must repair the leak or defect as soon as practicable according to the requirements of paragraphs (c)(4)(i) through (iii) of this section, except as provided in paragraph (c)(5) of this section.

(i) A first attempt at repair must be made no later than 5 calendar days after the leak is detected.

(ii) Repair must be completed no later than 30 calendar days after the leak is detected.

(iii) Grease or another applicable substance must be applied to deteriorating or cracked gaskets to improve the seal while awaiting repair.

(5) *Delay of repair.* Delay of repair of a closed vent system or cover for which leaks or defects have been detected is allowed if the repair is technically infeasible without a shutdown, or if you determine that emissions resulting from immediate repair would be greater than the fugitive emissions likely to result from delay of repair. You must complete repair of such equipment by the end of the next shutdown.

(6) *Unsafe to inspect requirements.* You may designate any parts of the closed vent system or cover as unsafe to inspect if the requirements in paragraphs (c)(6)(i) and (ii) of this section are met. Unsafe to inspect parts are exempt from the inspection requirements of paragraphs (c)(1) and (2) of this section.

(i) You determine that the equipment is unsafe to inspect because inspecting personnel would be exposed to an imminent or potential danger as a consequence of complying with paragraphs (c)(1) or (2) of this section.

(ii) You have a written plan that requires inspection of the equipment as frequently as practicable during safe-to-inspect times.

(7) *Difficult to inspect requirements.* You may designate any parts of the closed vent system or cover as difficult to inspect, if the requirements in paragraphs (c)(7)(i) and (ii) of this section are met. Difficult to inspect parts are exempt from the inspection requirements of paragraphs (c)(1) and (2) of this section.

(i) You determine that the equipment cannot be inspected without elevating the inspecting personnel more than 2 meters above a support surface.

(ii) You have a written plan that requires inspection of the equipment at least once every 5 years.

§ 60.5417a What are the continuous control device monitoring requirements for my centrifugal compressor and storage vessel affected facilities?

You must meet the applicable requirements of this section to

demonstrate continuous compliance for each control device used to meet emission standards for your storage vessel or centrifugal compressor affected facility.

(a) For each control device used to comply with the emission reduction standard for centrifugal compressor affected facilities in § 60.5380a(a)(1), you must install and operate a continuous parameter monitoring system for each control device as specified in paragraphs (c) through (g) of this section, except as provided for in paragraph (b) of this section. If you install and operate a flare in accordance with § 60.5412a(a)(3), you are exempt from the requirements of paragraphs (e) and (f) of this section. If you install and operate an enclosed combustion device which is not specifically listed in paragraph (d) of this section, you must demonstrate continuous compliance according to paragraphs (h)(1) through (h)(4) of this section.

(b) You are exempt from the monitoring requirements specified in paragraphs (c) through (g) of this section for the control devices listed in paragraphs (b)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) A boiler or process heater in which all vent streams are introduced with the primary fuel or are used as the primary fuel.

(2) A boiler or process heater with a design heat input capacity equal to or greater than 44 megawatts.

(c) If you are required to install a continuous parameter monitoring system, you must meet the specifications and requirements in paragraphs (c)(1) through (4) of this section.

(1) Each continuous parameter monitoring system must measure data values at least once every hour and record the parameters in paragraphs (c)(1)(i) or (ii) of this section.

(i) Each measured data value.

(ii) Each block average value for each 1-hour period or shorter periods calculated from all measured data values during each period. If values are measured more frequently than once per minute, a single value for each minute may be used to calculate the hourly (or shorter period) block average instead of all measured values.

(2) You must prepare a site-specific monitoring plan that addresses the monitoring system design, data collection, and the quality assurance and quality control elements outlined in paragraphs (c)(2)(i) through (v) of this section. You must install, calibrate, operate, and maintain each continuous parameter monitoring system in accordance with the procedures in your approved site-specific monitoring plan.

Heat sensing monitoring devices that indicate the continuous ignition of a pilot flame are exempt from the calibration, quality assurance and quality control requirements in this section.

(i) The performance criteria and design specifications for the monitoring system equipment, including the sample interface, detector signal analyzer, and data acquisition and calculations.

(ii) Sampling interface (e.g., thermocouple) location such that the monitoring system will provide representative measurements.

(iii) Equipment performance checks, system accuracy audits, or other audit procedures.

(iv) Ongoing operation and maintenance procedures in accordance with provisions in § 60.13(b).

(v) Ongoing reporting and recordkeeping procedures in accordance with provisions in § 60.7(c), (d), and (f).

(3) You must conduct the continuous parameter monitoring system equipment performance checks, system accuracy audits, or other audit procedures specified in the site-specific monitoring plan at least once every 12 months.

(4) You must conduct a performance evaluation of each continuous parameter monitoring system in accordance with the site-specific monitoring plan. Heat sensing monitoring devices that indicate the continuous ignition of a pilot flame are exempt from the calibration, quality assurance and quality control requirements in this section.

(d) You must install, calibrate, operate, and maintain a device equipped with a continuous recorder to measure the values of operating parameters appropriate for the control device as specified in paragraph (d)(1), (2), or (3) of this section.

(1) A continuous monitoring system that measures the operating parameters in paragraphs (d)(1)(i) through (viii) of this section, as applicable.

(i) For a thermal vapor incinerator that demonstrates during the performance test conducted under § 60.5413a(b) that combustion zone temperature is an accurate indicator of performance, a temperature monitoring device equipped with a continuous recorder. The monitoring device must have a minimum accuracy of ± 1 percent of the temperature being monitored in $^{\circ}\text{Celsius}$, or ± 2.5 $^{\circ}\text{Celsius}$, whichever value is greater. You must install the temperature sensor at a location representative of the combustion zone temperature.

(ii) For a catalytic vapor incinerator, a temperature monitoring device equipped with a continuous recorder.

The device must be capable of monitoring temperature at two locations and have a minimum accuracy of ± 1 percent of the temperature being monitored in $^{\circ}\text{Celsius}$, or ± 2.5 $^{\circ}\text{Celsius}$, whichever value is greater. You must install one temperature sensor in the vent stream at the nearest feasible point to the catalyst bed inlet, and you must install a second temperature sensor in the vent stream at the nearest feasible point to the catalyst bed outlet.

(iii) For a flare, a heat sensing monitoring device equipped with a continuous recorder that indicates the continuous ignition of the pilot flame. The heat sensing monitoring device is exempt from the calibration requirements of this section.

(iv) For a boiler or process heater, a temperature monitoring device equipped with a continuous recorder. The temperature monitoring device must have a minimum accuracy of ± 1 percent of the temperature being monitored in $^{\circ}\text{Celsius}$, or ± 2.5 $^{\circ}\text{Celsius}$, whichever value is greater. You must install the temperature sensor at a location representative of the combustion zone temperature.

(v) For a condenser, a temperature monitoring device equipped with a continuous recorder. The temperature monitoring device must have a minimum accuracy of ± 1 percent of the temperature being monitored in $^{\circ}\text{Celsius}$, or ± 2.5 $^{\circ}\text{Celsius}$, whichever value is greater. You must install the temperature sensor at a location in the exhaust vent stream from the condenser.

(vi) For a regenerative-type carbon adsorption system, a continuous monitoring system that meets the specifications in paragraphs (d)(1)(vi)(A) and (B) of this section.

(A) The continuous parameter monitoring system must measure and record the average total regeneration stream mass flow or volumetric flow during each carbon bed regeneration cycle. The flow sensor must have a measurement sensitivity of 5 percent of the flow rate or 10 cubic feet per minute, whichever is greater. You must check the mechanical connections for leakage at least every month, and you must perform a visual inspection at least every 3 months of all components of the flow continuous parameter monitoring system for physical and operational integrity and all electrical connections for oxidation and galvanic corrosion if your flow continuous parameter monitoring system is not equipped with a redundant flow sensor; and

(B) The continuous parameter monitoring system must measure and record the average carbon bed temperature for the duration of the

carbon bed steaming cycle and measure the actual carbon bed temperature after regeneration and within 15 minutes of completing the cooling cycle. The temperature monitoring device must have a minimum accuracy of ± 1 percent of the temperature being monitored in $^{\circ}\text{Celsius}$, or ± 2.5 $^{\circ}\text{Celsius}$, whichever value is greater.

(vii) For a nonregenerative-type carbon adsorption system, you must monitor the design carbon replacement interval established using a design analysis performed as specified in § 60.5413a(c)(3). The design carbon replacement interval must be based on the total carbon working capacity of the control device and source operating schedule.

(viii) For a combustion control device whose model is tested under § 60.5413a(d), a continuous monitoring system meeting the requirements of paragraphs (d)(1)(viii)(A) and (B) of this section. If you comply with the periodic testing requirements of § 60.5413a(b)(5)(ii), you are not required to continuously monitor the gas flow rate under paragraph (d)(1)(viii)(A) of this section.

(A) The continuous monitoring system must measure gas flow rate at the inlet to the control device. The monitoring instrument must have an accuracy of ± 2 percent or better at the maximum expected flow rate. The flow rate at the inlet to the combustion device must not exceed the maximum flow rate determined by the manufacturer.

(B) A monitoring device that continuously indicates the presence of the pilot flame while emissions are routed to the control device.

(2) An organic monitoring device equipped with a continuous recorder that measures the concentration level of organic compounds in the exhaust vent stream from the control device. The monitor must meet the requirements of Performance Specification 8 or 9 of appendix B of this part. You must install, calibrate, and maintain the monitor according to the manufacturer's specifications.

(3) A continuous monitoring system that measures operating parameters other than those specified in paragraph (d)(1) or (2) of this section, upon approval of the Administrator as specified in § 60.13(i).

(e) You must calculate the daily average value for each monitored operating parameter for each operating day, using the data recorded by the monitoring system, except for inlet gas flow rate and data from the heat sensing devices that indicate the presence of a pilot flame. If the emissions unit

operation is continuous, the operating day is a 24-hour period. If the emissions unit operation is not continuous, the operating day is the total number of hours of control device operation per 24-hour period. Valid data points must be available for 75 percent of the operating hours in an operating day to compute the daily average.

(f) For each operating parameter monitor installed in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (d) of this section, you must comply with paragraph (f)(1) of this section for all control devices. When condensers are installed, you must also comply with paragraph (f)(2) of this section.

(1) You must establish a minimum operating parameter value or a maximum operating parameter value, as appropriate for the control device, to define the conditions at which the control device must be operated to continuously achieve the applicable performance requirements of § 60.5412a(a)(1) or (2). You must establish each minimum or maximum operating parameter value as specified in paragraphs (f)(1)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) If you conduct performance tests in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413a(b) to demonstrate that the control device achieves the applicable performance requirements specified in § 60.5412a(a)(1) or (2), then you must establish the minimum operating parameter value or the maximum operating parameter value based on values measured during the performance test and supplemented, as necessary, by a condenser design analysis or control device manufacturer recommendations or a combination of both.

(ii) If you use a condenser design analysis in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413a(c) to demonstrate that the control device achieves the applicable performance requirements specified in § 60.5412a(a)(2), then you must establish the minimum operating parameter value or the maximum operating parameter value based on the condenser design analysis and supplemented, as necessary, by the condenser manufacturer's recommendations.

(iii) If you operate a control device where the performance test requirement was met under § 60.5413a(d) to demonstrate that the control device achieves the applicable performance requirements specified in § 60.5412a(a)(1), then your control device inlet gas flow rate must not exceed the maximum inlet gas flow rate determined by the manufacturer.

(2) If you use a condenser as specified in paragraph (d)(1)(v) of this section, you must establish a condenser performance curve showing the relationship between condenser outlet temperature and condenser control efficiency, according to the requirements of paragraphs (f)(2)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) If you conduct a performance test in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413a(b) to demonstrate that the condenser achieves the applicable performance requirements in § 60.5412a(a)(2), then the condenser performance curve must be based on values measured during the performance test and supplemented as necessary by control device design analysis, or control device manufacturer's recommendations, or a combination or both.

(ii) If you use a control device design analysis in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5413a(c)(1) to demonstrate that the condenser achieves the applicable performance requirements specified in § 60.5412a(a)(2), then the condenser performance curve must be based on the condenser design analysis and supplemented, as necessary, by the control device manufacturer's recommendations.

(g) A deviation for a given control device is determined to have occurred when the monitoring data or lack of monitoring data result in any one of the criteria specified in paragraphs (g)(1) through (6) of this section being met. If you monitor multiple operating parameters for the same control device during the same operating day and more than one of these operating parameters meets a deviation criterion specified in paragraphs (g)(1) through (6) of this section, then a single excursion is determined to have occurred for the control device for that operating day.

(1) A deviation occurs when the daily average value of a monitored operating parameter is less than the minimum operating parameter limit (or, if applicable, greater than the maximum operating parameter limit) established in paragraph (f)(1) of this section or when the heat sensing device indicates that there is no pilot flame present.

(2) If you are subject to § 60.5412a(a)(2), a deviation occurs when the 365-day average condenser efficiency calculated according to the requirements specified in § 60.5415a(b)(2)(viii)(D) is less than 95.0 percent.

(3) If you are subject to § 60.5412a(a)(2) and you have less than 365 days of data, a deviation occurs when the average condenser efficiency

calculated according to the procedures specified in § 60.5415a(b)(2)(viii)(D)(1) or (2) is less than 95.0 percent.

(4) A deviation occurs when the monitoring data are not available for at least 75 percent of the operating hours in a day.

(5) If the closed vent system contains one or more bypass devices that could be used to divert all or a portion of the gases, vapors, or fumes from entering the control device, a deviation occurs when the requirements of paragraph (g)(5)(i) or (ii) of this section are met.

(i) For each bypass line subject to § 60.5411a(a)(3)(i)(A), the flow indicator indicates that flow has been detected and that the stream has been diverted away from the control device to the atmosphere.

(ii) For each bypass line subject to § 60.5411a(a)(3)(i)(B), if the seal or closure mechanism has been broken, the bypass line valve position has changed, the key for the lock-and-key type lock has been checked out, or the car-seal has been broken.

(6) For a combustion control device whose model is tested under § 60.5413a(d), a deviation occurs when the conditions of paragraphs (g)(6)(i) or (ii) of this section are met.

(i) The inlet gas flow rate exceeds the maximum established during the test conducted under § 60.5413a(d).

(ii) Failure of the monthly visible emissions test conducted under § 60.5413a(e)(3) occurs.

(h) For each control device used to comply with the emission reduction standard in § 60.5395a(a)(2) for your storage vessel affected facility, you must demonstrate continuous compliance according to paragraphs (h)(1) through (h)(4) of this section. You are exempt from the requirements of this paragraph if you install a control device model tested in accordance with § 60.5413a(d)(2) through (10), which meets the criteria in § 60.5413a(d)(11), the reporting requirement in § 60.5413a(d)(12), and meet the continuous compliance requirement in § 60.5413a(e).

(1) For each combustion device you must conduct inspections at least once every calendar month according to paragraphs (h)(1)(i) through (iv) of this section. Monthly inspections must be separated by at least 14 calendar days.

(i) Conduct visual inspections to confirm that the pilot is lit when vapors are being routed to the combustion device and that the continuous burning pilot flame is operating properly.

(ii) Conduct inspections to monitor for visible emissions from the combustion device using section 11 of EPA Method 22 of appendix A of this

part. The observation period shall be 15 minutes. Devices must be operated with no visible emissions, except for periods not to exceed a total of 1 minute during any 15 minute period.

(iii) Conduct olfactory, visual and auditory inspections of all equipment associated with the combustion device to ensure system integrity.

(iv) For any absence of the pilot flame, or other indication of smoking or improper equipment operation (e.g., visual, audible, or olfactory), you must ensure the equipment is returned to proper operation as soon as practicable after the event occurs. At a minimum, you must perform the procedures specified in paragraphs (h)(1)(iv)(A) and (B) of this section.

(A) You must check the air vent for obstruction. If an obstruction is observed, you must clear the obstruction as soon as practicable.

(B) You must check for liquid reaching the combustor.

(2) For each vapor recovery device, you must conduct inspections at least once every calendar month to ensure physical integrity of the control device according to the manufacturer's instructions. Monthly inspections must be separated by at least 14 calendar days.

(3) Each control device must be operated following the manufacturer's written operating instructions, procedures and maintenance schedule to ensure good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions. Records of the manufacturer's written operating instructions, procedures, and maintenance schedule must be available for inspection as specified in § 60.5420a(c)(13).

(4) Conduct a periodic performance test no later than 60 months after the initial performance test as specified in § 60.5413a(b)(5)(ii) and conduct subsequent periodic performance tests at intervals no longer than 60 months following the previous periodic performance test.

§ 60.5420a What are my notification, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements?

(a) You must submit the notifications according to paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section if you own or operate one or more of the affected facilities specified in § 60.5365a that was constructed, modified or reconstructed during the reporting period.

(1) If you own or operate an affected facility that is the group of all equipment within a process unit at an onshore natural gas processing plant, or a sweetening unit at an onshore natural gas processing plant, you must submit

the notifications required in § 60.7(a)(1), (3), and (4). If you own or operate a well, centrifugal compressor, reciprocating compressor, pneumatic controller, pneumatic pump, storage vessel, or collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site or collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station, you are not required to submit the notifications required in § 60.7(a)(1), (3), and (4).

(2)(i) If you own or operate a well affected facility, you must submit a notification to the Administrator no later than 2 days prior to the commencement of each well completion operation listing the anticipated date of the well completion operation. The notification shall include contact information for the owner or operator; the United States Well Number; the latitude and longitude coordinates for each well in decimal degrees to an accuracy and precision of five (5) decimals of a degree using the North American Datum of 1983; and the planned date of the beginning of flowback. You may submit the notification in writing or in electronic format.

(ii) If you are subject to state regulations that require advance notification of well completions and you have met those notification requirements, then you are considered to have met the advance notification requirements of paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section.

(b) *Reporting requirements.* You must submit annual reports containing the information specified in paragraphs (b)(1) through (8) and (12) of this section and performance test reports as specified in paragraph (b)(9) or (10) of this section, if applicable. You must submit annual reports following the procedure specified in paragraph (b)(11) of this section. The initial annual report is due no later than 90 days after the end of the initial compliance period as determined according to § 60.5410a. Subsequent annual reports are due no later than same date each year as the initial annual report. If you own or operate more than one affected facility, you may submit one report for multiple affected facilities provided the report contains all of the information required as specified in paragraphs (b)(1) through (8) of this section. Annual reports may coincide with title V reports as long as all the required elements of the annual report are included. You may arrange with the Administrator a common schedule on which reports required by this part may be submitted as long as the schedule does not extend the reporting period.

(1) The general information specified in paragraphs (b)(1)(i) through (iv) of this section for all reports.

(i) The company name, facility site name associated with the affected facility, US Well ID or US Well ID associated with the affected facility, if applicable, and address of the affected facility. If an address is not available for the site, include a description of the site location and provide the latitude and longitude coordinates of the site in decimal degrees to an accuracy and precision of five (5) decimals of a degree using the North American Datum of 1983.

(ii) An identification of each affected facility being included in the annual report.

(iii) Beginning and ending dates of the reporting period.

(iv) A certification by a certifying official of truth, accuracy, and completeness. This certification shall state that, based on information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, the statements and information in the document are true, accurate, and complete.

(2) For each well affected facility, the information in paragraphs (b)(2)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) Records of each well completion operation as specified in paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (iv) and (vi) of this section, if applicable, for each well affected facility conducted during the reporting period. In lieu of submitting the records specified in paragraph (c)(1)(i) through (iv) of this section, the owner or operator may submit a list of the well completions with hydraulic fracturing completed during the reporting period and the records required by paragraph (c)(1)(v) of this section for each well completion.

(ii) Records of deviations specified in paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of this section that occurred during the reporting period.

(iii) Records specified in paragraph (c)(1)(vii) of this section, if applicable, that support a determination under 60.5432a that the well affected facility is a low pressure well as defined in 60.5430a.

(3) For each centrifugal compressor affected facility, the information specified in paragraphs (b)(3)(i) through (iv) of this section.

(i) An identification of each centrifugal compressor using a wet seal system constructed, modified or reconstructed during the reporting period.

(ii) Records of deviations specified in paragraph (c)(2) of this section that occurred during the reporting period.

(iii) If required to comply with § 60.5380a(a)(2), the records specified in

paragraphs (c)(6) through (11) of this section.

(iv) If complying with § 60.5380a(a)(1) with a control device tested under § 60.5413a(d) which meets the criteria in § 60.5413a(d)(11) and § 60.5413a(e), records specified in paragraph (c)(2)(i) through (c)(2)(vii) of this section for each centrifugal compressor using a wet seal system constructed, modified or reconstructed during the reporting period.

(4) For each reciprocating compressor affected facility, the information specified in paragraphs (b)(4)(i) and (ii) of this section.

(i) The cumulative number of hours of operation or the number of months since initial startup or since the previous reciprocating compressor rod packing replacement, whichever is later. Alternatively, a statement that emissions from the rod packing are being routed to a process through a closed vent system under negative pressure.

(ii) Records of deviations specified in paragraph (c)(3)(iii) of this section that occurred during the reporting period.

(5) For each pneumatic controller affected facility, the information specified in paragraphs (b)(5)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) An identification of each pneumatic controller constructed, modified or reconstructed during the reporting period, including the identification information specified in § 60.5390a(b)(2) or (c)(2).

(ii) If applicable, documentation that the use of pneumatic controller affected facilities with a natural gas bleed rate greater than 6 standard cubic feet per hour are required and the reasons why.

(iii) Records of deviations specified in paragraph (c)(4)(v) of this section that occurred during the reporting period.

(6) For each storage vessel affected facility, the information in paragraphs (b)(6)(i) through (vii) of this section.

(i) An identification, including the location, of each storage vessel affected facility for which construction, modification or reconstruction commenced during the reporting period. The location of the storage vessel shall be in latitude and longitude coordinates in decimal degrees to an accuracy and precision of five (5) decimals of a degree using the North American Datum of 1983.

(ii) Documentation of the VOC emission rate determination according to § 60.5365a(e) for each storage vessel that became an affected facility during the reporting period or is returned to service during the reporting period.

(iii) Records of deviations specified in paragraph (c)(5)(iii) of this section that occurred during the reporting period.

(iv) A statement that you have met the requirements specified in § 60.5410a(h)(2) and (3).

(v) You must identify each storage vessel affected facility that is removed from service during the reporting period as specified in § 60.5395a(c)(1)(ii), including the date the storage vessel affected facility was removed from service.

(vi) You must identify each storage vessel affected facility returned to service during the reporting period as specified in § 60.5395a(c)(3), including the date the storage vessel affected facility was returned to service.

(vii) If complying with § 60.5395a(a)(2) with a control device tested under § 60.5413a(d) which meets the criteria in § 60.5413a(d)(11) and § 60.5413a(e), records specified in paragraphs (c)(5)(vi)(A) through (F) of this section for each storage vessel constructed, modified, reconstructed or returned to service during the reporting period.

(7) For the collection of fugitive emissions components at each well site and the collection of fugitive emissions components at each compressor station within the company-defined area, the records of each monitoring survey including the information specified in paragraphs (b)(7)(i) through (xii) of this section. For the collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station, if a monitoring survey is waived under § 60.5397a(g)(5), you must include in your annual report the fact that a monitoring survey was waived and the calendar months that make up the quarterly monitoring period for which the monitoring survey was waived.

(i) Date of the survey.

(ii) Beginning and end time of the survey.

(iii) Name of operator(s) performing survey. If the survey is performed by optical gas imaging, you must note the training and experience of the operator.

(iv) Ambient temperature, sky conditions, and maximum wind speed at the time of the survey.

(v) Monitoring instrument used.

(vi) Any deviations from the monitoring plan or a statement that there were no deviations from the monitoring plan.

(vii) Number and type of components for which fugitive emissions were detected.

(viii) Number and type of fugitive emissions components that were not repaired as required in § 60.5397a(h).

(ix) Number and type of difficult-to-monitor and unsafe-to-monitor fugitive emission components monitored.

(x) The date of successful repair of the fugitive emissions component.

(xi) Number and type of fugitive emission components placed on delay of repair and explanation for each delay of repair.

(xii) Type of instrument used to resurvey a repaired fugitive emissions component that could not be repaired during the initial fugitive emissions finding.

(8) For each pneumatic pump affected facility, the information specified in paragraphs (b)(8)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) For each pneumatic pump that is constructed, modified or reconstructed during the reporting period, you must provide certification that the pneumatic pump meets one of the conditions described in paragraphs (b)(8)(i)(A), (B) or (C) of this section.

(A) No control device or process is available on site.

(B) A control device or process is available on site and the owner or operator has determined in accordance with § 60.5393a(b)(5) that it is technically infeasible to capture and route the emissions to the control device or process.

(C) Emissions from the pneumatic pump are routed to a control device or process. If the control device is designed to achieve less than 95 percent emissions reduction, specify the percent emissions reductions the control device is designed to achieve.

(ii) For any pneumatic pump affected facility which has been previously reported as required under paragraph (b)(8)(i) of this section and for which a change in the reported condition has occurred during the reporting period, provide the identification of the pneumatic pump affected facility and the date it was previously reported and a certification that the pneumatic pump meets one of the conditions described in paragraphs (b)(8)(ii)(A), (B) or (C) or (D) of this section.

(A) A control device has been added to the location and the pneumatic pump now reports according to paragraph (b)(8)(i)(C) of this section.

(B) A control device has been added to the location and the pneumatic pump affected facility now reports according to paragraph (b)(8)(i)(B) of this section.

(C) A control device or process has been removed from the location or otherwise is no longer available and the pneumatic pump affected facility now report according to paragraph (b)(8)(i)(A) of this section.

(D) A control device or process has been removed from the location or is otherwise no longer available and the owner or operator has determined in accordance with § 60.5393a(b)(5) through an engineering evaluation that it is technically infeasible to capture and route the emissions to another control device or process.

(iii) Records of deviations specified in paragraph (c)(16)(ii) of this section that occurred during the reporting period.

(9) Within 60 days after the date of completing each performance test (see § 60.8) required by this subpart, except testing conducted by the manufacturer as specified in § 60.5413a(d), you must submit the results of the performance test following the procedure specified in either paragraph (b)(9)(i) or (ii) of this section.

(i) For data collected using test methods supported by the EPA's Electronic Reporting Tool (ERT) as listed on the EPA's ERT Web site (https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ert/ert_info.html) at the time of the test, you must submit the results of the performance test to the EPA via the Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface (CEDRI). (CEDRI can be accessed through the EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) (<https://cdx.epa.gov/>.) Performance test data must be submitted in a file format generated through the use of the EPA's ERT or an alternate electronic file format consistent with the extensible markup language (XML) schema listed on the EPA's ERT Web site. If you claim that some of the performance test information being submitted is confidential business information (CBI), you must submit a complete file generated through the use of the EPA's ERT or an alternate electronic file consistent with the XML schema listed on the EPA's ERT Web site, including information claimed to be CBI, on a compact disc, flash drive, or other commonly used electronic storage media to the EPA. The electronic media must be clearly marked as CBI and mailed to U.S. EPA/OAQPS/CORE CBI Office, Attention: Group Leader, Measurement Policy Group, MD C404-02, 4930 Old Page Rd., Durham, NC 27703. The same ERT or alternate file with the CBI omitted must be submitted to the EPA via the EPA's CDX as described earlier in this paragraph.

(ii) For data collected using test methods that are not supported by the EPA's ERT as listed on the EPA's ERT Web site at the time of the test, you must submit the results of the performance test to the Administrator at the appropriate address listed in § 60.4.

(10) For combustion control devices tested by the manufacturer in accordance with § 60.5413a(d), an electronic copy of the performance test results required by § 60.5413a(d) shall be submitted via email to *Oil_and_Gas_PT@EPA.GOV* unless the test results for that model of combustion control device are posted at the following Web site: *epa.gov/airquality/oilandgas/*.

(11) You must submit reports to the EPA via the CEDRI. (CEDRI can be accessed through the EPA's CDX (<https://cdx.epa.gov/>.) You must use the appropriate electronic report in CEDRI for this subpart or an alternate electronic file format consistent with the extensible markup language (XML) schema listed on the CEDRI Web site (<https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/cedri/>). If the reporting form specific to this subpart is not available in CEDRI at the time that the report is due, you must submit the report to the Administrator at the appropriate address listed in § 60.4. Once the form has been available in CEDRI for at least 90 calendar days, you must begin submitting all subsequent reports via CEDRI. The reports must be submitted by the deadlines specified in this subpart, regardless of the method in which the reports are submitted.

(12) You must submit the certification signed by the qualified professional engineer according to § 60.5411a(d) for each closed vent system routing to a control device or process.

(c) *Recordkeeping requirements.* You must maintain the records identified as specified in § 60.7(f) and in paragraphs (c)(1) through (16) of this section. All records required by this subpart must be maintained either onsite or at the nearest local field office for at least 5 years. Any records required to be maintained by this subpart that are submitted electronically via the EPA's CDX may be maintained in electronic format.

(1) The records for each well affected facility as specified in paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (vii) of this section, as applicable. For each well affected facility for which you make a claim that the well affected facility is not subject to the requirements for well completions pursuant to 60.5375a(g), you must maintain the record in paragraph (c)(1)(vi), only.

(i) Records identifying each well completion operation for each well affected facility;

(ii) Records of deviations in cases where well completion operations with hydraulic fracturing were not performed in compliance with the requirements specified in § 60.5375a.

(iii) Records required in § 60.5375a(b) or (f)(3) for each well completion operation conducted for each well affected facility that occurred during the reporting period. You must maintain the records specified in paragraphs (c)(1)(iii)(A) through (C) of this section.

(A) For each well affected facility required to comply with the requirements of § 60.5375a(a), you must record: The location of the well; the United States Well Number; the date and time of the onset of flowback following hydraulic fracturing or refracturing; the date and time of each attempt to direct flowback to a separator as required in § 60.5375a(a)(1)(ii); the date and time of each occurrence of returning to the initial flowback stage under § 60.5375a(a)(1)(i); and the date and time that the well was shut in and the flowback equipment was permanently disconnected, or the startup of production; the duration of flowback; duration of recovery and disposition of recovery (*i.e.*, routed to the gas flow line or collection system, re-injected into the well or another well, used as an onsite fuel source, or used for another useful purpose that a purchased fuel or raw material would serve); duration of combustion; duration of venting; and specific reasons for venting in lieu of capture or combustion. The duration must be specified in hours. In addition, for wells where it is technically infeasible to route the recovered gas to any of the four options specified in § 60.5375a(a)(1)(ii), you must record the reasons for the claim of technical infeasibility with respect to all four options provided in that subparagraph, including but not limited to; name and location of the nearest gathering line and technical considerations preventing routing to this line; capture, reinjection, and reuse technologies considered and aspects of gas or equipment preventing use of recovered gas as a fuel onsite; and technical considerations preventing use of recovered gas for other useful purpose that that a purchased fuel or raw material would serve.

(B) For each well affected facility required to comply with the requirements of § 60.5375a(f), you must maintain the records specified in paragraph (c)(1)(iii)(A) of this section except that you do not have to record the duration of recovery to the flow line.

(C) For each well affected facility for which you make a claim that it meets the criteria of § 60.5375a(a)(1)(iii)(A), you must maintain the following:

(1) Records specified in paragraph (c)(1)(iii)(A) of this section except that you do not have to record: The date and time of each attempt to direct flowback

to a separator; the date and time of each occurrence of returning to the initial flowback stage; duration of recovery and disposition of recovery (*i.e.*, routed to the gas flow line or collection system, re-injected into the well or another well, used as an onsite fuel source, or used for another useful purpose that a purchased fuel or raw material would serve).

(2) If applicable, records that the conditions of § 60.5375a(1)(iii)(A) are no longer met and that the well completion operation has been stopped and a separator installed. The records shall include the date and time the well completion operation was stopped and the date and time the separator was installed.

(3) A record of the claim signed by the certifying official that no liquids collection is at the well site. The claim must include a certification by a certifying official of truth, accuracy and completeness. This certification shall state that, based on information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, the statements and information in the document are true, accurate, and complete.

(iv) For each well affected facility for which you claim an exception under § 60.5375a(a)(3), you must record: The location of the well; the United States Well Number; the specific exception claimed; the starting date and ending date for the period the well operated under the exception; and an explanation of why the well meets the claimed exception.

(v) For each well affected facility required to comply with both § 60.5375a(a)(1) and (3), if you are using a digital photograph in lieu of the records required in paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (iv) of this section, you must retain the records of the digital photograph as specified in § 60.5410a(a)(4).

(vi) For each well affected facility for which you make a claim that the well affected facility is not subject to the well completion standards according to 60.5375a(g), you must maintain:

(A) A record of the analysis that was performed in order to make that claim, including but not limited to, GOR values for established leases and data from wells in the same basin and field;

(B) The location of the well; the United States Well Number;

(C) A record of the claim signed by the certifying official. The claim must include a certification by a certifying official of truth, accuracy, and completeness. This certification shall state that, based on information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, the statements and information in the

document are true, accurate, and complete.

(vii) For each well affected facility for which you determine according to § 60.5432a that it is a low pressure well, a record of the determination and supporting inputs and calculations.

(2) For each centrifugal compressor affected facility, you must maintain records of deviations in cases where the centrifugal compressor was not operated in compliance with the requirements specified in § 60.5380a. Except as specified in paragraph (c)(2)(vii) of this section, you must maintain the records in paragraphs (c)(2)(i) through (vi) of this section for each control device tested under § 60.5413a(d) which meets the criteria in § 60.5413a(d)(11) and § 60.5413a(e) and used to comply with § 60.5380a(a)(1) for each centrifugal compressor.

(i) Make, model and serial number of purchased device.

(ii) Date of purchase.

(iii) Copy of purchase order.

(iv) Location of the centrifugal compressor and control device in latitude and longitude coordinates in decimal degrees to an accuracy and precision of five (5) decimals of a degree using the North American Datum of 1983.

(v) Inlet gas flow rate.

(vi) Records of continuous compliance requirements in § 60.5413a(e) as specified in paragraphs (c)(2)(vi)(A) through (E) of this section.

(A) Records that the pilot flame is present at all times of operation.

(B) Records that the device was operated with no visible emissions except for periods not to exceed a total of 1 minute during any 15 minute period.

(C) Records of the maintenance and repair log.

(D) Records of the visible emissions test following return to operation from a maintenance or repair activity.

(E) Records of the manufacturer's written operating instructions, procedures and maintenance schedule to ensure good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions.

(vii) As an alternative to the requirements of paragraph (c)(2)(iv) of this section, you may maintain records of one or more digital photographs with the date the photograph was taken and the latitude and longitude of the centrifugal compressor and control device imbedded within or stored with the digital file. As an alternative to imbedded latitude and longitude within the digital photograph, the digital photograph may consist of a photograph of the centrifugal compressor and control device with a photograph of a

separately operating GPS device within the same digital picture, provided the latitude and longitude output of the GPS unit can be clearly read in the digital photograph.

(3) For each reciprocating compressor affected facility, you must maintain the records in paragraphs (c)(3)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) Records of the cumulative number of hours of operation or number of months since initial startup or the previous replacement of the reciprocating compressor rod packing, whichever is later. Alternatively, a statement that emissions from the rod packing are being routed to a process through a closed vent system under negative pressure.

(ii) Records of the date and time of each reciprocating compressor rod packing replacement, or date of installation of a rod packing emissions collection system and closed vent system as specified in § 60.5385a(a)(3).

(iii) Records of deviations in cases where the reciprocating compressor was not operated in compliance with the requirements specified in § 60.5385a.

(4) For each pneumatic controller affected facility, you must maintain the records identified in paragraphs (c)(4)(i) through (v) of this section, as applicable.

(i) Records of the date, location and manufacturer specifications for each pneumatic controller constructed, modified or reconstructed.

(ii) Records of the demonstration that the use of pneumatic controller affected facilities with a natural gas bleed rate greater than the applicable standard are required and the reasons why.

(iii) If the pneumatic controller is not located at a natural gas processing plant, records of the manufacturer's specifications indicating that the controller is designed such that natural gas bleed rate is less than or equal to 6 standard cubic feet per hour.

(iv) If the pneumatic controller is located at a natural gas processing plant, records of the documentation that the natural gas bleed rate is zero.

(v) Records of deviations in cases where the pneumatic controller was not operated in compliance with the requirements specified in § 60.5390a.

(5) For each storage vessel affected facility, you must maintain the records identified in paragraphs (c)(5)(i) through (vi) of this section.

(i) If required to reduce emissions by complying with § 60.5395a(a)(2), the records specified in §§ 60.5420a(c)(6) through (8), 60.5416a(c)(6)(ii), and 60.5416a(c)(7)(ii). You must maintain the records in paragraph (c)(5)(vi) of this part for each control device tested under § 60.5413a(d) which meets the criteria

in § 60.5413a(d)(11) and § 60.5413a(e) and used to comply with § 60.5395a(a)(2) for each storage vessel.

(ii) Records of each VOC emissions determination for each storage vessel affected facility made under § 60.5365a(e) including identification of the model or calculation methodology used to calculate the VOC emission rate.

(iii) Records of deviations in cases where the storage vessel was not operated in compliance with the requirements specified in §§ 60.5395a, 60.5411a, 60.5412a, and 60.5413a, as applicable.

(iv) For storage vessels that are skid-mounted or permanently attached to something that is mobile (such as trucks, railcars, barges or ships), records indicating the number of consecutive days that the vessel is located at a site in the oil and natural gas production segment, natural gas processing segment or natural gas transmission and storage segment. If a storage vessel is removed from a site and, within 30 days, is either returned to the site or replaced by another storage vessel at the site to serve the same or similar function, then the entire period since the original storage vessel was first located at the site, including the days when the storage vessel was removed, will be added to the count towards the number of consecutive days.

(v) You must maintain records of the identification and location of each storage vessel affected facility.

(vi) Except as specified in paragraph (c)(5)(vi)(G) of this section, you must maintain the records specified in paragraphs (c)(5)(vi)(A) through (F) of this section for each control device tested under § 60.5413a(d) which meets the criteria in § 60.5413a(d)(11) and § 60.5413a(e) and used to comply with § 60.5395a(a)(2) for each storage vessel.

(A) Make, model and serial number of purchased device.

(B) Date of purchase.

(C) Copy of purchase order.

(D) Location of the control device in latitude and longitude coordinates in decimal degrees to an accuracy and precision of five (5) decimals of a degree using the North American Datum of 1983.

(E) Inlet gas flow rate.

(F) Records of continuous compliance requirements in § 60.5413a(e) as specified in paragraphs (c)(5)(vi)(F)(1) through (5) of this section.

(1) Records that the pilot flame is present at all times of operation.

(2) Records that the device was operated with no visible emissions except for periods not to exceed a total of 1 minute during any 15 minute period.

(3) Records of the maintenance and repair log.

(4) Records of the visible emissions test following return to operation from a maintenance or repair activity.

(5) Records of the manufacturer's written operating instructions, procedures and maintenance schedule to ensure good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions.

(G) As an alternative to the requirements of paragraph (c)(5)(vi)(D) of this section, you may maintain records of one or more digital photographs with the date the photograph was taken and the latitude and longitude of the storage vessel and control device imbedded within or stored with the digital file. As an alternative to imbedded latitude and longitude within the digital photograph, the digital photograph may consist of a photograph of the storage vessel and control device with a photograph of a separately operating GPS device within the same digital picture, provided the latitude and longitude output of the GPS unit can be clearly read in the digital photograph.

(6) Records of each closed vent system inspection required under § 60.5416a(a)(1) and (2) for centrifugal compressors, reciprocating compressors and pneumatic pumps, or § 60.5416a(c)(1) for storage vessels.

(7) A record of each cover inspection required under § 60.5416a(a)(3) for centrifugal or reciprocating compressors or § 60.5416a(c)(2) for storage vessels.

(8) If you are subject to the bypass requirements of § 60.5416a(a)(4) for centrifugal compressors, reciprocating compressors or pneumatic pumps, or § 60.5416a(c)(3) for storage vessels, a record of each inspection or a record of each time the key is checked out or a record of each time the alarm is sounded.

(9) If you are subject to the closed vent system no detectable emissions requirements of § 60.5416a(b) for centrifugal compressors, reciprocating compressors or pneumatic pumps, a record of the monitoring conducted in accordance with § 60.5416a(b).

(10) For each centrifugal compressor or pneumatic pump affected facility, records of the schedule for carbon replacement (as determined by the design analysis requirements of § 60.5413a(c)(2) or (3)) and records of each carbon replacement as specified in § 60.5412a(c)(1).

(11) For each centrifugal compressor affected facility subject to the control device requirements of § 60.5412a(a), (b), and (c), records of minimum and maximum operating parameter values, continuous parameter monitoring

system data, calculated averages of continuous parameter monitoring system data, results of all compliance calculations, and results of all inspections.

(12) For each carbon adsorber installed on storage vessel affected facilities, records of the schedule for carbon replacement (as determined by the design analysis requirements of § 60.5412a(d)(2)) and records of each carbon replacement as specified in § 60.5412a(c)(1).

(13) For each storage vessel affected facility subject to the control device requirements of § 60.5412a(c) and (d), you must maintain records of the inspections, including any corrective actions taken, the manufacturers' operating instructions, procedures and maintenance schedule as specified in § 60.5417a(h)(3). You must maintain records of EPA Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part, section 11 results, which include: Company, location, company representative (name of the person performing the observation), sky conditions, process unit (type of control device), clock start time, observation period duration (in minutes and seconds), accumulated emission time (in minutes and seconds), and clock end time. You may create your own form including the above information or use Figure 22-1 in EPA Method 22 of appendix A-7 of this part. Manufacturer's operating instructions, procedures and maintenance schedule must be available for inspection.

(14) A log of records as specified in § 60.5412a(d)(1)(iii), for all inspection, repair and maintenance activities for each control device failing the visible emissions test.

(15) For each collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site and each collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station, the records identified in paragraphs (c)(15)(i) through (iii) of this section.

(i) The fugitive emissions monitoring plan as required in § 60.5397a(b), (c), and (d).

(ii) The records of each monitoring survey as specified in paragraphs (c)(15)(ii)(A) through (I) of this section.

(A) Date of the survey.

(B) Beginning and end time of the survey.

(C) Name of operator(s) performing survey. You must note the training and experience of the operator.

(D) Monitoring instrument used.

(E) When optical gas imaging is used to perform the survey, one or more digital photographs or videos, captured from the optical gas imaging instrument used for conduct of monitoring, of each required monitoring survey being

performed. The digital photograph must include the date the photograph was taken and the latitude and longitude of the collection of fugitive emissions components at a well site or collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station imbedded within or stored with the digital file. As an alternative to imbedded latitude and longitude within the digital file, the digital photograph or video may consist of an image of the monitoring survey being performed with a separately operating GPS device within the same digital picture or video, provided the latitude and longitude output of the GPS unit can be clearly read in the digital image.

(F) Fugitive emissions component identification when Method 21 is used to perform the monitoring survey.

(G) Ambient temperature, sky conditions, and maximum wind speed at the time of the survey.

(H) Any deviations from the monitoring plan or a statement that there were no deviations from the monitoring plan.

(I) Documentation of each fugitive emission, including the information specified in paragraphs (c)(15)(ii)(I)(1) through (12) of this section.

(1) Location.

(2) Any deviations from the monitoring plan or a statement that there were no deviations from the monitoring plan.

(3) Number and type of components for which fugitive emissions were detected.

(4) Number and type of difficult-to-monitor and unsafe-to-monitor fugitive emission components monitored.

(5) Instrument reading of each fugitive emissions component that requires repair when Method 21 is used for monitoring.

(6) Number and type of fugitive emissions components that were not repaired as required in § 60.5397a(h).

(7) Number and type of components that were tagged as a result of not being repaired during the monitoring survey when the fugitive emissions were initially found as required in § 60.5397a(h)(3)(ii).

(8) If a fugitive emissions component is not tagged, a digital photograph or video of each fugitive emissions component that could not be repaired during the monitoring survey when the fugitive emissions were initially found as required in § 60.5397a(h)(3)(ii). The digital photograph or video must clearly identify the location of the component that must be repaired. Any digital photograph or video required under this paragraph can also be used to meet the requirements under paragraph

(c)(15)(ii)(E) of this section, as long as the photograph or video is taken with the optical gas imaging instrument, includes the date and the latitude and longitude are either imbedded or visible in the picture.

(9) Repair methods applied in each attempt to repair the fugitive emissions components.

(10) Number and type of fugitive emission components placed on delay of repair and explanation for each delay of repair.

(11) The date of successful repair of the fugitive emissions component.

(12) Instrumentation used to resurvey a repaired fugitive emissions component that could not be repaired during the initial fugitive emissions finding.

(iii) For the collection of fugitive emissions components at a compressor station, if a monitoring survey is waived under § 60.5397a(g)(5), you must maintain records of the average calendar month temperature, including the source of the information, for each calendar month of the quarterly monitoring period for which the monitoring survey was waived.

(16) For each pneumatic pump affected facility, you must maintain the records identified in paragraphs (c)(16)(i) through (v) of this section.

(i) Records of the date, location and manufacturer specifications for each pneumatic pump constructed, modified or reconstructed.

(ii) Records of deviations in cases where the pneumatic pump was not operated in compliance with the requirements specified in § 60.5393a.

(iii) Records on the control device used for control of emissions from a pneumatic pump including the installation date, manufacturer's specifications, and if the control device is designed to achieve less than 95 percent emission reduction, a design evaluation or manufacturer's specifications indicating the percentage reduction achieved the control device is designed to achieve.

(iv) Records substantiating a claim according to § 60.5393a(b)(5) that it is technically infeasible to capture and route emissions from a pneumatic pump to a control device or process; including the qualified professional engineer certification according to § 60.5393a(b)(5)(ii) and the records of the engineering assessment of technical infeasibility performed according to § 60.5393a(b)(5)(iii).

(v) You must retain copies of all certifications, engineering assessments and related records for a period of five years and make them available if directed by the implementing agency.

(17) For each closed vent system routing to a control device or process, the records of the assessment conducted according to § 60.5411a(d):

- (i) A copy of the assessment conducted according to § 60.5411a(d)(1);
- (ii) A copy of the certification according to § 60.5411a(d)(1)(i); and
- (iii) The owner or operator shall retain copies of all certifications, assessments and any related records for a period of five years, and make them available if directed by the delegated authority.

§ 60.5421a What are my additional recordkeeping requirements for my affected facility subject to GHG and VOC requirements for onshore natural gas processing plants?

(a) You must comply with the requirements of paragraph (b) of this section in addition to the requirements of § 60.486a.

(b) The following recordkeeping requirements apply to pressure relief devices subject to the requirements of § 60.5401a(b)(1).

(1) When each leak is detected as specified in § 60.5401a(b)(2), a weatherproof and readily visible identification, marked with the equipment identification number, must be attached to the leaking equipment. The identification on the pressure relief device may be removed after it has been repaired.

(2) When each leak is detected as specified in § 60.5401a(b)(2), the information specified in paragraphs (b)(2)(i) through (x) of this section must be recorded in a log and shall be kept for 2 years in a readily accessible location:

- (i) The instrument and operator identification numbers and the equipment identification number.
- (ii) The date the leak was detected and the dates of each attempt to repair the leak.
- (iii) Repair methods applied in each attempt to repair the leak.
- (iv) "Above 500 ppm" if the maximum instrument reading measured by the methods specified in § 60.5400a(d) after each repair attempt is 500 ppm or greater.
- (v) "Repair delayed" and the reason for the delay if a leak is not repaired within 15 calendar days after discovery of the leak.
- (vi) The signature of the owner or operator (or designate) whose decision it was that repair could not be effected without a process shutdown.
- (vii) The expected date of successful repair of the leak if a leak is not repaired within 15 days.
- (viii) Dates of process unit shutdowns that occur while the equipment is unrepaired.

(ix) The date of successful repair of the leak.

(x) A list of identification numbers for equipment that are designated for no detectable emissions under the provisions of § 60.482–4a(a). The designation of equipment subject to the provisions of § 60.482–4a(a) must be signed by the owner or operator.

§ 60.5422a What are my additional reporting requirements for my affected facility subject to GHG and VOC requirements for onshore natural gas processing plants?

(a) You must comply with the requirements of paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section in addition to the requirements of § 60.487a(a), (b), (c)(2)(i) through (iv), and (c)(2)(vii) through (viii). You must submit semiannual reports to the EPA via the Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface (CEDRI). (CEDRI can be accessed through the EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) (<https://cdx.epa.gov/>)). Use the appropriate electronic report in CEDRI for this subpart or an alternate electronic file format consistent with the extensible markup language (XML) schema listed on the CEDRI Web site (<https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/cedri/>). If the reporting form specific to this subpart is not available in CEDRI at the time that the report is due, submit the report to the Administrator at the appropriate address listed in § 60.4. Once the form has been available in CEDRI for at least 90 days, you must begin submitting all subsequent reports via CEDRI. The report must be submitted by the deadline specified in this subpart, regardless of the method in which the report is submitted.

(b) An owner or operator must include the following information in the initial semiannual report in addition to the information required in § 60.487a(b)(1) through (4): Number of pressure relief devices subject to the requirements of § 60.5401a(b) except for those pressure relief devices designated for no detectable emissions under the provisions of § 60.482–4a(a) and those pressure relief devices complying with § 60.482–4a(c).

(c) An owner or operator must include the information specified in paragraphs (c)(1) and (2) of this section in all semiannual reports in addition to the information required in § 60.487a(c)(2)(i) through (vi):

- (1) Number of pressure relief devices for which leaks were detected as required in § 60.5401a(b)(2); and
- (2) Number of pressure relief devices for which leaks were not repaired as required in § 60.5401a(b)(3).

§ 60.5423a What additional recordkeeping and reporting requirements apply to my sweetening unit affected facilities at onshore natural gas processing plants?

(a) You must retain records of the calculations and measurements required in § 60.5405a(a) and (b) and § 60.5407a(a) through (g) for at least 2 years following the date of the measurements. This requirement is included under § 60.7(f) of the General Provisions.

(b) You must submit a report of excess emissions to the Administrator in your annual report if you had excess emissions during the reporting period. The excess emissions report must be submitted to the EPA via the Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface (CEDRI). (CEDRI can be accessed through the EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) (<https://cdx.epa.gov/>)). You must use the appropriate electronic report in CEDRI for this subpart or an alternate electronic file format consistent with the extensible markup language (XML) schema listed on the CEDRI Web site (<https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/cedri/>). If the reporting form specific to this subpart is not available in CEDRI at the time that the report is due, you must submit the report to the Administrator at the appropriate address listed in § 60.4. Once the form has been available in CEDRI for at least 90 days, you must begin submitting all subsequent reports via CEDRI. The report must be submitted by the deadline specified in this subpart, regardless of the method in which the report is submitted. For the purpose of these reports, excess emissions are defined as specified in paragraphs (b)(1) and (2) of this section.

(1) Any 24-hour period (at consistent intervals) during which the average sulfur emission reduction efficiency (R) is less than the minimum required efficiency (Z).

(2) For any affected facility electing to comply with the provisions of § 60.5407a(b)(2), any 24-hour period during which the average temperature of the gases leaving the combustion zone of an incinerator is less than the appropriate operating temperature as determined during the most recent performance test in accordance with the provisions of § 60.5407a(b)(3). Each 24-hour period must consist of at least 96 temperature measurements equally spaced over the 24 hours.

(c) To certify that a facility is exempt from the control requirements of these standards, for each facility with a design capacity less than 2 LT/D of H₂S in the acid gas (expressed as sulfur) you must keep, for the life of the facility, an analysis demonstrating that the facility's

design capacity is less than 2 LT/D of H₂S expressed as sulfur.

(d) If you elect to comply with § 60.5407a(e) you must keep, for the life of the facility, a record demonstrating that the facility's design capacity is less than 150 LT/D of H₂S expressed as sulfur.

(e) The requirements of paragraph (b) of this section remain in force until and unless the EPA, in delegating enforcement authority to a state under section 111(c) of the Act, approves reporting requirements or an alternative means of compliance surveillance adopted by such state. In that event, affected sources within the state will be relieved of obligation to comply with paragraph (b) of this section, provided that they comply with the requirements established by the state. Electronic reporting to the EPA cannot be waived, and as such, the provisions of this paragraph do not relieve owners or operators of affected facilities of the requirement to submit the electronic reports required in this section to the EPA.

§ 60.5425a What parts of the General Provisions apply to me?

Table 3 to this subpart shows which parts of the General Provisions in §§ 60.1 through 60.19 apply to you.

§ 60.5430a What definitions apply to this subpart?

As used in this subpart, all terms not defined herein shall have the meaning given them in the Act, in subpart A or subpart VVa of part 60; and the following terms shall have the specific meanings given them.

Acid gas means a gas stream of hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) that has been separated from sour natural gas by a sweetening unit.

Alaskan North Slope means the approximately 69,000 square-mile area extending from the Brooks Range to the Arctic Ocean.

API Gravity means the weight per unit volume of hydrocarbon liquids as measured by a system recommended by the American Petroleum Institute (API) and is expressed in degrees.

Artificial lift equipment means mechanical pumps including, but not limited to, rod pumps and electric submersible pumps used to flowback fluids from a well.

Bleed rate means the rate in standard cubic feet per hour at which natural gas is continuously vented (bleeds) from a pneumatic controller.

Capital expenditure means, in addition to the definition in 40 CFR 60.2, an expenditure for a physical or

operational change to an existing facility that exceeds P, the product of the facility's replacement cost, R, and an adjusted annual asset guideline repair allowance, A, as reflected by the following equation: $P = R \times A$, where:

(1) The adjusted annual asset guideline repair allowance, A, is the product of the percent of the replacement cost, Y, and the applicable basic annual asset guideline repair allowance, B, divided by 100 as reflected by the following equation: $A = Y \times (B \div 100)$;

(2) The percent Y is determined from the following equation: $Y = 1.0 - 0.575 \log x$, where x is 2011 minus the year of construction; and

(3) The applicable basic annual asset guideline repair allowance, B, is 4.5.

Centrifugal compressor means any machine for raising the pressure of a natural gas by drawing in low pressure natural gas and discharging significantly higher pressure natural gas by means of mechanical rotating vanes or impellers. Screw, sliding vane, and liquid ring compressors are not centrifugal compressors for the purposes of this subpart.

Certifying official means one of the following:

(1) For a corporation: A president, secretary, treasurer, or vice-president of the corporation in charge of a principal business function, or any other person who performs similar policy or decision-making functions for the corporation, or a duly authorized representative of such person if the representative is responsible for the overall operation of one or more manufacturing, production, or operating facilities applying for or subject to a permit and either:

(i) The facilities employ more than 250 persons or have gross annual sales or expenditures exceeding \$25 million (in second quarter 1980 dollars); or

(ii) The Administrator is notified of such delegation of authority prior to the exercise of that authority. The Administrator reserves the right to evaluate such delegation;

(2) For a partnership (including but not limited to general partnerships, limited partnerships, and limited liability partnerships) or sole proprietorship: A general partner or the proprietor, respectively. If a general partner is a corporation, the provisions of paragraph (1) of this definition apply;

(3) For a municipality, State, Federal, or other public agency: Either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For the purposes of this part, a principal executive officer of a Federal agency includes the chief

executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., a Regional Administrator of EPA); or

(4) For affected facilities:

(i) The designated representative in so far as actions, standards, requirements, or prohibitions under title IV of the Clean Air Act or the regulations promulgated thereunder are concerned; or

(ii) The designated representative for any other purposes under part 60.

Collection system means any infrastructure that conveys gas or liquids from the well site to another location for treatment, storage, processing, recycling, disposal or other handling.

Completion combustion device means any ignition device, installed horizontally or vertically, used in exploration and production operations to combust otherwise vented emissions from completions. Completion combustion devices include pit flares.

Compressor station means any permanent combination of one or more compressors that move natural gas at increased pressure through gathering or transmission pipelines, or into or out of storage. This includes, but is not limited to, gathering and boosting stations and transmission compressor stations. The combination of one or more compressors located at a well site, or located at an onshore natural gas processing plant, is not a compressor station for purposes of § 60.5397a.

Condensate means hydrocarbon liquid separated from natural gas that condenses due to changes in the temperature, pressure, or both, and remains liquid at standard conditions.

Continuous bleed means a continuous flow of pneumatic supply natural gas to a pneumatic controller.

Crude oil and natural gas source category means:

(1) Crude oil production, which includes the well and extends to the point of custody transfer to the crude oil transmission pipeline or any other forms of transportation; and

(2) Natural gas production, processing, transmission, and storage, which include the well and extend to, but do not include, the local distribution company custody transfer station.

Custody transfer means the transfer of crude oil or natural gas after processing and/or treatment in the producing operations, or from storage vessels or automatic transfer facilities or other such equipment, including product loading racks, to pipelines or any other forms of transportation.

Dehydrator means a device in which an absorbent directly contacts a natural gas stream and absorbs water in a contact tower or absorption column (absorber).

Delineation well means a well drilled in order to determine the boundary of a field or producing reservoir.

Deviation means any instance in which an affected source subject to this subpart, or an owner or operator of such a source:

(1) Fails to meet any requirement or obligation established by this subpart including, but not limited to, any emission limit, operating limit, or work practice standard;

(2) Fails to meet any term or condition that is adopted to implement an applicable requirement in this subpart and that is included in the operating permit for any affected source required to obtain such a permit; or

(3) Fails to meet any emission limit, operating limit, or work practice standard in this subpart during startup, shutdown, or malfunction, regardless of whether or not such failure is permitted by this subpart.

Equipment, as used in the standards and requirements in this subpart relative to the equipment leaks of GHG (in the form of methane) and VOC from onshore natural gas processing plants, means each pump, pressure relief device, open-ended valve or line, valve, and flange or other connector that is in VOC service or in wet gas service, and any device or system required by those same standards and requirements in this subpart.

Field gas means feedstock gas entering the natural gas processing plant.

Field gas gathering means the system used transport field gas from a field to the main pipeline in the area.

Flare means a thermal oxidation system using an open (without enclosure) flame. Completion combustion devices as defined in this section are not considered flares.

Flow line means a pipeline used to transport oil and/or gas to a processing facility or a mainline pipeline.

Flowback means the process of allowing fluids and entrained solids to flow from a well following a treatment, either in preparation for a subsequent phase of treatment or in preparation for cleanup and returning the well to production. The term flowback also means the fluids and entrained solids that emerge from a well during the flowback process. The flowback period begins when material introduced into the well during the treatment returns to the surface following hydraulic fracturing or refracturing. The flowback

period ends when either the well is shut in and permanently disconnected from the flowback equipment or at the startup of production. The flowback period includes the initial flowback stage and the separation flowback stage.

Fugitive emissions component means any component that has the potential to emit fugitive emissions of methane or VOC at a well site or compressor station, including but not limited to valves, connectors, pressure relief devices, open-ended lines, flanges, covers and closed vent systems not subject to § 60.5411a, thief hatches or other openings on a controlled storage vessel not subject to § 60.5395a, compressors, instruments, and meters. Devices that vent as part of normal operations, such as natural gas-driven pneumatic controllers or natural gas-driven pumps, are not fugitive emissions components, insofar as the natural gas discharged from the device's vent is not considered a fugitive emission. Emissions originating from other than the vent, such as the thief hatch on a controlled storage vessel, would be considered fugitive emissions.

Gas processing plant process unit means equipment assembled for the extraction of natural gas liquids from field gas, the fractionation of the liquids into natural gas products, or other operations associated with the processing of natural gas products. A process unit can operate independently if supplied with sufficient feed or raw materials and sufficient storage facilities for the products.

Gas to oil ratio (GOR) means the ratio of the volume of gas at standard temperature and pressure that is produced from a volume of oil when depressurized to standard temperature and pressure.

Greenfield site means a site, other than a natural gas processing plant, which is entirely new construction. Natural gas processing plants are not considered to be greenfield sites, even if they are entirely new construction.

Hydraulic fracturing means the process of directing pressurized fluids containing any combination of water, proppant, and any added chemicals to penetrate tight formations, such as shale or coal formations, that subsequently require high rate, extended flowback to expel fracture fluids and solids during completions.

Hydraulic refracturing means conducting a subsequent hydraulic fracturing operation at a well that has previously undergone a hydraulic fracturing operation.

In light liquid service means that the piece of equipment contains a liquid

that meets the conditions specified in § 60.485a(e) or § 60.5401a(f)(2).

In wet gas service means that a compressor or piece of equipment contains or contacts the field gas before the extraction step at a gas processing plant process unit.

Initial flowback stage means the period during a well completion operation which begins at the onset of flowback and ends at the separation flowback stage.

Intermediate hydrocarbon liquid means any naturally occurring, unrefined petroleum liquid.

Intermittent/snap-action pneumatic controller means a pneumatic controller that is designed to vent non-continuously.

Liquefied natural gas unit means a unit used to cool natural gas to the point at which it is condensed into a liquid which is colorless, odorless, non-corrosive and non-toxic.

Liquid collection system means tankage and/or lines at a well site to contain liquids from one or more wells or to convey liquids to another site.

Local distribution company (LDC) custody transfer station means a metering station where the LDC receives a natural gas supply from an upstream supplier, which may be an interstate transmission pipeline or a local natural gas producer, for delivery to customers through the LDC's intrastate transmission or distribution lines.

Low pressure well means a well that satisfies at least one of the following conditions:

(1) The static pressure at the wellhead following fracturing but prior to the onset of flowback is less than the flow line pressure at the sales meter;

(2) The pressure of flowback fluid immediately before it enters the flow line, as determined under § 60.5432a, is less than the flow line pressure at the sales meter; or

(3) Flowback of the fracture fluids will not occur without the use of artificial lift equipment.

Maximum average daily throughput means the earliest calculation of daily average throughput during the 30-day PTE evaluation period employing generally accepted methods.

Natural gas-driven diaphragm pump means a positive displacement pump powered by pressurized natural gas that uses the reciprocating action of flexible diaphragms in conjunction with check valves to pump a fluid. A pump in which a fluid is displaced by a piston driven by a diaphragm is not considered a diaphragm pump for purposes of this subpart. A lean glycol circulation pump that relies on energy exchange with the

rich glycol from the contactor is not considered a diaphragm pump.

Natural gas-driven pneumatic controller means a pneumatic controller powered by pressurized natural gas.

Natural gas liquids means the hydrocarbons, such as ethane, propane, butane, and pentane that are extracted from field gas.

Natural gas processing plant (gas plant) means any processing site engaged in the extraction of natural gas liquids from field gas, fractionation of mixed natural gas liquids to natural gas products, or both. A Joule-Thompson valve, a dew point depression valve, or an isolated or standalone Joule-Thompson skid is not a natural gas processing plant.

Natural gas transmission means the pipelines used for the long distance transport of natural gas (excluding processing). Specific equipment used in natural gas transmission includes the land, mains, valves, meters, boosters, regulators, storage vessels, dehydrators, compressors, and their driving units and appurtenances, and equipment used for transporting gas from a production plant, delivery point of purchased gas, gathering system, storage area, or other wholesale source of gas to one or more distribution area(s).

Nonfractionating plant means any gas plant that does not fractionate mixed natural gas liquids into natural gas products.

Non-natural gas-driven pneumatic controller means an instrument that is actuated using other sources of power than pressurized natural gas; examples include solar, electric, and instrument air.

Onshore means all facilities except those that are located in the territorial seas or on the outer continental shelf.

Pneumatic controller means an automated instrument used for maintaining a process condition such as liquid level, pressure, delta-pressure and temperature.

Pressure vessel means a storage vessel that is used to store liquids or gases and is designed not to vent to the atmosphere as a result of compression of the vapor headspace in the pressure vessel during filling of the pressure vessel to its design capacity.

Process unit means components assembled for the extraction of natural gas liquids from field gas, the fractionation of the liquids into natural gas products, or other operations associated with the processing of natural gas products. A process unit can operate independently if supplied with sufficient feed or raw materials and sufficient storage facilities for the products.

Produced water means water that is extracted from the earth from an oil or natural gas production well, or that is separated from crude oil, condensate, or natural gas after extraction.

Qualified Professional Engineer means an individual who is licensed by a state as a Professional Engineer to practice one or more disciplines of engineering and who is qualified by education, technical knowledge and experience to make the specific technical certifications required under this subpart. Professional engineers making these certifications must be currently licensed in at least one state in which the certifying official is located.

Reciprocating compressor means a piece of equipment that increases the pressure of a process gas by positive displacement, employing linear movement of the driveshaft.

Reciprocating compressor rod packing means a series of flexible rings in machined metal cups that fit around the reciprocating compressor piston rod to create a seal limiting the amount of compressed natural gas that escapes to the atmosphere, or other mechanism that provides the same function.

Recovered gas means gas recovered through the separation process during flowback.

Recovered liquids means any crude oil, condensate or produced water recovered through the separation process during flowback.

Reduced emissions completion means a well completion following fracturing or refracturing where gas flowback that is otherwise vented is captured, cleaned, and routed to the gas flow line or collection system, re-injected into the well or another well, used as an onsite fuel source, or used for other useful purpose that a purchased fuel or raw material would serve, with no direct release to the atmosphere.

Reduced sulfur compounds means H₂S, carbonyl sulfide (COS), and carbon disulfide (CS₂).

Removed from service means that a storage vessel affected facility has been physically isolated and disconnected from the process for a purpose other than maintenance in accordance with § 60.5395a(c)(1).

Returned to service means that a storage vessel affected facility that was removed from service has been:

(1) Reconnected to the original source of liquids or has been used to replace any storage vessel affected facility; or

(2) Installed in any location covered by this subpart and introduced with crude oil, condensate, intermediate hydrocarbon liquids or produced water.

Routed to a process or route to a process means the emissions are conveyed via a closed vent system to any enclosed portion of a process that is operational where the emissions are predominantly recycled and/or consumed in the same manner as a material that fulfills the same function in the process and/or transformed by chemical reaction into materials that are not regulated materials and/or incorporated into a product; and/or recovered.

Salable quality gas means natural gas that meets the flow line or collection system operator specifications, regardless of whether such gas is sold.

Separation flowback stage means the period during a well completion operation when it is technically feasible for a separator to function. The separation flowback stage ends either at the startup of production, or when the well is shut in and permanently disconnected from the flowback equipment.

Startup of production means the beginning of initial flow following the end of flowback when there is continuous recovery of salable quality gas and separation and recovery of any crude oil, condensate or produced water.

Storage vessel means a tank or other vessel that contains an accumulation of crude oil, condensate, intermediate hydrocarbon liquids, or produced water, and that is constructed primarily of nonearthen materials (such as wood, concrete, steel, fiberglass, or plastic) which provide structural support. A well completion vessel that receives recovered liquids from a well after startup of production following flowback for a period which exceeds 60 days is considered a storage vessel under this subpart. A tank or other vessel shall not be considered a storage vessel if it has been removed from service in accordance with the requirements of § 60.5395a(c)(1) until such time as such tank or other vessel has been returned to service. For the purposes of this subpart, the following are not considered storage vessels:

(1) Vessels that are skid-mounted or permanently attached to something that is mobile (such as trucks, railcars, barges or ships), and are intended to be

located at a site for less than 180 consecutive days. If you do not keep or are not able to produce records, as required by § 60.5420a(c)(5)(iv), showing that the vessel has been located at a site for less than 180 consecutive days, the vessel described herein is considered to be a storage vessel from the date the original vessel was first located at the site. This exclusion does not apply to a well completion vessel as described above.

(2) Process vessels such as surge control vessels, bottoms receivers or knockout vessels.

(3) Pressure vessels designed to operate in excess of 204.9 kilopascals and without emissions to the atmosphere.

Sulfur production rate means the rate of liquid sulfur accumulation from the sulfur recovery unit.

Sulfur recovery unit means a process device that recovers element sulfur from acid gas.

Surface site means any combination of one or more graded pad sites, gravel pad sites, foundations, platforms, or the immediate physical location upon which equipment is physically affixed.

Sweetening unit means a process device that removes hydrogen sulfide and/or carbon dioxide from the sour natural gas stream.

Total Reduced Sulfur (TRS) means the sum of the sulfur compounds hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, and dimethyl disulfide as measured by Method 16 of appendix A-6 of this part.

Total SO₂ equivalents means the sum of volumetric or mass concentrations of the sulfur compounds obtained by adding the quantity existing as SO₂ to the quantity of SO₂ that would be obtained if all reduced sulfur compounds were converted to SO₂ (ppmv or kg/dscm (lb/dscf)).

Underground storage vessel means a storage vessel stored below ground.

Well means a hole drilled for the purpose of producing oil or natural gas, or a well into which fluids are injected.

Well completion means the process that allows for the flowback of petroleum or natural gas from newly drilled wells to expel drilling and reservoir fluids and tests the reservoir flow characteristics, which may vent

produced hydrocarbons to the atmosphere via an open pit or tank.

Well completion operation means any well completion with hydraulic fracturing or refracturing occurring at a well affected facility.

Well completion vessel means a vessel that contains flowback during a well completion operation following hydraulic fracturing or refracturing. A well completion vessel may be a lined earthen pit, a tank or other vessel that is skid-mounted or portable. A well completion vessel that receives recovered liquids from a well after startup of production following flowback for a period which exceeds 60 days is considered a storage vessel under this subpart.

Well site means one or more surface sites that are constructed for the drilling and subsequent operation of any oil well, natural gas well, or injection well. For purposes of the fugitive emissions standards at § 60.5397a, well site also means a separate tank battery surface site collecting crude oil, condensate, intermediate hydrocarbon liquids, or produced water from wells not located at the well site (e.g., centralized tank batteries).

Wellhead means the piping, casing, tubing and connected valves protruding above the earth's surface for an oil and/or natural gas well. The wellhead ends where the flow line connects to a wellhead valve. The wellhead does not include other equipment at the well site except for any conveyance through which gas is vented to the atmosphere.

Wildcat well means a well outside known fields or the first well drilled in an oil or gas field where no other oil and gas production exists.

§ 60.5432a How do I determine whether a well is a low pressure well using the low pressure well equation?

(a) To determine that your well is a low pressure well subject to § 60.5375a(f), you must determine whether the characteristics of the well are such that the well meets the definition of low pressure well in § 60.5430a. To determine that the well meets the definition of low pressure well in § 60.5430a, you must use the low pressure well equation below:

$$P_L \text{ (psia)} = 0.495 \times P_R - \frac{q_g}{q_g + q_o + q_w} [0.05 \times P_R + 0.038 \times L - 67.578] - \left[\frac{q_o}{q_g + q_o + q_w} \times \left(\frac{\rho_o}{144} + \frac{q_w}{q_g + q_o + q_w} 0.433 \right) \right] \cdot L$$

Where:

- (1) P_L is the pressure of flowback fluid immediately before it enters the flow line, expressed in pounds force per square inch (psia), and is to be calculated using the equation above;
- (2) P_R is the pressure of the reservoir containing oil, gas, and water at the well site, expressed in psia;
- (3) L is the true vertical depth of the well, expressed in feet (ft);
- (4) q_o is the flow rate of oil in the well, expressed in cubic feet/second (cu ft/sec);
- (5) q_g is the flow rate of gas in the well, expressed in cu ft/sec;
- (6) q_w is the flow rate of water in the well, expressed in cu ft/sec;
- (7) ρ_o is the density of oil in the well, expressed in pounds mass per cubic feet (lbm/cu ft).

(b) You must determine the four values in paragraphs (a)(4) through (7) of this section, using the calculations in paragraphs (b)(1) through (b)(15) of this section.

(1) Determine the value of the bottom hole pressure, P_{BH} (psia), based on available information at the well site, or by calculating it using the reservoir pressure, P_R (psia), in the following equation:

$$P_{BH} \text{ (psia)} = \frac{1}{2} P_R$$

(2) Determine the value of the bottom hole temperature, T_{BH} (F), based on available information at the well site, or by calculating it using the true vertical depth of the well, L (ft), in the following equation:

$$T_{BH} \text{ (F)} = (0.014 \times L) + 79.081$$

(3) Calculate the value of the applicable natural gas specific gravity that would result from a separator pressure of 100 psig, γ_{gs} , using the

following equation with: Separator at standard conditions (pressure, $p = 14.7$ (psia), temperature, $T = 60$ (F)); the oil API gravity at the well site, γ_o ; and the gas specific gravity at the separator under standard conditions, $\gamma_{gp} = 0.75$:

$$\gamma_{gs} = \gamma_{gp} \cdot \left(1.0 + 5.912 \times 10^{-5} \cdot \gamma_o \cdot T \cdot \log \left(\frac{p}{114.7} \right) \right)$$

(4) Calculate the value of the applicable dissolved GOR, R_s (scf/STBO), using the following equation with: The bottom hole pressure, P_{BH}

(psia), determined in (b)(1) of this section; the bottom hole temperature, T_{BH} (F), determined in (b)(2) of this section; the gas gravity at separator

pressure of 100 psig, γ_{gs} , calculated in (b)(3) of this section; the oil API gravity, γ_o , at the well site; and the constants, C1, C2, and C3, found in Table A:

$$R_s \left(\frac{\text{scf}}{\text{STBO}} \right) = C1 \cdot \gamma_{gs} \cdot P_{BH}^{C2} \cdot \exp \left[C3 \left(\frac{\gamma_o}{T_{BH} + 460} \right) \right]$$

TABLE A—COEFFICIENTS FOR THE CORRELATION FOR R_s

Constant	$\gamma_{API} \leq 30$	$\gamma_{API} > 30$
C1	0.0362	0.0178
C2	1.0937	1.1870
C3	25.7240	23.931

(5) Calculate the value of the oil formation volume factor, B_o (bbl/STBO), using the following equation with: the bottom hole temperature, T_{BH} (F), determined in paragraph (b)(2) of this section; the gas gravity at separator pressure of 100 psig, γ_{gs} , calculated in paragraph (b)(3) of this section; the

dissolved GOR, R_s (scf/STBO), calculated in paragraph (b)(4) of this section; the oil API gravity, γ_o , at the well site; and the constants, C1, C2, and C3, found in Table B:

$$B_o \left(\frac{\text{bbl}}{\text{STBO}} \right) = 1.0 + C1 \cdot R_s + (T_{BH} - 60) \left(\frac{\gamma_o}{\gamma_{gs}} \right) \cdot (C2 + C3 \cdot R_s)$$

TABLE B—COEFFICIENTS FOR THE CORRELATION FOR B_o

Constant	$\gamma_{API} \leq 30$	$\gamma_{API} > 30$
C1	4.677×10^{-4}	4.670×10^{-4}
C2	1.751×10^{-5}	1.100×10^{-5}
C3	-1.811×10^{-8}	1.337×10^{-9}

(6) Calculate the density of oil at the wellhead, $\rho_{WH} \left(\frac{lbm}{cu\ ft} \right)$, using the following equation with the value of the oil API gravity, γ_o , at the well site:

$$\rho_{WH} \left(\frac{lbm}{cu\ ft} \right) = \frac{141.5}{\gamma_o + 131.5} \times 62.4$$

(7) Calculate the density of oil at bottom hole conditions, $\rho_{BH} \left(\frac{lbm}{cu\ ft} \right)$, using the following equation with: the dissolved GOR, R_s (scf/STBO), calculated in paragraph (b) (4) of this section; the oil formation volume factor, B_o (bbl/STBO), calculated in paragraph (b) (5) of this section; the oil density at the wellhead, $\rho_{WH} \left(\frac{lbm}{cu\ ft} \right)$, calculated in paragraph (b) (6) of this section; and the dissolved gas gravity, $\gamma_{gd} = 0.77$:

$$\rho_{BH} \left(\frac{lbm}{cu\ ft} \right) = \frac{\rho_{WH} + 0.0136 \times R_s \times \gamma_{gd}}{B_o}$$

(8) Calculate the density of oil in the well, $\rho_o \left(\frac{lbm}{cu\ ft} \right)$, using the following equation with the density of oil at the wellhead, $\rho_{WH} \left(\frac{lbm}{cu\ ft} \right)$, calculated in paragraph (b)(6) of this section; and the density of oil at bottom hole conditions, $\rho_{BH} \left(\frac{lbm}{cu\ ft} \right)$, calculated in paragraph (b)(7) of this section:

$$\rho_o \left(\frac{lbm}{cu\ ft} \right) = 0.5 \times (\rho_{WH} + \rho_{BH})$$

(9) Calculate the oil flow rate, $q_o \text{ (cu ft/sec)}$, using the following equation with: the oil formation volume factor, $Bo \text{ (bbl/STBO)}$, as calculated in paragraph (b)(5) of this section; and the estimated oil production rate at the well head, $Q_o \text{ (STBO/day)}$:

$$q_o \left(\frac{cu\ ft}{sec} \right) = Q_o \left(\frac{STBO}{day} \right) \times Bo \left(\frac{bbl}{STBO} \right) \times 5.614 \left(\frac{cu\ ft}{bbl} \right) \times \frac{1}{24 \times 60 \times 60} \left(\frac{day}{sec} \right)$$

(10) Calculate the critical pressure, P_c (psia), and critical temperature, T_c (R), using the equations below with: Gas gravity at standard conditions (pressure, $P = 14.7 \text{ (psia)}$, temperature, $T = 60 \text{ (F)}$), $\gamma = 0.75$; and where the mole fractions of nitrogen, carbon dioxide and hydrogen sulfide in the gas are $X_{N_2} =$

0.168225, $X_{CO_2} = 0.013163$, and $X_{H_2S} = 0.013680$, respectively:
 $P_c \text{ (psia)} = 678 - 50 \cdot (\gamma_g - 0.5) - 206.7$
 $\cdot X_{N_2} + 440 \cdot X_{CO_2} + 606.7 \cdot X_{H_2S}$
 $T_c \text{ (R)} = 326 + 315.7 \cdot (\gamma_g - 0.5) - 240$
 $\cdot X_{N_2} - 88.3 \cdot X_{CO_2} + 133.3 \cdot X_{H_2S}$
 (11) Calculate reduced pressure, P_r , and reduced temperature, T_r , using the

following equations with: the bottom hole pressure, P_{BH} , as determined in paragraph (b)(1) of this section; the bottom hole temperature, $T_{BH} \text{ (F)}$, as determined in paragraph (b)(2) of this section in the following equations:

$$P_r = \frac{P_{BH}}{P_c}$$

$$T_r = \frac{T_{BH} + 460}{T_c}$$

(12)(i) Calculate the gas compressibility factor, Z , using the following equation with the reduced

pressure, P_r , calculated in paragraph (b)(11) of this section:

$$Z = A + \frac{(1 - A)}{e^B} + C \cdot p_r^D$$

(ii) The values for A, B, C, D in the above equation, are calculated using the

following equations with the reduced pressure, P_r , and reduced temperature,

T_r , calculated in paragraph (b)(11) of this section:

$$A = 1.39 \cdot (T_r - 0.92)^{0.5} - 0.36 \cdot T_r - 0.101$$

$$B = (0.62 - 0.23 \cdot T_r) \cdot P_r + \left(\frac{0.066}{(T_r - 0.86)} - 0.037 \right) \cdot P_r^2$$

$$+ \frac{0.32}{10^{9 \cdot (T_r - 1)}} \cdot P_r^6$$

$$C = (0.132 - 0.32 \cdot \log(T_r))$$

$$D = 10^{0.3106 - 0.49 \cdot T_r + 0.1824 \cdot T_r^2}$$

(13) Calculate the gas formation volume factor, $B_g \left(\frac{\text{cuft}}{\text{scf}} \right)$, using the bottom hole pressure, P_{BH} (psia), as determined in paragraph (b) (1) of this section; and the bottom hole temperature, T_{BH} (F), as determined in paragraph (b) (2) of this section:

$$B_g \left(\frac{\text{cuft}}{\text{scf}} \right) = 0.0283 \cdot \frac{Z \cdot (T_{BH} + 460)}{P_{BH}} \text{ ()}$$

(14) Calculate the gas flow rate, $q_g \left(\frac{\text{cuft}}{\text{sec}} \right)$, using the following equation with: the value of gas formation volume factor, $B_g \left(\frac{\text{cuft}}{\text{scf}} \right)$, calculated in paragraph (b) (13) of this section; the estimated gas production rate, Q_g (scf/day); the estimated oil production rate, Q_o (STBO/day); and the dissolved GOR, R_s (scf/STBO), as calculated in paragraph (b) (4) of this section:

$$q_g \left(\frac{\text{cf}}{\text{sec}} \right) = (Q_g - R_s \cdot Q_o) \cdot B_g \cdot \frac{1}{24 \times 60 \times 60}$$

(15) Calculate the flow rate of water in the well, q_w (cu ft/sec), using the following equation with the water

production rate Q_w (bbl/day) at the well site:

$$q_w \left(\frac{\text{cf}}{\text{sec}} \right) = Q_w \left(\frac{\text{bbl}}{\text{day}} \right) \times 5.614 \left(\frac{\text{cf}}{\text{bbl}} \right) \times \frac{1}{24 \times 60 \times 60} \left(\frac{\text{day}}{\text{sec}} \right)$$

TABLE 1 TO SUBPART OOOOa OF PART 60—REQUIRED MINIMUM INITIAL SO₂ EMISSION REDUCTION EFFICIENCY (Z_i)

H ₂ S content of acid gas (Y), %	Sulfur feed rate (X), LT/D			
	2.0 < X < 5.0	5.0 < X < 15.0	15.0 < X < 300.0	X > 300.0
Y > 50	79.0	88.51X ^{0.0101} Y ^{0.0125} or 99.9, whichever is smaller.		
20 < Y < 50	79.0	88.51X ^{0.0101} Y ^{0.0125} or 97.9, whichever is smaller		97.9
10 < Y < 20	79.0	88.51X ^{0.0101} Y ^{0.0125} or 93.5, whichever is smaller.	93.5	93.5
Y < 10	79.0	79.0	79.0	79.0

TABLE 2 TO SUBPART OOOOa OF PART 60—REQUIRED MINIMUM SO₂ EMISSION REDUCTION EFFICIENCY (Z_c)

H ₂ S content of acid gas (Y), %	Sulfur feed rate (X), LT/D			
	2.0 < X < 5.0	5.0 < X < 15.0	15.0 < X < 300.0	X > 300.0
Y > 50	74.0	85.35X ^{0.0144} Y ^{0.0128} or 99.9, whichever is smaller.		
20 < Y < 50	74.0	85.35X ^{0.0144} Y ^{0.0128} or 97.5, whichever is smaller		97.5
10 < Y < 20	74.0	85.35X ^{0.0144} Y ^{0.0128} or 90.8, whichever is smaller.	90.8	90.8
Y < 10	74.0	74.0	74.0	74.0

X = The sulfur feed rate from the sweetening unit (i.e., the H₂S in the acid gas), expressed as sulfur, Mg/D(LT/D), rounded to one decimal place.

Y = The sulfur content of the acid gas from the sweetening unit, expressed as

mole percent H₂S (dry basis) rounded to one decimal place.

Z = The minimum required sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emission reduction efficiency, expressed as percent carried to one decimal place. Z_i refers to the reduction efficiency required at the

initial performance test. Z_c refers to the reduction efficiency required on a continuous basis after compliance with Z_i has been demonstrated.

As stated in § 60.5425a, you must comply with the following applicable General Provisions:

TABLE 3 TO SUBPART OOOOa OF PART 60—APPLICABILITY OF GENERAL PROVISIONS TO SUBPART OOOOa

General provisions citation	Subject of citation	Applies to subpart?	Explanation
§ 60.1	General applicability of the General Provisions	Yes	Additional terms defined in § 60.5430a.
§ 60.2	Definitions	Yes	
§ 60.3	Units and abbreviations	Yes	
§ 60.4	Address	Yes	
§ 60.5	Determination of construction or modification ...	Yes	
§ 60.6	Review of plans	Yes	
§ 60.7	Notification and record keeping	Yes	
§ 60.8	Performance tests	Yes	Except that § 60.7 only applies as specified in § 60.5420a(a). Performance testing is required for control devices used on storage vessels, centrifugal compressors and pneumatic pumps.
§ 60.9	Availability of information	Yes	Requirements are specified in subpart OOOOa.
§ 60.10	State authority	Yes	
§ 60.11	Compliance with standards and maintenance requirements.	No	
§ 60.12	Circumvention	Yes	Continuous monitors are required for storage vessels.
§ 60.13	Monitoring requirements	Yes	
§ 60.14	Modification	Yes	To the extent any provision in § 60.14 conflicts with specific provisions in subpart OOOOa, it is superseded by subpart OOOOa provisions.
§ 60.15	Reconstruction	Yes	Except that § 60.15(d) does not apply to wells, pneumatic controllers, pneumatic pumps, centrifugal compressors, reciprocating compressors or storage vessels.
§ 60.16	Priority list	Yes	
§ 60.17	Incorporations by reference	Yes	
§ 60.18	General control device and work practice requirements.	Yes	

TABLE 3 TO SUBPART OOOOa OF PART 60—APPLICABILITY OF GENERAL PROVISIONS TO SUBPART OOOOa—Continued

General provisions citation	Subject of citation	Applies to subpart?	Explanation
§ 60.19	General notification and reporting requirement	Yes	

[FR Doc. 2016-11971 Filed 6-2-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

- (iii) Shelf life.
- (iv) Compatibility information for use in the magnetic resonance environment.
- (v) Stent foreshortening information supported by dimensional testing.

Dated: July 6, 2016.

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016-16530 Filed 7-12-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG-2016-0643]

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Willamette River at Portland, OR

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of deviation from drawbridge regulation.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard has issued a temporary deviation from the operating schedule that governs four Multnomah County bridges: The Broadway Bridge, mile 11.7; Burnside Bridge, mile 12.4; Morrison Bridge, mile 12.8; and Hawthorne Bridge, mile 13.1; all crossing the Willamette River at Portland, OR. This deviation is necessary to accommodate the annual Portland Providence Bridge Pedal event. The deviation allows the bridges to remain in the closed-to-navigation position to allow safe roadway movement of event participants.

DATES: This deviation is effective from 6 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. on August 14, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The docket for this deviation, [USCG-2016-00643] is available at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Type the docket number in the "SEARCH" box and click "SEARCH." Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this deviation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this temporary deviation, call or email Mr. Steven Fischer, Bridge Administrator, Thirteenth Coast Guard District; telephone 206-220-7282, email d13-pf-d13bridges@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Multnomah County has requested a temporary deviation from the operating schedule for the Broadway Bridge, mile 11.7; Burnside Bridge, mile 12.4; Morrison Bridge, mile 12.8; and Hawthorne Bridge, mile 13.1; all crossing the Willamette River at Portland, OR. The requested deviation is

to accommodate the annual Portland Providence Bridge Pedal event. To facilitate this event, the draws of these bridges will be maintained as follows: The Broadway Bridge provides a vertical clearance of 90 feet in the closed-to-navigation position; Burnside Bridge provides a vertical clearance of 64 feet in the closed-to-navigation position; Morrison Bridge provides a vertical clearance of 69 feet in the closed-to-navigation position; and Hawthorne Bridge provides a vertical clearance of 49 feet in the closed-to-navigation position; all clearances are referenced to the vertical clearance above Columbia River Datum 0.0. The normal operating schedule for all four bridges is in 33 CFR 117.897. This deviation allows the Broadway Bridge, Burnside Bridge, Morrison Bridge, and Hawthorne Bridge to remain in the closed-to-navigation position and need not open for maritime traffic from 6 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. on August 14, 2016. Waterway usage on this part of the Willamette River includes vessels ranging from commercial tug and barge to small pleasure craft.

Vessels able to pass through the bridge in the closed-to-navigation positions may do so at any time. The bridges will be able to open for emergencies, and there is no immediate alternate route for vessels to pass. The Coast Guard will inform the users of the waterway, through our Local and Broadcast Notices to Mariners, of the change in operating schedule for the bridges so that vessels can arrange their transits to minimize any impact caused by the temporary deviation.

In accordance with 33 CFR 117.35(e), the drawbridges must return to their regular operating schedules immediately at the end of the effective period of this temporary deviation. This deviation from the operating regulations is authorized under 33 CFR 117.35.

Dated: July 6, 2016.

Steven M. Fischer,

Bridge Administrator, Thirteenth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2016-16471 Filed 7-12-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 60 and 63

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0682; FRL-9948-92-OAR]

RIN 2016-AS83

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Petroleum Refinery Sector Amendments

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action amends the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for Petroleum Refineries in three respects. First, this action adjusts the compliance date for regulatory requirements that apply at maintenance vents during periods of startup, shutdown, maintenance or inspection for sources constructed or reconstructed on or before June 30, 2014. Second, this action amends the compliance dates for the regulatory requirements that apply during startup, shutdown, or hot standby for fluid catalytic cracking units (FCCU) and startup and shutdown for sulfur recovery units (SRU) constructed or reconstructed on or before June 30, 2014. Finally, this action finalizes technical corrections and clarifications to the NESHAP and the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for Petroleum Refineries. These amendments are being finalized in response to new information submitted after these regulatory requirements were promulgated as part of the residual risk and technology review (RTR) rulemaking, which was published on December 1, 2015. This action will have an insignificant effect on emissions reductions and costs.

DATES: This final rule is effective on July 13, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0682. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., confidential business information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are

available electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Brenda Shine, Sector Policies and Programs Division, Refining and Chemicals Group (E143-01), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone number: (919) 541-3608; email address: shine.brenda@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Preamble Acronyms and Abbreviations. We use multiple acronyms and terms in this preamble. While this list may not be exhaustive, to ease the reading of this preamble and for reference purposes, the EPA defines the following terms and acronyms here:

CAA Clean Air Act
 CBI confidential business information
 CFR Code of Federal Regulations
 COMS continuous opacity monitoring system
 CPMS continuous parameter monitoring system
 EPA Environmental Protection Agency
 ESP electrostatic precipitator
 FCCU fluid catalytic cracking unit
 HAP hazardous air pollutants
 LEL lower explosive limit
 NESHAP national emissions standards for hazardous air pollutants
 NSPS new source performance standards
 NTTAA National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
 OAQPS Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
 OMB Office of Management and Budget
 OSHA Occupational Safety and Health Administration
 PRA Paperwork Reduction Act
 PSM Process Safety Management
 QA quality assurance
 RFA Regulatory Flexibility Act
 RMP Risk Management Plan
 RSR Refinery Sector Rule
 RTR residual risk and technology review
 SRU sulfur recovery unit
 TTN Technology Transfer Network
 UMRA Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Organization of This Document. The information in this preamble is organized as follows:

- I. General Information
 - A. Does this action apply to me?
 - B. Where can I get a copy of this document and other related information?
 - C. Judicial Review and Administrative Reconsideration
- II. Background Information
- III. Final Revisions to Compliance Dates and Technical Corrections in the NSPS and NESHAP for Petroleum Refineries and Revisions on the February 9, 2016 Proposal
- IV. Summary of Comments and Responses
 - A. Compliance Date Amendments
 - B. Technical and Editorial Corrections
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

- A. Executive Orders 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review
- B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
- C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)
- D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)
- E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
- F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
- G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks
- H. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use
- I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)
- J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
- K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

Regulated Entities. Categories and entities potentially regulated by this action are shown in Table 1 of this preamble.

TABLE 1—INDUSTRIAL SOURCE CATEGORIES AFFECTED BY THIS FINAL ACTION

NESHAP and source category	NAICS ^a Code
Petroleum Refining Industry	324110

^aNorth American Industry Classification System.

Table 1 of this preamble is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to provide a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by the final action for the source categories listed. To determine whether your facility is affected, you should examine the applicability criteria in the appropriate NESHAP or NSPS. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of any aspect of these NESHAP or NSPS, please contact the appropriate person listed in the preceding **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble.

B. Where can I get a copy of this document and other related information?

In addition to being available in the docket, an electronic copy of this final action will also be available on the Internet through the Technology Transfer Network (TTN) Web site, a forum for information and technology exchange in various areas of air pollution control. Following signature

by the EPA Administrator, the EPA will post a copy of this final action at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/petref.html>.

Following publication in the **Federal Register**, the EPA will post the **Federal Register** version and key technical documents at this same Web site.

C. Judicial Review and Administrative Reconsideration

Under Clean Air Act (CAA) section 307(b)(1), judicial review of this final action is available only by filing a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by September 12, 2016. Under CAA section 307(b)(2), the requirements established by this final rule may not be challenged separately in any civil or criminal proceedings brought by the EPA to enforce the requirements.

Section 307(d)(7)(B) of the CAA further provides that “[o]nly an objection to a rule or procedure which was raised with reasonable specificity during the period for public comment (including any public hearing) may be raised during judicial review.” This section also provides a mechanism for the EPA to reconsider the rule “[i]f the person raising an objection can demonstrate to the Administrator that it was impracticable to raise such objection within [the period for public comment] or if the grounds for such objection arose after the period for public comment (but within the time specified for judicial review) and if such objection is of central relevance to the outcome of the rule.” Any person seeking to make such a demonstration should submit a Petition for Reconsideration to the Office of the Administrator, U.S. EPA, Room 3000, EPA WJC North Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460, with a copy to the person listed in the preceding **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section, and the Associate General Counsel for the Air and Radiation Law Office, Office of General Counsel (Mail Code 2344A), U.S. EPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460.

II. Background Information

The EPA promulgated NESHAP pursuant to the CAA sections 112(d)(2) and (3) for petroleum refineries located at major sources in three separate rules. These standards are also referred to as maximum achievable control technology (MACT) standards. The first rule was promulgated on August 18, 1995, in 40 CFR part 63, subpart CC (also referred to as Refinery MACT 1) and regulates miscellaneous process vents, storage vessels, wastewater,

equipment leaks, gasoline loading racks, marine tank vessel loading, and heat exchange systems. The second rule was promulgated on April 11, 2002, in 40 CFR part 63, subpart UUU (also referred to as Refinery MACT 2) and regulates process vents on catalytic cracking units (CCU, including FCCU), catalytic reforming units, and SRU. Finally, on October 28, 2009, the EPA promulgated amendments to Refinery MACT 1 to include MACT standards for heat exchange systems, which were not originally addressed in Refinery MACT 1. This same rulemaking included updating cross-references to the General Provisions in 40 CFR part 63.

The EPA completed an RTR of Refinery MACT 1 and 2, publishing proposed amendments on June 30, 2014. These proposed amendments also included technical corrections and clarifications raised in a 2008 industry petition for reconsideration of NSPS for Petroleum Refineries (40 CFR part 60, subpart Ja). After seeking, receiving and addressing public comments, the EPA published final amendments on December 1, 2015.

The December 1, 2015, final amendments included requirements in Refinery MACT 1 for process vents designated as “maintenance vents.” Maintenance vents are those whose use is needed only during startup, shutdown, maintenance or inspection of equipment where the equipment is emptied, depressurized, degassed or placed into service. The December 1, 2015, final amendments require that the hydrocarbon content of the vapor in the equipment served by the maintenance vent to be less than or equal to 10 percent of the lower explosive limit (LEL) prior to venting to the atmosphere. The December 1, 2015, final rule also provides specific allowances for situations when the 10 percent LEL cannot be demonstrated or is technically infeasible. After promulgation of the rule, we learned that there was confusion regarding the interpretation of the dates provided in Table 11 of 40 CFR part 63, subpart CC. We intended the compliance date for maintenance vents located at sources constructed on or before June 30, 2014, to be the next qualifying maintenance activity occurring after February 1, 2016 (the effective date of the December 1, 2015, final amendments).

Additionally, the December 1, 2015, final amendments included alternative standards for startup and shutdown events for FCCU and SRU in Refinery MACT 2. For FCCU, the final amendments included two options for demonstrating compliance with the particulate matter (PM) limit (as a

surrogate for metal hazardous air pollutants [HAP]) during periods of startup, shutdown, or hot standby in § 63.1564(a)(5). These options are: Meeting the emission limit(s) that apply during normal operations or meeting a minimum cyclone face velocity limit. Similarly, two options were provided for demonstrating compliance with the carbon monoxide (CO) limit for FCCU (as a surrogate for organic HAP) during periods of startup and shutdown in § 63.1565(a)(5). These options include: Meeting the emission limit(s) that apply during normal operations or meeting an excess oxygen limit in the exhaust from the catalyst regenerator. For SRU, three compliance options were provided to demonstrate compliance during periods of startup and shutdown in § 63.1568(a)(4). These are: Meeting the emission limit(s) that apply during normal operations, sending purge gases to a flare that meets certain operating requirements, or sending purge gases to a thermal oxidizer or incinerator that meets specific temperature and excess oxygen requirements. For owners or operators electing to comply with the alternative limits for startup, shutdown, or hot standby for FCCU (e.g., minimum cyclone face velocity option for PM; excess oxygen limit for the catalyst regenerator exhaust for CO) or for startup or shutdown for SRU (e.g., sending purge gases to a thermal oxidizer or incinerator meeting temperature and excess oxygen requirements), the compliance date established in the final amendments was February 1, 2016 (the effective date of the December 1, 2015, RTR final amendments).

Since the promulgation of the December 1, 2015, final amendments, the EPA received new information that the compliance dates for the maintenance vents and alternative startup/shutdown standards for FCCU and SRU pose safety concerns. This information indicated that the compliance dates do not allow sufficient time to complete the management of change process including evaluating the change, forming an internal team to accomplish the change, engineering the change which could include developing new set points, installing new controls or alarms, conducting risk assessments, updating associated plans and procedures, providing training, performing pre-startup safety reviews, and implementing the change as required by other regulatory programs. Further, the information indicated that in some cases refinery owners or operators may need to install additional control equipment to meet the new

requirements. On January 19, 2016, the EPA received a petition for reconsideration from the American Petroleum Institute (API) and the American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers (AFPMM) formally requesting that EPA reconsider these issues.

On February 9, 2016, the EPA published proposed revisions to the December 1, 2015, final amendments. Specifically, the proposal included a revision to the compliance date in 40 CFR part 63 subpart CC for the requirements for maintenance vents which apply during periods of startup, shutdown, maintenance or inspection for sources constructed or reconstructed on or before June 30, 2014. The proposal also included a revision to the compliance dates in 40 CFR part 63 subpart UUU for the use of the alternative standards for FCCU and SRU which apply during startup and shutdown and for FCCU during hot standby for sources constructed or reconstructed on or before June 30, 2014. Finally, the proposed rule provided technical corrections and clarifications to the NESHAP and NSPS Ja.

The proposal provided a 45-day comment period ending on March 25, 2016. The EPA received comments on the proposed revisions from refiners, trade associations, a state environmental and health department, environmental groups, and private citizens. This final rule provides a discussion of the final revisions, including changes in response to comments on the February 9, 2016, proposal, as well as a summary of the significant comments received and responses. This action fully responds to the January 19, 2016, petition for reconsideration submitted by API and AFPMM.

III. Final Revisions to Compliance Dates and Technical Corrections in the NSPS and NESHAP for Petroleum Refineries and Revisions on the February 9, 2016, Proposal

In the February 9, 2016 proposal, we proposed to require owners and operators of sources that were constructed or reconstructed on or before June 30, 2014, to comply with the requirements for maintenance vents during startup, shutdown, maintenance and inspection; the requirements for FCCU during startup, shutdown and hot standby; and the requirements for SRU during startup and shutdown no later than 18 months after the effective date of the December 1, 2015, rule (*i.e.*, no later than August 1, 2017). We are finalizing these amendments as proposed.

We also proposed to make clarifying revisions to Table 11 in 40 CFR part 63, subpart CC to more clearly delineate the compliance dates for the various provisions in subpart CC and to reflect the compliance date proposed for the maintenance vent provisions. We are finalizing these amendments as proposed with minor clarifications. Relative to the amendments made to Table 11 in subpart CC, we received a comment that the compliance dates for storage vessels in the proposed revisions to Table 11 do not reflect the use of the overlap provisions in § 63.640(n). The overlap provisions in § 63.640(n) allow Group 1 and 2 storage vessels to comply with other regulations (e.g., 40 CFR part 60, subpart Kb) as a means of demonstrating compliance with the standards in Refinery MACT 1. Compliance with the overlap provisions is in lieu of complying with the storage vessel provisions in Refinery MACT 1. We acknowledge that Table 11 does not directly reference the overlap provisions included in § 63.640(n). We are clarifying in Table 11 that owners or operators of affected storage vessels must transition to comply with the provisions in § 63.660 “. . . or, if applicable, § 63.640(n) . . .” on or before April 29, 2016.

We also proposed a number of technical and clarifying revisions to other portions of the regulations. These amendments are listed below and are being finalized as proposed with minor revision as noted in Items 3 and 9. Finally, we are making two additional revisions, as described following the numbered paragraphs below. One change is to correct an error we identified and the other is in response to a comment we received during the comment period.

1. Revising the first sentence in § 60.102a(f)(1)(i) to incorporate the pollutant of concern, sulfur dioxide (SO₂), directly into the regulatory text rather than inside a parenthesis within the sentence;

2. Making a grammatical correction to the closed blowdown system definition in § 63.641 by adding an “a” before the phrase, “. . . process vessel to a control device or back into the process.”;

3. Replacing the term “relief valve” and “valve” with “pressure relief device” and “device” in the force majeure event definition in §§ 63.641 and 63.670(o)(1)(ii)(B), respectively. We received a comment that the term “valve” should be replaced with the term “device” in § 63.670(o)(1)(vi) for consistency and are finalizing this change;

4. Expanding the list of exceptions for equipment leak requirements in

§ 63.648(a) to ensure that the intent of the rulemaking is clear, that pressure relief devices subject to the requirements in either 40 CFR part 60, subpart VV or part 63, subpart H and the requirements in 40 CFR part 63, subpart CC are to comply with the requirements in § 63.648(j)(1) and (2), instead of the pressure relief device requirements in 40 CFR part 60, subpart VV and 40 CFR part 63, subpart H;

5. Editing the reporting and recordkeeping requirements related to fenceline monitoring contained in § 63.655(h)(8) to provide clarity that compliance reports are due 45 days after the end of each reporting period. The term “periodic” in the context of the report for fenceline monitoring has been removed to avoid confusion concerning the due dates of other periodic reports contained in 40 CFR part 63, subpart CC such as those specified in § 63.655(g);

6. Editing the siting requirements for passive monitors near known sources of volatile organic compounds (VOC) contained in § 63.658(c)(1) to clarify that a monitor should be placed on the shoreline adjacent to the dock for marine vessel loading operations by removing the phrase “that are located offshore”;

7. Revising the catalytic reforming unit (CRU) pressure limit exclusion provision in 40 CFR 63.1566(a)(4) to specify that refiners have 3 years to comply with the requirements to meet emission limitations in Tables 15 and 16 if they actively purge or depressurize at vessel pressures of 5 pounds per square inch gage (psig) or less;

8. Revising the entry for item 1 in Table 2 of 40 CFR part 63, subpart UUU to clarify that refineries have 18 months to comply with the 20-percent opacity operating limit for units subject to Refinery NSPS subpart J or units electing to comply with Refinery NSPS subpart J provisions;

9. Removing the reference to § 60.102a(b)(1) in § 63.1564(a)(1)(iv). Additionally, in response to a comment, we are removing the phrase “of this Chapter” from this same provision for consistency.

10. Making a typographical correction to the reference to § 63.1566(a)(5)(iii) in 40 CFR part 63, subpart UUU, Table 3, Item 12 to correctly reference § 63.1564(a)(5)(ii); and

11. Making an editorial correction to add the word “and” in place of a semicolon in 40 CFR part 63, subpart UUU, Table 5, Item 2.

In reviewing the rule requirements, we noted that the last sentence of the introductory paragraph in § 63.1564(a)(1) refers to “. . . the four options in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) through

(vi) of this section.” There are six options in these paragraphs, and thus we are finalizing an amendment to revise § 63.1564(a)(1) to accurately describe these paragraphs by replacing the word “four” with “six.”

As discussed in more detail in Section IV of this preamble, in response to a comment, we are finalizing an amendment to item (5) in the definition of miscellaneous process vent to clarify that in situ sampling systems will be excluded from the definition until February 1, 2016. After this date, these sampling systems will be considered miscellaneous process vents. Systems which are determined to be Group 1 miscellaneous process vents will need to comply with applicable provisions no later January 30, 2019.

IV. Summary of Comments and Responses

This section summarizes substantive comments received on the February 2016 proposal. We received some comments suggesting rule revisions for requirements in the December 2015 rule for which we did not propose a revision in the February 2016 proposal. These comments were not specifically summarized or addressed because they are beyond the scope of the amendments and we did not open those provisions for public comment. The Agency may elect to consider the issues raised by those comments in the context of a future rulemaking action.

A. Compliance Date Amendments

Comment 1: Two commenters expressed support for the proposal to revise the compliance dates for the maintenance vent provisions during periods of startup, shutdown, maintenance and inspection in 40 CFR part 63, subpart CC, for the alternative standards for startup, shutdown and hot standby for FCCU in 40 CFR part 63, subpart UUU and the alternative standards for startup and shutdown for SRU in subpart UUU. These commenters agreed that additional time is needed to install controls and/or comply with management of change requirements in applicable process safety management (PSM) and risk management program (RMP) requirements. Commenters asserted that refineries need this time to fully perform applicability determinations, complete the procurement process to acquire consultant services to assist with these applicability determinations, modify internal procedures, perform training and implement control/equipment/operational changes as needed.

One commenter further explained that they also interpreted statements in the December 1, 2015, preamble to the final rule (80 FR at 75186) as EPA's intent to provide 18 months for compliance with the provisions in §§ 63.1564 and 63.1565 including the associated monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting requirements. The commenter points out that the regulatory provisions in 63.1564 (a)(2) and in Table 2 of subpart UUU do not reflect this intent and that these provisions should be revised to reflect an August 1, 2017, compliance date. The commenter specifically requested that EPA clarify the regulatory language to provide an August 2017 compliance date for monitoring requirements for FCCU controls, such as bag leak detectors, total power and the secondary current operating limits for electrostatic precipitators (ESP), and daily checks of the air or water pressure to the spray nozzles on jet ejector-type wet scrubbers or other types of wet scrubbers equipped with atomizing spray nozzles.

The commenter further explained that pursuant to § 63.1572(c)(1)–(5), the compliance time for continuous parameter monitoring systems (CPMS) specifications in Table 41, when coupled with the revisions to monitoring requirements contained in § 63.1572(d), is inadequate (the commenter believes these requirements are effective within 60 days of the effective date of the Refinery Sector Rule) given that refineries would have to perform an assessment of each CPMS as well as an assessment of potential equipment and operational changes.

Response 1: We appreciate the support for the proposed revisions. We disagree, however, with the comment indicating a belief that we also intended to provide 18 months for refineries to comply with the FCCU provisions in §§ 63.1564 and 63.1565, including the associated monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting requirements.

Sections 63.1564 and 63.1565 refer to NSPS Ja requirements, which are not new requirements for some sources pursuant to the December 2015 final amendments. In the preamble to the December 2015 final amendments, we stated (80 FR 75186): “As proposed, we are providing 18 months after the effective date of the final rule to conduct required performance tests and comply with any *revised* [emphasis added] operating limits for FCCU.” We did not consider the pre-existing NSPS requirements referred to in §§ 63.1564 and 63.1565 to be “revised operating limits” for sources subject to NSPS Ja. We note that an 18-month compliance period for these NSPS Ja requirements is

not supported because the proposed and final MACT operating limits are identical to the NSPS Ja operating limits which already apply to these affected sources. For refinery sources subject to the December 2015 final amendments and that are non-NSPS Ja sources, Tables 1 through 14 to 40 CFR part 63, subpart UUU clearly provide an 18-month compliance period for refineries to transition from the existing requirements to the revised operating limits.

With regard to the revised FCCU monitoring requirements in § 63.1572(d), as discussed in the Response to Comment document for the December 1, 2015, final rule (Docket Item No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–0682–0802), we amended the alternative monitoring approach to require daily inspections of the air or water supply lines with the understanding that no new monitoring equipment is needed to complete these inspections. Therefore, we proposed and then finalized these alternative requirements to apply immediately on the effective date of the rule.

With regard to the compliance time for CPMS, the commenter is mistaken that the regulations provide a 60-day compliance period. Section 63.1572(c)(1) provides an 18-month transition period to the new CPMS quality assurance (QA) requirements in Table 41. When establishing this compliance date, we estimated that the time to perform these evaluations, request vendor quotes, if necessary to upgrade or replace existing monitors, and install the new/upgraded equipment would require about 12 to 18 months. Thus, in the promulgating the final rule, the Agency considered the types of concerns raised by the commenter and provided an 18-month transition period.

We note that pursuant to the provisions in § 63.6(i), which are generally applicable, refinery owners or operators may seek compliance extensions on a case-by-case basis if necessary.

Comment 2: One commenter stated that by extending the compliance dates for the provisions addressed in the proposal, the EPA has extended the amount of time for illegal exemptions for periods of startup, shutdown and malfunction. The commenter also asserted that substituting the general duty requirements as the continuous emissions limit during the period between the promulgation and effective date is not consistent with the CAA as it requires that section 112 standards apply at all times, and general duty

requirements do not meet the requirements of CAA section 112.

The commenter also maintained that the CAA requires that air toxics standards should be effective upon promulgation, and provides that existing sources should comply as expeditiously as practicable. The commenter argued that the EPA has not demonstrated in the record how 18 months is as “expeditiously as practicable,” and therefore the extension of the compliance period is arbitrary and unlawful. The commenter continued that the reasons given for the extension were in part based on a potential need to install controls, but the EPA did not provide an independent analysis demonstrating that there is an actual need for new controls. Further, the commenter asserted that this scenario could be addressed on a case-by-case basis by the provisions in § 63.6(i) rather than as a blanket exemption for all sources. The commenter also stated that the other reason given for the extension, compliance with the RMP and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (OSHA) PSM, does not justify an extension for compliance with the air toxics program. The commenter also stated that the timing for removing these SSM exemptions has been delayed for approximately 8 years (since the 2008 *Sierra Club* ruling) due to rulemaking processes and delays, and that further delay is unwarranted.

Finally, the commenter stated that the EPA did not provide emissions data to support their statements in the preamble that the emission impacts from extending the compliance deadlines will have “an insignificant effect on emissions reductions.”

Response 2: We share the commenter's desire to implement the new Refinery Sector Rule provisions as quickly as possible. However, we have determined that it is infeasible to immediately comply with certain provisions of the December 1, 2015, final rule, and it is, therefore, necessary to provide the additional compliance time. Based on the information that we now have, we concluded that facilities require additional time to comply with certain provisions in the final rule in order to allow facilities to install the appropriate monitoring equipment, change procedures, and, if necessary, add or modify emission control equipment.

We disagree with the commenters that we substituted the general duty requirement for the requirements for which we are establishing an 18-month compliance period. Rather, we discussed the general duty provision to

emphasize that although compliance with the relevant amendments would be delayed for a period of time, these sources remain obligated to comply with good air pollution control practices as specified in the general duty requirements. We were not suggesting that the “general duty” requirement is sufficient to meet CAA section 112 for the regulated sources at issue in this rule.

We disagree with the commenter that the compliance period is not supported and is therefore arbitrary. The process equipment associated with maintenance vents, FCCU and SRU, are subject to the requirements of the RMP regulation in 40 CFR part 68 and the OSHA PSM standard in 29 CFR part 1910. Therefore, any operational or procedural changes resulting from meeting the applicable standards must follow the management of change procedures in the respective regulatory programs, as codified in § 68.75 and § 1910.119(l). As part of the management of change process, the EPA expects that facilities will have to perform an upfront assessment to determine what changes are required to meet the maintenance vent requirements and alternative standards for FCCU and SRU during periods of startup and shutdown. Based on the new information we received after these regulatory requirements were promulgated, we anticipate that refinery owners or operators will have to adjust or install new instrumentation including alarms, closed drain headers, equipment blowdown drums, and other new or revised equipment and controls in order to comply with the new startup and shutdown provisions. Where these types of projects are necessary, it is likely facilities will have to hire a contractor to assist with the project and complete the procurement process. Additionally, we expect that facilities will have to perform risk assessments and review and revise standard operating procedures, as necessary. Further, the management of change provisions also require that employees who are involved in operating a process, and maintenance and contract employees whose job tasks are affected by the change, must be trained prior to start up of the affected process. Finally, facilities are required to conduct pre-startup safety reviews and obtain authorization to fully implement and startup the modified process and/or equipment.

We disagree that compliance obligations with EPA’s RMP and OSHA’s PSM cannot be considered in determining the appropriate compliance period to the extent those obligations can be met consistent with the

compliance period mandated by CAA section 112. In the present case, the compliance period of 18 months is well within the maximum 3-year compliance period allowed by CAA section 112(i). When considering an appropriate compliance timeframe, it is important to consider the time it takes to safely transition to new operating procedures. If an explosion or fire occurs due to inadequate planning and evaluation of new procedures, the amount of toxics released to the atmosphere could dwarf the emission reductions anticipated from the new startup and shutdown requirements. Such an event could cause harm to refinery personnel and unnecessarily expose the neighboring community to releases of toxic emissions. Therefore, we believe it is reasonable to consider other applicable regulatory compliance obligations for these programs when establishing compliance dates for CAA section 112 requirements.

While we understand the commenter’s concerns that the regulatory changes did not occur as quickly as they would have hoped, we cannot ignore feasibility and compliance with health and safety requirements, as discussed above, in determining an appropriate compliance timeframe. The “delay” in establishing these requirements does not somehow make it technically feasible to immediately comply with these new standards. Even with the 18-month timeframe being finalized today, sources must still begin the planning and evaluation process immediately to meet the compliance date.

We agree with the commenters that another statutory mechanism for addressing compliance issues such as the ones addressed here would be to rely on facility-specific requests pursuant to § 63.6(i). However, when a significant number of extension requests are anticipated, we consider it reasonable and more efficient to provide the additional compliance time within the rule. Providing the compliance time in the rule reduces both industry and Agency burden associated with developing and evaluating waivers on a case-by-case basis. It also reduces the uncertainty that facilities face when a regulatory compliance date is approaching and a request for an extension has not yet been addressed by the Agency. Moreover, in the current case, the compliance period established in the December 1, 2015 rule was only a few months after the publication of the rule and that time period was generally not sufficient for a case-by-case extension process.

We believe that the later compliance date will have an insignificant effect on a refinery’s overall emissions. The maintenance vent provisions apply only to vent emissions associated with taking equipment out of service for maintenance or repair. While there may be a number of pieces of equipment taken out of service over a given year, many facility owners or operators already have standard procedures for de-inventorying equipment. While these procedures may not specifically meet the final rule requirements (for example, they may depressure to atmosphere once the vessel is below 5 psig, but may not measure the lower explosive limit even though it could be monitored), the general equipment de-inventory procedures will typically limit emissions to the atmosphere. For the startup and shutdown operating limit alternatives for FCCU and SRU, these equipment may be shut down only once every 2 to 5 years. Therefore, we expect very few of these events to occur during the revised compliance period so there are limited opportunities for these emissions and limited opportunities for emissions reductions. We note that when we finalized the FCCU requirements, we did not project any emissions reductions associated with these requirements. This is partly due to the limited frequency of occurrence and partly due to uncertainties in the existing practices used by facilities to reduce these emissions. While we developed these requirements to ensure these sources had emission limitations that applied at all times, the decision was not based on a quantitative estimate of the emission reduction that would be achieved by these requirements. In general, we believe the emissions from these emission points to be relatively small compared to the refinery’s total HAP emissions so that the emissions reduction achieved by the new requirements would be small. Therefore, we expect that the modification to the compliance dates in this final rule will not significantly impact a refinery’s emissions.

Comment 3: One commenter stated that the references in the proposed rule to the procedures for requesting compliance extensions through § 63.6(i) are problematic for state regulators and industry. Facilities that have to install new controls or otherwise invest in capital projects in order to comply with the new maintenance vent requirements or alternative standards for FCCU and SRU may not have ample time to submit such requests. Instead of requiring compliance by August 2017, the commenter suggested that the EPA

finalize a compliance date 6 months after promulgation of the final rule. This would allow sources an opportunity to use the provisions in § 63.6(i) as determined appropriate on a case-by-case basis by the delegated authority. Finally, the commenter suggested that, in the future, the EPA should promulgate standards with compliance dates at least 120 days after promulgation and that the EPA should issue a stay of the requirements if similar situations requiring compliance date extensions should arise.

Response 3: As explained in the previous response, a compliance date of August 1, 2017, is consistent with CAA section 112(i)(3). And, because numerous facilities will likely need additional time beyond the current compliance date, it is reasonable to rely on that provision instead of setting a shorter compliance period and relying on the case-by-case extension provisions of CAA section 112 and § 63.6(i). Furthermore, for the reasons provided in the previous response, we do not believe that a 6-month compliance period as requested by this commenter reflects the actual time it will take for most facilities to comply with these provisions. The request that we provide a minimum of 120 days for compliance in future rulemakings goes beyond the scope of this rulemaking. Compliance periods for future regulations will be addressed in the context of the relevant proposed and final rules.

Comment 4: One commenter requested that an 18-month extension to the compliance date be provided to allow for compliance with the general duty requirements for maintenance vents. The commenter stated that prior to the December 1, 2015 final amendments, designated maintenance vents were not considered “affected facilities,” and, therefore, were not subject to the general duty provisions. The commenter argued that facilities will need to perform applicability determinations for vents on refinery processes, update procedures, perform training, and go through the OSHA management of change process to assess the implications of the general duty clause on applicable vents, and thus sources need time to do so.

Response 4: We did not propose any change to the general duty requirement for “maintenance vents.” Rather, we proposed a revision to the compliance date for startup, shutdown, maintenance and inspection for maintenance vents. Although we noted that the general duty provision applies prior to the proposed revised compliance date, we did not propose to modify the compliance obligation for meeting the general duty

requirement. Therefore, we believe that this comment goes beyond the scope of this rulemaking. However, we note that we consider it standard practice for any operating facility to use good air pollution control practices regardless of the emission source and whether or not that source is specifically regulated by the MACT standard; thus, additional time to meet such a requirement would not be warranted.

Comment 5: One commenter stated that the EPA should extend the compliance dates for the monitoring requirements for bypass lines of miscellaneous process vents in § 63.644(c). The commenter asserted that the February 1, 2016 API/AFPM supplemental petition provides a list of reasons why such an extension is needed and that EPA could rely on the same justification as that for the compliance date extension being granted for the startup, shutdown, maintenance and inspection requirements for maintenance vents in § 63.643(c). The commenter noted that the API/AFPM petition explains that items previously excluded from the monitoring requirements in § 63.644(c), such as high point bleeds, analyzer vents, open-ended valves or lines, and pressure relief valves are no longer excluded under the December 2015 final rule, and, thus, would now be required to install flow indicators or employ car-seal or lock-and-key type valves. The API/AFPM petition also explains that since onstream analyzer vents (in situ sampling systems) are excluded from the definition of miscellaneous process vents through January 30, 2019, but not specifically excluded from the bypass line monitoring provisions, some local agencies may interpret that the bypass line provisions apply to analyzer vents and would require analyzer vents to be in compliance during the additional period between the February 1, 2016, effective date of the rule and January 30, 2019.

Response 5: As part of the December 1, 2015, final rule, the EPA removed provisions from § 63.644(c) that excluded high point bleeds, analyzer vents, open-ended valves or lines, and pressure relief valves from the bypass line provisions in § 63.644(c)(1) and (2). Low leg drains and equipment subject to § 63.648 continue to be excluded from the bypass line provisions in § 63.644(c). Because open-ended valves or lines and pressure relief valves (devices) are equipment subject to § 63.648, they remain subject to the bypass line exclusion. In addition, high point bleeds are open-ended valves or lines and would also be equipment

subject to § 63.648, and thus, subject to the bypass line exclusion.

We removed analyzer vents from the list of items excluded from the bypass line provisions because we consider analyzer vents to be miscellaneous process vents consistent with our amendments to item (5) in the list of exclusions from the definition of miscellaneous process vents in § 63.641. We recognize that based on the wording of item (5), some may interpret that, prior to January 30, 2019, these analyzer vents could be construed to be bypass lines. This is not our intent. We consider analyzer vents to be miscellaneous process vents as they routinely or continuously vent gases to the atmosphere. We included the January 30, 2019, date to establish the date at which these analyzer vents must comply with the miscellaneous process vent standards.

It was not our intent that analyzer vents would be considered bypass lines between the February 1, 2016, effective date of the rule and the January 30, 2019, compliance date provided in item (5) of the list of exclusions from the definition of miscellaneous process vents. While we consider it unlikely that local agencies would interpret the Refinery final amendments to require bypass line monitoring for analyzer vents, we understand the commenter's concern. To clarify these requirements consistent with our original intent, we are amending item (5) in the definition of miscellaneous process vent to exclude “In situ sampling systems (onstream analyzers)” until February 1, 2016. After this date, these sampling systems will be included in the definition of miscellaneous process vents and sampling systems determined to be Group 1 miscellaneous process vents must comply with the requirements in §§ 63.643 and 63.644 no later than January 30, 2019.

Comment 6: One commenter requested that EPA provide an 18-month compliance period, rather than the 150 days provided, for existing storage tanks to transition from complying with the requirements in § 63.646 to the storage vessel requirements in § 63.660, which were established in the December 2015 final rule. The storage vessel provisions in § 63.660 require that new or existing Group 1 storage vessels comply with the requirements in subpart WW or subpart SS of 40 CFR part 63. The commenter stated that sources will need time to assess whether their existing storage tanks meet the “Group 1 Storage Tank” definition finalized in § 63.641 as part of the RTR rulemaking, and, if so, to assess whether existing controls will need to

be updated to meet the subpart WW requirements contained in § 63.660. Should such control upgrades be required, the commenter asserted that additional time will be needed to design and install the equipment, complete management of change process and provide operator training. The commenter also stated that subpart WW imposes additional inspection and recordkeeping requirements which will require additional time for further operator training. A second commenter provided similar comments, stating that inadequate time had been given to assess applicability and upgrade tank controls (if needed) for existing Group 1 storage vessels. Finally, a comment was received stating that Table 11 appears to require compliance with § 63.660 and is in conflict with the overlap provisions in § 63.640(n). The overlap provisions in § 63.640(n) allow Group 1 and 2 storage vessels to comply with other regulations (e.g., 40 CFR part 60, subpart Kb) as a means of demonstrating compliance with the standards in Refinery MACT 1. Compliance with the overlap provisions is made in lieu of complying with the storage vessel provisions in § 63.660 of Refinery MACT 1.

Response 6: While Table 11 was completely re-printed in the proposed amendments, we did not propose to revise the compliance dates for storage vessels or to address storage vessels in any way as part of the proposed rule; thus, this comment is considered out of scope. We note that this small population of tanks was specifically provided additional time to install the required controls as specified in § 63.660(d) and the commenters did not provide specific information on why additional time is required. Section 63.6(i) provides a mechanism to request additional time for the limited number of tanks within this small population of tanks that may need additional time.

With respect to the comment that subpart WW imposes additional inspection and recordkeeping requirements, the required inspections are infrequent (generally once a year to once every 5 or 10 years) and we disagree that existing compliance provisions do not provide sufficient time for owners or operators to “upgrade,” if necessary, their inspection procedures.

We agree with the commenter that Table 11 does appear to require all storage vessels to transition to comply with § 63.660 in conflict with the overlap provisions in § 63.640(n), which allow compliance with 40 CFR part 60, subpart Kb as a means to comply with the amended Refinery MACT 1 storage vessel requirements. Therefore, we are

revising the relevant language in Table 11 to clarify that owners or operators of affected storage vessels must transition to comply with the provisions in § 63.660 “. . . or, if applicable, § 63.640(n) . . .” on or before April 29, 2016.

B. Technical and Editorial Corrections

Comment 1: One commenter questioned the revisions to Items (4)(i) and (4)(ii) in Table 11 of 40 CFR part 63, subpart CC as they apply to existing sources constructed or reconstructed before July 14, 1994. For such sources, the commenter stated that these revisions appear to retroactively impose compliance dates of August 18, 1998, for paragraphs that were added or amended after August 18, 1998. The commenter provided examples of the references to requirements in § 63.648(j)(1) and (2) and § 63.644 which should have an effective date of February 1, 2016. The commenter further stated that Table 11 is not all inclusive and omits many compliance dates of sections in subpart CC, including those revised during the amendment process and provided examples. The commenter asserted that these omissions make the table incomplete and contribute to overall confusion, and, therefore, requested that the table be deleted and compliance dates be incorporated directly into the regulatory text.

Response 1: The commenter is mistaken that § 63.648(j)(1) and (2) are new requirements. In the December 2015 final rule, EPA incorporated requirements from 60.482–4 of 40 CFR part 60, subpart VV (which was previously referenced in 63.648(a) of 40 CFR part 63, subpart CC) directly into § 63.648(j)(1) and (2). Section 63.644 was amended and these final revisions provide additional clarification on the compliance date for analyzer vents, as described in Response No. 5. Therefore, Table 11 neither changed the requirement nor changed the applicable compliance date.

Table 11 is not intended to reflect every requirement and compliance date. Rather, for requirements not identified in Table 11, as in those cited by the commenter, the compliance date is the effective date of the rule, February 1, 2016, or is specified in the appropriate section.

Comment 2: One commenter requested that the use of the term “pressure relief device” or “device” be used in § 63.670(o)(1)(vi), similar to the edits proposed in § 63.641 and § 63.670(o)(1)(ii)(B). The commenter also requested that the EPA provide a

definition of the term “pressure relief device” in § 63.641.

Response 2: We agree that § 63.670(o)(1)(vi) should use the term “pressure relief device” consistent with the edits proposed to § 63.641 and § 63.670(o)(1)(ii)(B), and we are amending this paragraph as suggested.

The request that EPA add a definition of “pressure relief device” is outside the scope of the current rulemaking.

Comment 3: One commenter requested that the proposed revision to § 63.1564(a)(1)(iv) also remove the words “of this chapter” for consistency with other options referencing subpart UUU alternatives.

Response 3: We agree with the commenter that the phrase “of this chapter” should be removed. This referred to the reference to § 60.102a(b)(1), which we proposed to remove and are removing in this final rule. In reviewing this comment, we also noted that the last sentence of the introductory paragraph in § 63.1564(a)(1) refers to “. . . the four options in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) through (vi) of this section.” To address this clerical error, we are also revising the last sentence in § 63.1564(a)(1) to replace the word “four” with the word “six.”

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Additional information about these statutes and Executive Orders can be found at <http://www2.epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive-orders>.

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review

This action is not a significant regulatory action and was, therefore, not submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review.

B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

This action does not impose any new information collection burden under the PRA. OMB has previously approved the information collection activities contained in the existing regulations at 40 CFR part 63, subparts CC and UUU and has assigned OMB control numbers 2060–0340 and 2060–0554. The finalized amendments are revisions to compliance dates, clarifications, and technical corrections that do not affect the estimated burden of the existing rule. Therefore, we have not revised the information collection request for the existing rule.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA. In making this determination, the impact of concern is any significant adverse economic impact on small entities. An agency may certify that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities if the rule relieves regulatory burden, has no net burden, or otherwise has a positive economic effect on the small entities subject to the rule. The action consists of revisions to compliance dates, clarifications, and technical corrections which do not change the expected economic impact analysis performed for the existing rule. We have, therefore, concluded that this action will have no net regulatory burden for all directly regulated small entities.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)

This action does not contain any unfunded mandate as described in UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538, and does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. The action imposes no enforceable duty on any state, local, or tribal governments or the private sector.

E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

This action does not have federalism implications. It will not have substantial direct effects on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This action does not have tribal implications as specified in Executive Order 13175. It will not have substantial direct effect on tribal governments, on the relationship between the federal government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the federal government and Indian tribes, as specified in Executive Order 13175. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this action.

G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it is not economically significant as defined in Executive Order 12866, and because the EPA does not believe the environmental

health or safety risks addressed by this action present a disproportionate risk to children. The final amendments serve to revise compliance dates and make technical clarifications and corrections. We expect the additional compliance time will have an insignificant effect on emission reductions as many refiners already have measures in place due to state and other federal requirements to minimize emissions during these periods. Further, these periods are relatively infrequent and are usually of short duration. Therefore, these amendments should not appreciably increase risk for any populations. Further, this action will allow more time for refiners to implement procedures to safely start up and shut down equipment which should minimize safety risks for all populations.

H. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13211 because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)

This rulemaking does not involve technical standards.

J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

The EPA believes that this action does not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations, low-income populations, or indigenous peoples, as specified in Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994). The finalized amendments serve to revise compliance dates and make technical clarifications and corrections. We expect the additional compliance time will have an insignificant effect on emission reductions as many refiners already have measures in place due to state and other federal requirements to minimize emissions during these periods. Further, these periods are relatively infrequent and are usually of short duration. Therefore, the finalized amendments should not appreciably increase risk for any populations. Further, this action will allow more time for refiners to implement procedures to safely start up and shut down equipment which should minimize safety risks for all populations.

K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

This action is subject to the CRA, and the EPA will submit a rule report to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. This is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects

40 CFR Part 60

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedures, Air pollution control, Hazardous substances, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

40 CFR Part 63

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedures, Air pollution control, Hazardous substances, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: July 1, 2016.

Gina McCarthy,
Administrator.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, EPA amends 40 CFR parts 60 and 63 as follows:

PART 60—STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 60 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart Ja—Standards of Performance for Petroleum Refineries for Which Construction, Reconstruction, or Modification Commenced After May 14, 2007

■ 2. Section 60.102a is amended by revising the first sentence of paragraph (f)(1)(i) to read as follows:

§ 60.102a Emissions limitations.

* * * * *

(f) * * *

(1) * * *

(i) For a sulfur recovery plant with an oxidation control system or a reduction control system followed by incineration, the owner or operator shall not discharge or cause the discharge of any gases containing SO₂ into the atmosphere in excess of the emission limit calculated using Equation 1 of this section. * * *

* * * * *

PART 63—NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS FOR SOURCE CATEGORIES

■ 3. The authority citation for part 63 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart CC—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Petroleum Refineries

■ 4. Section 63.641 is amended by revising the definitions of “Closed blowdown system”, “Force majeure event” and paragraph (5) of the definition “Miscellaneous process vent” to read as follows:

§ 63.641 Definitions.

* * * * *

Closed blowdown system means a system used for depressuring process vessels that is not open to the atmosphere and is configured of piping, ductwork, connections, accumulators/knockout drums, and, if necessary, flow inducing devices that transport gas or vapor from a process vessel to a control device or back into the process.

* * * * *

Force majeure event means a release of HAP, either directly to the atmosphere from a pressure relief device or discharged via a flare, that is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Administrator to result from an event beyond the refinery owner or operator’s control, such as natural disasters; acts of war or terrorism; loss of a utility external to the refinery (*e.g.*, external power curtailment), excluding power curtailment due to an interruptible service agreement; and fire or explosion originating at a near or adjoining facility outside of the refinery that impacts the refinery’s ability to operate.

* * * * *

Miscellaneous process vent * * *

(5) In situ sampling systems (onstream analyzers) until February 1, 2016. After this date, these sampling systems will be included in the definition of miscellaneous process vents and sampling systems determined to be Group 1 miscellaneous process vents must comply with the requirements in §§ 63.643 and 63.644 no later than January 30, 2019;

* * * * *

■ 5. Section 63.643 is amended by revising paragraph (c) introductory text and adding paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 63.643 Miscellaneous process vent provisions.

* * * * *

(c) An owner or operator may designate a process vent as a maintenance vent if the vent is only used as a result of startup, shutdown, maintenance, or inspection of equipment where equipment is emptied, depressurized, degassed or placed into service. The owner or operator does not need to designate a maintenance vent as a Group 1 or Group 2 miscellaneous process vent. The owner of operator must comply with the applicable requirements in paragraphs (c)(1) through (3) of this section for each maintenance vent according to the compliance dates specified in table 11 of this subpart, unless an extension is requested in accordance with the provisions in § 63.6(i).

* * * * *

(d) After February 1, 2016 and prior to the date of compliance with the maintenance vent provisions in paragraph (c) of this section, the owner or operator must comply with the requirements in § 63.642(n) for each maintenance venting event and maintain records necessary to demonstrate compliance with the requirements in § 63.642(n) including, if appropriate, records of existing standard site procedures used to deinventory equipment for safety purposes.

■ 6. Section 63.648 is amended by revising paragraph (a) introductory text as follows:

§ 63.648 Equipment leak standards.

(a) Each owner or operator of an existing source subject to the provisions of this subpart shall comply with the provisions of 40 CFR part 60, subpart VV, and paragraph (b) of this section except as provided in paragraphs (a)(1) and (2), (c) through (i), and (j)(1) and (2) of this section. Each owner or operator of a new source subject to the provisions of this subpart shall comply with subpart H of this part except as provided in paragraphs (c) through (i) and (j)(1) and (2) of this section.

* * * * *

■ 7. Section 63.655 is amended by revising paragraph (h)(8) introductory text to read as follows:

§ 63.655 Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

* * * * *

(h) * * *

(8) For fenceline monitoring systems subject to § 63.658, within 45 calendar days after the end of each reporting period, each owner or operator shall submit the following information to the EPA’s Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface (CEDRI). (CEDRI can be accessed through the EPA’s Central

Data Exchange (CDX) (<https://cdx.epa.gov/>). The owner or operator need not transmit these data prior to obtaining 12 months of data.

* * * * *

■ 8. Section 63.658 is amended by revising paragraph (c)(1) to read as follows:

§ 63.658 Fenceline monitoring provisions.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(1) As it pertains to this subpart, known sources of VOCs, as used in Section 8.2.1.3 in Method 325A of appendix A of this part for siting passive monitors, means a wastewater treatment unit, process unit, or any emission source requiring control according to the requirements of this subpart, including marine vessel loading operations. For marine vessel loading operations, one passive monitor should be sited on the shoreline adjacent to the dock.

* * * * *

■ 9. Section 63.670 is amended by revising paragraphs (o)(1)(ii)(B) and (o)(1)(vi) to read as follows:

§ 63.670 Requirements for flare control devices.

* * * * *

- (o) * * *
- (1) * * *
- (ii) * * *

(B) Implementation of prevention measures listed for pressure relief devices in § 63.648(j)(5) for each pressure relief device that can discharge to the flare.

* * * * *

(vi) For each pressure relief device vented to the flare identified in paragraph (o)(1)(iv) of this section, provide a detailed description of each pressure release device, including type of relief device (rupture disc, valve type) diameter of the relief device opening, set pressure of the relief device and listing of the prevention measures implemented. This information may be maintained in an electronic database on-site and does not need to be submitted as part of the flare management plan unless requested to do so by the Administrator.

* * * * *

■ 10. The appendix to subpart CC is amended by revising table 11 to read as follows:

Appendix to Subpart CC of Part 63—Tables

* * * * *

TABLE 11—COMPLIANCE DATES AND REQUIREMENTS

If the construction/ reconstruction date is . . .	Then the owner or operator must comply with . . .	And the owner or operator must achieve compliance . . .	Except as provided in . . .
(1) After June 30, 2014.	(i) Requirements for new sources in §§ 63.643(a) and (b); 63.644, 63.645, and 63.647; 63.648(a) through (i) and (j)(1) and (2); 63.649 through 63.651; and 63.654 through 63.656.	Upon initial startup	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(ii) Requirements for new sources in §§ 63.642(n), 63.643(c), 63.648(j)(3), (6) and (7); and 63.657 through 63.660.	Upon initial startup or February 1, 2016, whichever is later.	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
(2) After September 4, 2007 but on or be- fore June 30, 2014.	(i) Requirements for new sources in §§ 63.643(a) and (b); 63.644, 63.645, and 63.647; 63.648(a) through (i) and (j)(1) and (2); and 63.649 through 63.651, 63.655 and 63.656.	Upon initial startup	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(ii) Requirements for new sources in § 63.654.	Upon initial startup or October 28, 2009, whichever is later.	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(iii) Requirements for new sources in either § 63.646 or § 63.660 or, if applicable, § 63.640(n).	Upon initial startup, but you must transition to comply with only the requirements in § 63.660 or, if applicable, § 63.640(n) on or before April 29, 2016.	§§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m) and 63.660(d).
	(iv) Requirements for existing sources in § 63.643(c).	On or before August 1, 2017	§§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m) and 63.643(d).
	(v) Requirements for existing sources in § 63.658.	On or before January 30, 2018	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(vi) Requirements for existing sources in § 63.648 (j)(3), (6) and (7) and § 63.657.	On or before January 30, 2019	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(vii) Requirements in § 63.642 (n)	Upon initial startup or February 1, 2016, whichever is later.	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
(3) After July 14, 1994 but on or before September 4, 2007.	(i) Requirements for new sources in §§ 63.643(a) and (b); 63.644, 63.645, and 63.647; 63.648(a) through (i) and (j)(1) and (2); and 63.649 through 63.651, 63.655 and 63.656.	Upon initial startup or August 18, 1995, whichever is later.	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(ii) Requirements for existing sources in § 63.654.	On or before October 29, 2012	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(iii) Requirements for new sources in either § 63.646 or § 63.660 or, if applicable, § 63.640(n).	Upon initial startup, but you must transition to comply with only the requirements in § 63.660 or, if applicable, § 63.640(n) on or before April 29, 2016.	§§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m) and 63.660(d).
	(iv) Requirements for existing sources in § 63.643(c).	On or before August 1, 2017	§§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m) and 63.643(d).
	(v) Requirements for existing sources in § 63.658.	On or before January 30, 2018	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(vi) Requirements for existing sources in §§ 63.648(j)(3), (6) and (7) and 63.657.	On or before January 30, 2019	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(vii) Requirements in § 63.642(n)	Upon initial startup or February 1, 2016, whichever is later.	
(4) On or before July 14, 1994.	(i) Requirements for existing sources in §§ 63.648(a) through (i) and (j)(1) and (2); and 63.649, 63.655 and 63.656.	(A) On or before August 18, 1998	(1) § 63.640(k), (l) and (m). (2) § 63.6(c)(5) or unless an extension has been granted by the Administrator as provided in § 63.6(i).
	(ii) Either the requirements for existing sources in §§ 63.643(a) and (b); 63.644, 63.645, 63.647, 63.650 and 63.651; and item (4)(v) of this table. OR The requirements in §§ 63.652 and 63.653.	(A) On or before August 18, 1998	(1) § 63.640(k), (l) and (m). (2) § 63.6(c)(5) or unless an extension has been granted by the Administrator as provided in § 63.6(i).
	(iii) Requirements for existing sources in either § 63.646 or § 63.660 or, if applicable, § 63.640(n).	On or before August 18, 1998, but you must transition to comply with only the requirements in § 63.660 or, if applicable, § 63.640(n) on or before April 29, 2016.	§§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m) and 63.660(d).

TABLE 11—COMPLIANCE DATES AND REQUIREMENTS—Continued

If the construction/reconstruction date is . . .	Then the owner or operator must comply with . . .	And the owner or operator must achieve compliance . . .	Except as provided in . . .
	(iv) Requirements for existing sources in § 63.654.	On or before October 29, 2012	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(v) Requirements for existing sources in § 63.643(c).	On or before August 1, 2017	§§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m) and 63.643(d).
	(vi) Requirements for existing sources in § 63.658.	On or before January 30, 2018	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(vii) Requirements for existing sources in §§ 63.648(j)(3), (6) and (7) and 63.657.	On or before January 30, 2019	§ 63.640(k), (l) and (m).
	(viii) Requirements in § 63.642 (n)	Upon initial startup or February 1, 2016, whichever is later.	

* * * * *

Subpart UUU—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Petroleum Refineries: Catalytic Cracking Units, Catalytic Reforming Units, and Sulfur Recovery Units

- 11. Section 63.1563 is amended by:
 - a. Revising paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) and (b);
 - b. Redesignating paragraphs (d) and (e) as paragraphs (e) and (f), respectively;
 - c. Adding new paragraph (d); and
 - d. Revising newly redesignated paragraph (e) introductory text.

The revisions and additions to read as follows:

§ 63.1563 When do I have to comply with this subpart?

(a) * * *

(1) If you startup your affected source before April 11, 2002, then you must comply with the emission limitations and work practice standards for new and reconstructed sources in this subpart no later than April 11, 2002 except as provided in paragraph (d) of this section.

(2) If you startup your affected source after April 11, 2002, you must comply with the emission limitations and work practice standards for new and reconstructed sources in this subpart upon startup of your affected source except as provided in paragraph (d) of this section.

(b) If you have an existing affected source, you must comply with the emission limitations and work practice standards for existing affected sources in this subpart by no later than April 11, 2005 except as specified in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section.

* * * * *

(d) You must comply with the applicable requirements in §§ 63.1564(a)(5), 63.1565(a)(5) and 63.1568(a)(4) as specified in paragraph

(d)(1) or (2) of this section, as applicable.

(1) For sources which commenced construction or reconstruction before June 30, 2014, you must comply with the applicable requirements in §§ 63.1564(a)(5), 63.1565(a)(5) and 63.1568(a)(4) on or before August 1, 2017 unless an extension is requested and approved in accordance with the provisions in § 63.6(i). After February 1, 2016 and prior to the date of compliance with the provisions in §§ 63.1564(a)(5), 63.1565(a)(5) and 63.1568(a)(4), you must comply with the requirements in § 63.1570(c) and (d).

(2) For sources which commenced construction or reconstruction on or after June 30, 2014, you must comply with the applicable requirements in §§ 63.1564(a)(5), 63.1565(a)(5) and 63.1568(a)(4) on or before February 1, 2016 or upon startup, whichever is later.

(e) If you have an area source that increases its emissions or its potential to emit such that it becomes a major source of HAP, the requirements in paragraphs (e)(1) and (2) of this section apply.

* * * * *

- 12. Section 63.1564 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(1) introductory text, (a)(1)(iv), (a)(5) introductory text and (c)(5) introductory text to read as follows:

§ 63.1564 What are my requirements for metal HAP emissions from catalytic cracking units?

(a) * * *

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (a)(5) of this section, meet each emission limitation in Table 1 of this subpart that applies to you. If your catalytic cracking unit is subject to the NSPS for PM in § 60.102 of this chapter or is subject to § 60.102a(b)(1) of this chapter, you must meet the emission limitations for NSPS units. If your catalytic cracking unit is not subject to the NSPS for PM, you can choose from the six options in

paragraphs (a)(1)(i) through (vi) of this section:

* * * * *

(iv) You can elect to comply with the PM per coke burn-off emission limit (Option 2);

* * * * *

(5) On or before the date specified in § 63.1563(d), you must comply with one of the two options in paragraphs (a)(5)(i) and (ii) of this section during periods of startup, shutdown and hot standby:

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(5) If you elect to comply with the alternative limit in paragraph (a)(5)(ii) of this section during periods of startup, shutdown and hot standby, demonstrate continuous compliance on or before the date specified in § 63.1563(d) by:

* * * * *

- 13. Section 63.1565 is amended by revising paragraph (a)(5) introductory text to read as follows:

§ 63.1565 What are my requirements for organic HAP emissions from catalytic cracking units?

(a) * * *

(5) On or before the date specified in § 63.1563(d), you must comply with one of the two options in paragraphs (a)(5)(i) and (ii) of this section during periods of startup, shutdown and hot standby:

* * * * *

- 14. Section 63.1566 is amended by revising paragraph (a)(4) to read as follows:

§ 63.1566 What are my requirements for organic HAP emissions from catalytic reforming units?

(a) * * *

(4) The emission limitations in Tables 15 and 16 of this subpart do not apply to emissions from process vents during passive depressuring when the reactor vent pressure is 5 pounds per square inch gauge (psig) or less or during active depressuring or purging prior to January

30, 2019, when the reactor vent pressure is 5 psig or less. On and after January 30, 2019, the emission limitations in Tables 15 and 16 of this subpart do apply to emissions from process vents during active purging operations (when nitrogen or other purge gas is actively introduced to the reactor vessel) or active depressuring (using a vacuum

pump, ejector system, or similar device) regardless of the reactor vent pressure.

* * * * *

■ 15. Section 63.1568 is amended by revising paragraph (a)(4) introductory text to read as follows:

§ 63.1568 What are my requirements for organic HAP emissions from sulfur recovery units?

(a) * * *

(4) On or before the date specified in § 63.1563(d), you must comply with one of the three options in paragraphs (a)(4)(i) through (iii) of this section during periods of startup and shutdown.

* * * * *

■ 16. Table 2 to subpart UUU of part 63 is amended by revising the entry for item 1 to read as follows:

TABLE 2 TO SUBPART UUU OF PART 63—OPERATING LIMITS FOR METAL HAP EMISSIONS FROM CATALYTIC CRACKING UNITS

For each new or existing catalytic cracking unit . . .	For this type of continuous monitoring system . . .	For this type of control device . . .	You shall meet this operating limit . . .
1. Subject to the NSPS for PM in 40 CFR 60.102 and not elect § 60.100(e).	Continuous opacity monitoring system.	Any	On and after August 1, 2017, maintain the 3-hour rolling average opacity of emissions from your catalyst regenerator vent no higher than 20 percent.
*	*	*	*

* * * * *

■ 17. Table 3 to subpart UUU of part 63 is amended by revising the entry for item 12 to read as follows:

TABLE 3 TO SUBPART UUU OF PART 63—CONTINUOUS MONITORING SYSTEMS FOR METAL HAP EMISSIONS FROM CATALYTIC CRACKING UNITS

For each new or existing catalytic cracking unit . . .	If you use this type of control device for your vent . . .	You shall install, operate, and maintain a . . .
12. Electing to comply with the operating limits in § 63.1564(a)(5)(ii) during periods of startup, shutdown, or hot standby.	Any	Continuous parameter monitoring system to measure and record the gas flow rate exiting the catalyst regenerator. ¹
*	*	*

¹ If applicable, you can use the alternative in § 63.1573(a)(1) instead of a continuous parameter monitoring system for gas flow rate.

* * * * *

■ 18. Table 5 to subpart UUU of part 63 is amended by revising the entry for item 2 to read as follows:

TABLE 5 TO SUBPART UUU OF PART 63—INITIAL COMPLIANCE WITH METAL HAP EMISSION LIMITS FOR CATALYTIC CRACKING UNITS

For each new and existing catalytic cracking unit catalyst regenerator vent . . .	For the following emission limit . . .	You have demonstrated initial compliance if . . .
2. Subject to NSPS for PM in 40 CFR 60.102a(b)(1)(i); or in § 60.102 and electing § 60.100(e) and electing to meet the PM per coke burn-off limit.	PM emissions must not exceed 1.0 g/kg (1.0 lb PM/1,000 lb) of coke burn-off.	You have already conducted a performance test to demonstrate initial compliance with the NSPS and the measured PM emission rate is less than or equal to 1.0 g/kg (1.0 lb/1,000 lb) of coke burn-off in the catalyst regenerator. As part of the Notification of Compliance Status, you must certify that your vent meets the PM limit. You are not required to do another performance test to demonstrate initial compliance. As part of your Notification of Compliance Status, you certify that your BLD; CO ₂ , O ₂ , or CO monitor; or continuous opacity monitoring system meets the requirements in § 63.1572.
*	*	*

[FR Doc. 2016-16451 Filed 7-12-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration****50 CFR Part 622**

[Docket No. 160225143-6583-02]

RIN 0648-BF61

Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 25

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: NMFS issues regulations to implement Regulatory Amendment 25 for the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for the Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region (Regulatory Amendment 25) as prepared and submitted by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council). This final rule revises the commercial and recreational annual catch limits (ACLs), the commercial trip limit, and the recreational bag limit for blueline tilefish. Additionally, this final rule revises the black sea bass recreational bag limit and the commercial and recreational fishing years for yellowtail snapper. The purpose of this final rule for blueline tilefish is to increase the optimum yield (OY) and ACLs based on a revised acceptable biological catch (ABC) recommendation from the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC). The purpose of this final rule is also to achieve OY for black sea bass, and adjust the fishing year for yellowtail snapper to better protect these species and allow for increased economic benefits to fishers.

DATES: This rule is effective August 12, 2016, except for the amendments to § 622.187(b)(2), § 622.191(a)(10), and § 622.193(z) that are effective July 13, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Electronic copies of Regulatory Amendment 25, which includes an environmental assessment, a Regulatory Flexibility Act analysis, and a regulatory impact review may be obtained from www.regulations.gov or the Southeast Regional Office (SERO) Web site at http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sustainable_fisheries/s_atl/sg/2015/reg_am25/index.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Janine Vara, NMFS SERO, telephone: 727-824-5305, or email: mary.vara@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The snapper-grouper fishery of the South Atlantic Region is managed under the FMP and includes blueline tilefish, black sea bass, and yellowtail snapper. The FMP was prepared by the Council and is implemented by NMFS through regulations at 50 CFR part 622 under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

On June 1, 2016, NMFS published a proposed rule for Regulatory Amendment 25 and requested public comment (81 FR 34944). The proposed rule and Regulatory Amendment 25 outline the rationale for the actions contained in this final rule. A summary of the actions implemented by Regulatory Amendment 25 and this final rule is provided below.

Management Measures Contained in This Final Rule

This final rule revises the commercial and recreational ACLs, commercial trip limit, and recreational bag limit for blueline tilefish; revises the recreational bag limit for black sea bass; and revises the fishing year for the yellowtail snapper commercial and recreational sectors. All ABC and ACL weights in this final rule are expressed in round weight.

Blueline Tilefish ACLs

This final rule revises the commercial and recreational ACLs for blueline tilefish. The current commercial ACLs are 26,766 lb (12,141 kg) for 2016, 35,785 lb (16,232 kg) for 2017, and 44,048 lb (19,980 kg) for 2018 and subsequent fishing years. The current recreational ACLs are 26,691 lb (12,107 kg) for 2016, 35,685 lb (16,186 kg) for 2017, and 43,925 lb (19,924 kg) for 2018 and subsequent fishing years. These ACLs were implemented through the final rule to implement Amendment 32 to the FMP (80 FR 16583, March 30, 2015). This final rule increases both the commercial and recreational ACLs for blueline tilefish in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of the South Atlantic. The commercial ACL will be set at 87,521 lb (39,699 kg) and the recreational ACL will be set at 87,277 lb (39,588 kg).

In Regulatory Amendment 25, the Council is revising the blueline tilefish total ACL (combined commercial and recreational ACL) based on a new ABC recommendation from the Council's SSC. The SSC provided their blueline tilefish ABC recommendation to set the

ABC at the equilibrium yield at 75 percent of the fishing mortality that produces the maximum sustainable yield (224,100 lb (101,650 kg)). The Council accepted the SSC's ABC recommendation and determined that this revised ABC is sufficient to prevent the overfishing of blueline tilefish.

The Council is also revising the total ACL to increase the buffer between the blueline tilefish ABC and ACL from 2 percent to 22 percent. The increase in the buffer is to account for management uncertainty, such as increased blueline tilefish landings north of the Council's area of jurisdiction. In Amendment 32, the Council set the total blueline tilefish ACL for the South Atlantic at 98 percent of the recommended ABC for the entire Atlantic region to account for management uncertainty because the stock assessment was coast-wide and the Council was aware that landings of blueline tilefish occurred north of North Carolina. In Regulatory Amendment 25, the Council set the total ACL at 78 percent of the ABC. This decision is based on a comparison of the landings between the South Atlantic and Greater Atlantic Regions (Maine through Virginia), which indicate that 22 percent of the landings from 2011-2014 are from the Greater Atlantic Region.

Blueline Tilefish Commercial Trip Limit

The current commercial trip limit for blueline tilefish is 100 lb (45 kg), gutted weight; 112 lb (51 kg), round weight, and was implemented in Amendment 32. The Council selected that trip limit as a way to slow the commercial harvest of blueline tilefish, potentially lengthen the commercial fishing season, and reduce the risk of the commercial ACL being exceeded. This final rule increases the blueline tilefish commercial trip limit to 300 lb (136 kg) gutted weight; 336 lb (152 kg), round weight. The Council decided that an appropriate response to the increase in ABC and total ACL is to increase the commercial trip limit. The increase in the commercial trip limit will increase the socioeconomic benefits to commercial fishermen. In addition, the increase in the commercial trip limit is not expected to result in an in-season closure of blueline tilefish.

Blueline Tilefish and Black Sea Bass Recreational Bag Limits

This final rule revises the recreational bag limits for both blueline tilefish and black sea bass. The current blueline tilefish bag limit is one fish per vessel per day for the months of May through August and is part of the aggregate bag limit for grouper and tilefish. There is no recreational retention of blueline



FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 81

Tuesday,

No. 168

August 30, 2016

Part III

Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR Parts 51, 60, 61, *et al.*

Revisions to Test Methods, Performance Specifications, and Testing Regulations for Air Emission Sources; Final Rule

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 51, 60, 61, and 63

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0292; FRL-9950-57-OAR]

RIN 2060-AS34

Revisions to Test Methods, Performance Specifications, and Testing Regulations for Air Emission Sources

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action promulgates technical and editorial corrections and revisions to regulations related to source testing of emissions. We have made corrections and updates to testing provisions, and added newly approved alternatives to existing testing regulations. These revisions will improve the quality of data and provide flexibility in the use of approved alternative procedures. The revisions do not impose any new substantive requirements on source owners or operators.

DATES: The final rule is effective on October 31, 2016. The incorporation by reference materials listed in the rule are approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of October 31, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0292. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., confidential business information or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Lula H. Melton, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Air Quality Assessment Division (E143-02), Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711; telephone number: (919) 541-2910; fax number: (919) 541-0516; email address: melton.lula@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The supplementary information in this preamble is organized as follows:

Table of Contents

I. General Information

- A. Does this action apply to me?
- B. What action is the Agency taking?
- C. Judicial Review
- II. Background
- III. Summary of Amendments
 - A. Appendix M of Part 51
 - B. Method 201A of Appendix M of Part 51
 - C. Method 202 of Appendix M of Part 51
 - D. Appendix P of Part 51
 - E. General Provisions (Subpart A) of Part 60
 - F. Standards of Performance for Stationary Spark Ignition Internal Combustion Engines (Subpart JJJJ) of Part 60
 - G. Method 1 of Appendix A-1 of Part 60
 - H. Method 2 of Appendix A-1 of Part 60
 - I. Method 2G of Appendix A-2 of Part 60
 - J. Method 3C of Appendix A-2 of Part 60
 - K. Method 4 of Appendix A-3 of Part 60
 - L. Method 5 of Appendix A-3 of Part 60
 - M. Method 5H of Appendix A-3 of Part 60
 - N. Method 5I of Appendix A-3 of Part 60
 - O. Method 6C of Appendix A-4 of Part 60
 - P. Method 7E of Appendix A-4 of Part 60
 - Q. Method 10 of Appendix A-4 of Part 60
 - R. Methods 10A and 10B of Appendix A-4 of Part 60
 - S. Method 15 of Appendix A-5 of Part 60
 - T. Method 16C of Appendix A-6 of Part 60
 - U. Method 18 of Appendix A-6 of Part 60
 - V. Method 25C of Appendix A-7 of Part 60
 - W. Method 26 of Appendix A-8 of Part 60
 - X. Method 26A of Appendix A-8 of Part 60
 - Y. Method 29 of Appendix A-8 of Part 60
 - Z. Method 30A of Appendix A-8 of Part 60
 - AA. Method 30B of Appendix A-8 of Part 60
 - BB. Appendix B to Part 60—Performance Specifications
 - CC. Performance Specification 1 of Appendix B of Part 60
 - DD. Performance Specification 2 of Appendix B of Part 60
 - EE. Performance Specification 3 of Appendix B of Part 60
 - FF. Performance Specification 4A of Appendix B of Part 60
 - GG. Performance Specification 11 of Appendix B of part 60
 - HH. Performance Specification 15 of Appendix B of Part 60
- II. Performance Specification 16 of Appendix B of Part 60
- JJ. Procedure 2 of Appendix F of Part 60
- KK. General Provisions (Subpart A) of Part 61
- LL. Method 107 of Appendix B of Part 61
- MM. General Provisions (Subpart A) of Part 63
- NN. Method 320 of Appendix A of Part 63
- IV. Public Comments on the Proposed Rule
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
 - A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review
 - B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
 - C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)
 - D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)
 - E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
 - F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

- G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks
- H. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use
- I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) and 1 CFR part 51
- J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
- K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me ?

The revisions promulgated in this final rule apply to a large number of industries that are already subject to the current provisions of 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) parts 51, 60, 61, and 63. For example, Performance Specification 4A applies to municipal waste combustors and hazardous waste incinerators. We did not list all of the specific affected industries or their North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes herein since there are many affected sources. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult either the air permitting authority for the entity or your EPA Regional representative as listed in 40 CFR 63.13.

B. What action is the Agency taking?

We are promulgating technical and editorial corrections and revisions to regulations related to source testing of emissions. More specifically, we are correcting typographical and technical errors, updating obsolete testing procedures, adding approved testing alternatives, and clarifying testing requirements.

C. Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), judicial review of this final rule is available by filing a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by October 31, 2016. Under section 307(d)(7)(B) of the CAA, only an objection to this final rule that was raised with reasonable specificity during the period for public comment can be raised during judicial review. Moreover, under section 307(b)(2) of the CAA, the requirements that are the subject of this final rule may not be challenged later in civil or criminal proceedings brought by the EPA to enforce these requirements.

II. Background

The revisions to test methods, performance specifications, and testing regulations were proposed in the **Federal Register** on September 8, 2015 (80 FR 54146). The public comment period ended December 9, 2015, and 42 comment letters were received from the public. Changes were made to this final rule based on the public comments.

III. Summary of Amendments

A. Appendix M of Part 51

In paragraph (4)(a) of appendix M to part 51, Methods 30A and 30B are added to the list of methods not requiring the use of audit samples.

B. Method 201A of Appendix M of Part 51

In Method 201A, the constant in equation 9 is corrected from 0.07657 to 0.007657.

C. Method 202 of Appendix M of Part 51

In Method 202, section 3.8 is added to incorporate ASTM E617–13 by reference. The first sentence in section 8.5.4.3 is revised by adding “back half of the filterable PM filter holder.” Also, in section 8.5.4.3, sentences inadvertently omitted in the proposed rule are re-inserted. In section 9.10, the erroneous statement “You must purge the assembled train as described in sections 8.5.3.2 and 8.5.3.3.” is corrected to reference section 8.5.3. Sections 10.3 and 10.4 are added to require calibration of the field balance used to weigh impingers and to require a multipoint calibration of the analytical balance. In section 10.3, the proposed language is revised to allow the use of a Class 6 tolerance weight (or better) in lieu of the proposed Class 3 (or better) tolerance weight for checking the field balance accuracy because the calibration weight does not need to be any better than one-half of the tolerance for the measurement. Sections 11.2.2.1, 11.2.2.2, 11.2.2.3, 11.2.2.4 and figure 7 are re-inserted.

D. Appendix P of Part 51

In appendix P of part 51, section 3.3, the erroneous reference to section 2.1 of Performance Specification 2 of appendix B of part 60 is corrected to section 6.1. Also, in section 3.3, the reference to the National Bureau of Standards is changed to the National Institute of Standards and Technology. In section 5.1.3, the erroneous reference to paragraph 4.1.4 is changed to reflect the correct reference to paragraphs 3.1.4 and 3.1.5.

E. General Provisions (Subpart A) of Part 60

In the General Provisions of part 60, section 60.8(f) is revised to require the reporting of specific emissions test data in test reports. These data elements are required regardless of whether the report is submitted electronically or in paper format. Note that revisions are made to the data elements (that were listed in the proposed rule) to provide clarity and to more appropriately define and limit the extent of elements reported for each test method included in a test report. These modifications ensure that emissions test reporting includes all data necessary to assess and assure the quality of the reported emissions data and that the reported information appropriately describes and identifies the specific unit covered by the emissions test report. Section 60.17(g) is revised to add ASTM D6911–15 to the list of incorporations by reference.

F. Standards of Performance for Stationary Spark Ignition Internal Combustion Engines (Subpart JJJJ) of Part 60

We received a request for a public hearing on this rule. We held a hearing in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina on October 8, 2015. All comments received at that hearing were related to our proposed revisions to subpart JJJJ, and a transcript of that hearing is available in the rule docket [EPA–HQ–OAR–2014–0292]. We also received a substantial number of comments from the public, both supportive of and in opposition to the revisions that we proposed.

At issue is the use of specific methodologies in a manner allowing a tester to speciate the volatile organic compounds (VOC) in the emissions and, from those speciated measurements, calculate a total VOC emissions rate using Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR using Method 320 or ASTM D6348–03) or Method 18, a measurement methodology that makes use of a combination of capture and analytical approaches. We proposed to remove Method 320 and ASTM D6348–03 as options for measuring VOC emissions under subpart JJJJ due to the lack of a consistent, demonstrable, and validated approach to measuring total VOC emissions. This decision was primarily due to the lack of a discrete list of compounds identified as those constituting the total VOC for the sources affected by subpart JJJJ. We proposed to eliminate the option to use these measurement approaches and leave Method 25A itself, a total

hydrocarbon measurement approach, as the sole means of determining compliance with the total VOC emissions limits in the rule. We are concerned that implementation of Methods 320, ASTM D6348–03, and Method 18 does not provide proper and consistent quality assurance (QA) for compliance demonstration with total VOC measurement as required under subpart JJJJ.

Several commenters stated that prohibiting the use of FTIR to measure VOC and leaving Method 25A as the sole means of demonstrating compliance would result in an increased cost to industry. The commenters reasoned that this would decrease the number of tests that could be conducted in a single day because Method 25A requires more time to set up and run. We did not find compelling support for this argument. A properly conducted emissions test using FTIR technology and Method 320 or ASTM D6348–03 takes several hours to conduct, including time for equipment setup including the same sampling probe and heated sample transport line requirements as Method 25A, warmup which takes the same amount of time as Method 25A, conducting appropriate calibration and spiking data quality assessments very similar in duration to the required Method 25A calibration, actual source sampling time to span three 1-hour periods, leak tests, and post-test QA procedures common to each method. While it is possible to conduct two such test runs in a single 12- to 14-hour day, it is likewise possible to conduct two such test runs with Method 25A in that same time frame.

Several commenters also remarked that using FTIR is less complex, easier, and quicker than using Method 25A, but we do not find this argument sufficiently compelling to reverse our proposed revisions. We understand that while an experienced spectroscopist can operate an FTIR with relative ease as compared to a novice, the process of quality assuring emissions data measured by FTIR in accordance with Method 320 or ASTM D6348–03 is not a trivial matter. Calibration checks and matrix spiking of target compounds, including the “most difficult to recover” compound (as required by Method 320), is both challenging and time consuming due to the need to rule out interferences that may be caused by the emissions gas matrix while working to individually quantify each VOC in that matrix. In summation, we do not agree that the use of FTIR for quantification of total VOC is quick, easy or less expensive to

conduct when compared with the use of Method 25A.

Several commenters provided information to the docket, and others stated individually during the public hearing that they have provided a list of VOC to the docket, or have compiled a list of VOC or recommend that EPA address the FTIR measurement issue through the agency providing a list of VOC that make up 95 percent of the emissions from natural gas-fired spark ignition (SI) engines. We agree with commenters that a list of VOC could be developed; however, we recognize that the list must represent total VOC (all the VOC that could be emitted from SI engines affected by subpart JJJJ), as that is the compliance requirement stated in the rule. We have not stated that 95 percent of the VOC emissions are the target goal for such a list. In a memo to the docket of this rule (Technical memorandum dated September 28, 2015, to Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0292 titled, "Proposal to Remove Methods 18, 320, and ASTM D6348-03 as Acceptable Methods for Measuring Total VOC Under 40 CFR 60, Subpart JJJJ"), we state that we are actively seeking sufficient documentation to create a complete list of VOC to support a speciated hydrocarbon measurement approach such as FTIR and/or Method 18. We received data from commenters that moves us toward compiling such a list, but we did not receive sufficient demonstration that all VOC were represented in that list. Additionally, while we received information on VOC present in well-operated and controlled engines, the data does not include VOC that may be present largely during, or only during, poor performance periods and could, thereby, serve as key indicators of engines that are not well-operated, well-controlled, or in compliance with the applicable standard. Therefore, we remain unable to define a complete list of VOC that would need to be quantified by a speciated measurement approach to demonstrate that total VOC were measured during a compliance test. Even so, we are swayed by arguments such as those made in support of speciated measurement approaches, specifically their ability to account for methane and ethane as separate quantifiable emissions.

Two commenters remarked that they do not believe that Method 25A is able to produce accurate total VOC values because there is an inherent issue with the "difference or subtraction" method when applied to compressed natural gas (CNG)-based emissions. We reviewed the data provided by the commenters in this respect and did not arrive at the

same conclusion. Our review shows that the commenters appear to double-count some of the emissions in arriving at their results and do not present compelling evidence that demonstrates the ability of a hydrocarbon cutter to remove all ethane from the measured gas.

Two commenters stated that FTIR can measure real-time non-methane, non-ethane VOC. We agree that this speciated approach is capable of providing emissions data for methane, ethane, and other VOC in near-real-time.

One commenter recommended that we allow FTIR methods since FTIR is the only technology that can provide a mass emissions rate and since FTIR does not have a zero drift nor calibration drift problem like Method 25A. Subpart JJJJ requires the calculation of a mass emissions rate on a propane basis and Method 25A, calibrated with propane and using the molecular weight of propane (44.01 lb/lb-mol) for mass emissions calculations, is quite capable of providing a mass emissions rate appropriate for determination of compliance with the VOC standards in subpart JJJJ. In regard to zero drift, Method 25A has QA and quality control (QC) criteria to limit the acceptance of data where instrument drift is excessive.

Three commenters noted that we did not provide supporting data for proposing to disallow FTIR methods that have been allowed under subpart JJJJ for the past 7 years. We submitted a supporting memo to the docket (Technical memorandum dated September 28, 2015, to Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0292 titled, "Proposal to Remove EPA Methods 18, 320, and ASTM D6348-03 as Acceptable Methods for Measuring Total VOC Under 40 CFR 60, Subpart JJJJ") that provides the reasoning and justification for our proposal.

One commenter recommended that changes to subpart JJJJ test methods be proposed as a separate rulemaking under subpart JJJJ. We believe that we have the authority to make necessary or otherwise appropriate changes to a specific test procedure or pollutant measurement requirement in a rule through this periodic rulemaking.

One commenter agreed with our proposed position that FTIR should not be used to measure total VOC, but remarked that Method 18 should continue to be allowed since it allows direct measurement of VOC constituents using gas chromatography and does not rely on differential methods or require multiple test methods. We found the latter arguments and reasoning to be persuasive and compelling. Method 18 does contain provisions to screen and

calibrate for VOC present in the emissions and thereby measure total VOC from a specific source. While this can be a complex and sometimes tedious undertaking, we recognize that it is an appropriate approach to measure total VOC from a specific source and are modifying the final rule language to reflect that this is allowable.

Two additional commenters agreed with our proposed position that the current FTIR methodologies are not adequately measuring total VOC. One of the commenters remarked that testers do not provide adequate total VOC results. The other commenter recommended only allowing FTIR if the QA is complete and accurate and if all VOC are proven to be accounted for. We are swayed by this commenter's support for complete QA/QC of data and stipulation that all VOC are proven to be accounted for. Although we do not currently possess sufficient data to compile a complete list of VOCs expected to be emitted from SI engines, we believe that where data with complete QA/QC are available, we may acquire sufficient data over time.

This action finalizes requirements to clarify the conduct of QA/QC procedures and report the QA/QC data with the emissions measurement data when applying Method 320 and ASTM D6348-03. We will revisit this decision and make a subsequent determination of the appropriateness for the use of Method 320 and/or ASTM-D6348 during the first risk and technology review evaluation for this sector.

In Table 2 of subpart JJJJ, the allowances to use Method 320 and ASTM D6348-03 are retained. The language requiring the reporting of specific QA/QC data when these test methods are used has been added to paragraph 60.4245(d).

The typographical error in the proposed Table 2 of subpart JJJJ is corrected; "methane cutter" is replaced with "hydrocarbon cutter" in paragraph (5) of section c.

G. Method 1 of Appendix A-1 of Part 60

In Method 1, section 11.2.1.2, the word "instances" is changed to "distances" in the second sentence, and the last two sentences in this section (inadvertently omitted in the proposed rule) are re-inserted. The second figure labeled Figure 1-2 is deleted because two figures labeled Figure 1-2 were inadvertently included.

H. Method 2 of Appendix A-1 of Part 60

In Method 2, instructions are given for conducting S-type pitot calibrations. Currently, the same equipment is commonly used for both Methods 2 and

2G (same S-type pitot), but the calibration procedure is slightly different in each method. Other key pieces that enhance the QA/QC of the calibrations are added to Method 2, and the amount of blockage allowed is reduced to improve calibration accuracy. To address these issues, changes are made to sections 6.7, 10.1.2.3, 10.1.3.4, 10.1.3.7, and 10.1.4.1.3 of Method 2. Sentences in section 6.7 (inadvertently omitted in the proposed rule) are re-inserted. In section 10.1.4.3, the erroneous reference to section 10.1.4.4 is corrected to section 12.4.4. The portion of Figure 2–10 labeled (b) is deleted because it is erroneous, and the label (a) is removed from the figure.

I. Method 2G of Appendix A–2 of Part 60

In Method 2G, instructions are given for conducting S-type pitot calibrations. Currently, the same equipment is commonly used for both Methods 2 and 2G (same S-type pitot), but the calibration procedure is slightly different in each method. Other key pieces that enhance the QA/QC of the calibrations are added to the method, and the amount of blockage allowed is reduced to tighten up calibration accuracy. Changes are made to sections 6.11.1, 6.11.2, 10.6.6, and 10.6.8 of Method 2G to address these issues. In section 10.6.6, the proposed language regarding recording rotational speed is revised based on a public comment.

J. Method 3C of Appendix A–2 of Part 60

In Method 3C, section 6.3 is revised to add subsections (6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.4, and 6.3.5) that clarify the requirements necessary to check analyzer linearity.

K. Method 4 of Appendix A–3 of Part 60

In Method 4, section 10.3 (Field Balance) is added to require calibration of the balance used to weigh impingers. In section 10.3, the proposed language is revised to allow the use of a Class 6 tolerance weight (or better) in lieu of the proposed Class 3 (or better) tolerance weight for checking the field balance accuracy because the calibration weight does not need to be any better than one-half of the tolerance for the measurement. Section 12.2.5, which gives another option for calculating the approximate moisture content, is added. Section 16.4 is revised to clarify that a fuel sample must be taken and analyzed to develop F-factors required by the alternative procedure. Also, in section 16.4, percent relative humidity is inadvertently defined as “calibrated

hydrometer acceptable”; the word “hydrometer” is replaced with “hygrometer.”

L. Method 5 of Appendix A–3 of Part 60

In Method 5, we erroneously finalized the reference to the Isostack metering system in 79 FR 11228. Therefore, this reference from section 6.1.1.9 is removed. Broadly applicable test method determinations or letters of assessments, regarding whether specific alternative metering equipment meets the specifications of the method as was our intent in the “Summary of Comments and Responses on Revisions to Test Methods and Testing Regulations” (EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–0114–0045), will continue to be issued. In section 6.1.1.9, the parenthetical phrase “(rechecked at least one point after each test)” is removed since the requirements for temperature sensors are given in section 10.5 of Method 5. The phrase “after ensuring that all joints have been wiped clean of silicone grease” is removed from section 8.7.6.2.5. Sections 10.7 and 10.8 are added to require calibration of the balance used to weigh impingers and to require a multipoint calibration of the analytical balance. In section 10.7, the proposed language is revised to allow the use of a Class 6 tolerance weight (or better) in lieu of the proposed Class 3 (or better) tolerance weight for checking the field balance accuracy because the calibration weight does not need to be any better than one-half of the tolerance for the measurement. In section 10.8, the proposed language is revised to “Audit the balance each day it is used for gravimetric measurements by weighing at least one ASTM E617–13 Class 2 tolerance (or better) calibration weight that corresponds to 50 to 150 percent of the weight of one filter or between 1 g and 5 g.”

M. Method 5H of Appendix A–3 of Part 60

In Method 5H, sections 10.4 and 10.5 are added to require calibration of the field balance used to weigh impingers and to require a multipoint calibration of the analytical balance. In section 10.4, the proposed language is revised to allow the use of a Class 6 tolerance weight (or better) in lieu of the proposed Class 3 (or better) tolerance weight for checking the field balance accuracy because the calibration weight does not need to be any better than one-half of the tolerance for the measurement. In section 10.5, the proposed language is revised to “Audit the balance each day it is used for gravimetric measurements by weighing at least one ASTM E617–13 Class 2 tolerance (or better)

calibration weight that corresponds to 50 to 150 percent of the weight of one filter or between 1 g and 5 g.”

N. Method 5I of Appendix A–3 of Part 60

In Method 5I, sections 10.1 and 10.2 are added to require calibration of the field balance used to weigh impingers and to require a multipoint calibration of the analytical balance. In section 10.1, the proposed language is revised to allow the use of a Class 6 tolerance weight (or better) in lieu of the proposed Class 3 (or better) tolerance weight for checking the field balance accuracy because the calibration weight does not need to be any more accurate than one-half of the tolerance for the measurement. In section 10.2, the proposed language is revised to “Audit the balance each day it is used for gravimetric measurements by weighing at least one ASTM E617–13 Class 2 tolerance (or better) calibration weight that corresponds to 50 to 150 percent of the weight of one filter or between 1 g and 5 g.”

O. Method 6C of Appendix A–4 of Part 60

In Method 6C, the language detailing the methodology for performing interference checks in section 8.3 is revised to clarify and streamline the procedure. While we continue to believe that quenching can be an issue for fluorescence analyzers, the language regarding quenching that was promulgated on February 27, 2014, has raised many questions and is being removed. It is our opinion that the interference check, if done properly, using sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and both levels of carbon dioxide (CO₂) as specified in Table 7E–3 of Method 7E, will evaluate effects due to quenching. We will continue to evaluate data as it becomes available and propose additional language, as needed. However, if you believe that quenching is an issue, we recommend that you repeat the interference check using the CO₂ values specified in Table 7E–3 and an SO₂ value similar to your measured stack emissions.

P. Method 7E of Appendix A–4 of Part 60

In Method 7E, section 8.1.2, the requirements/specifications for the 3-point sampling line are revised to be consistent with Performance Specification 2; the new requirement is 0.4, 1.2, and 2.0 meters.

The language in section 8.2.7 regarding quenching that was promulgated on February 27, 2014, has raised many questions, and is being

removed at this time. It is our opinion that the interference check, if done properly, using the gas levels specified in Table 7E-3 of Method 7E, will evaluate analyzer bias. We will continue to evaluate data as it becomes available and propose additional language in the future as needed. However, if you feel that analyzer bias is an issue, we recommend that you repeat the interference check using calibration gas values similar to your measured stack emissions. The language in section 8.2.7 requiring that the interference check be performed periodically or after major repairs has also been removed to be consistent with the language found in section 8.2.7 (2), which states "This interference test is valid for the life of the instrument unless major analytical components (e.g., the detector) are replaced with different model parts."

The word "equations" is replaced with "equation" in the sentence in section 12.8 that reads "If desired, calculate the total NO_x concentration with a correction for converter efficiency using equation 7E-8."

We requested and received comments on the stratification test in Method 7E. We will consider the comments and propose changes in a future rulemaking.

Q. Method 10 of Appendix A-4 of Part 60

In Method 10, sections 6.2.5 and 8.4.2 are revised, and section 6.2.6 is added to clarify the types of sample tanks allowed for integrated sampling.

R. Methods 10A and 10B of Appendix A-4 of Part 60

Methods 10A and 10B are revised to allow the use of sample tanks as an alternative to flexible bags for sample collection.

S. Method 15 of Appendix A-5 of Part 60

In Method 15, section 8.3.2 is revised to clarify the calibrations that represent partial calibration.

T. Method 16C of Appendix A-6 of Part 60

In Method 16C, section 12.2, equation 16C-1 is revised to replace C_v (manufacturer certified concentration of a calibration gas in ppmv SO₂) in the denominator with CS (calibration span in ppmv). The definition of CS is added to the nomenclature in section 12.1, and the definition of C_v is retained in the nomenclature in section 12.1 because C_v is in the numerator of equation 16C-1.

U. Method 18 of Appendix A-6 of Part 60

In Method 18, section 8.2.1.5.2.3 is removed because the General Provisions to Part 60 already include a requirement to analyze two field audit samples as described in section 9.2.

V. Method 25C of Appendix A-7 of Part 60

In Method 25C, section 9.1 is corrected to reference section 8.4.2 instead of section 8.4.1. Section 11.2 is deleted because the audit sample analysis is now covered under the General Provisions to Part 60. The nomenclature is revised in section 12.1, and equation 25C-2 is revised in section 12.3. Sections 12.4, 12.5, 12.5.1, and 12.5.2 are added to incorporate equations to correct sample concentrations for ambient air dilution. In section 12.5.2, the reference to equation 25C-4 is corrected to 25C-5.

W. Method 26 of Appendix A-8 of Part 60

In Method 26, section 13.3 is revised to indicate the correct method detection limit; the equivalent English unit for the metric quantity is added.

X. Method 26A of Appendix A-8 of Part 60

In Method 26A, language regarding minimizing chloride interferences is added to section 4.3. Also in section 4.3, the first sentence (inadvertently omitted in the proposed rule) is re-inserted.

Sections 6.1.7 and 8.1.5 are not changed in this final rule. The language in the proposed rule that revised the required probe and filter temperature requirements in sections 6.1.7 and 8.1.5 to allow a lower probe and filter temperature was an error.

In section 8.1.6, the typographical error, ". . . between 120 and 134 °C (248 and 275 °F . . .)", is corrected to ". . . between 120 and 134 °C (248 and 273 °F . . .)".

Y. Method 29 of Appendix A-8 of Part 60

In Method 29, section 8.2.9.3 is revised to require rinsing impingers containing permanganate with hydrogen chloride (HCl) to ensure consistency with the application of Method 29 across various stationary source categories and because there is evidence that HCl is needed to release the mercury (Hg) bound in the precipitate from the permanganate. Sections 10.4 and 10.5 are added to require calibration of the field balance used to weigh impingers and to require a multipoint calibration of the analytical balance. In section 10.4, the proposed language is

revised to allow the use of a Class 6 tolerance weight (or better) in lieu of the proposed Class 3 (or better) tolerance weight for checking the field balance accuracy because the calibration weight does not need to be any better than one-half of the tolerance for the measurement.

Z. Method 30A of Appendix A-8 of Part 60

In Method 30A, the heading of section 8.1 is changed from "Sample Point Selection" to "Selection of Sampling Sites and Sampling Points."

AA. Method 30B of Appendix A-8 of Part 60

In Method 30B, the heading of section 8.1 is changed from "Sample Point Selection" to "Selection of Sampling Sites and Sampling Points." In section 8.3.3.8, the reference to ASTM WK223 is changed to ASTM D6911-15, and the last two sentences in this section (inadvertently omitted in the proposed rule) are re-inserted.

BB. Appendix B to Part 60—Performance Specifications

In the index to appendix B to part 60, Performance Specification 16—Specifications and Test Procedures for Predictive Emission Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources is added.

CC. Performance Specification 1 of Appendix B of Part 60

In Performance Specification 1, paragraph 8.1(2)(i) is revised in order to not limit the location of a continuous opacity monitoring system (COMS) to a point at least four duct diameters downstream and two duct diameters upstream from a control device or flow disturbance. Paragraph 8.1(2)(i) refers to paragraphs 8.1(2)(ii) and 8.1(2)(iii) for additional options.

DD. Performance Specification 2 of Appendix B of Part 60

In Performance Specification 2, the definition of span value is revised in section 3.11. The sentence, "For spans less than 500 ppm, the span value may either be rounded upward to the next highest multiple of 10 ppm, or to the next highest multiple of 100 ppm such that the equivalent emissions concentration is not less than 30 percent of the selected span value.", is added to section 3.11. Also, in section 6.1.1, the data recorder language is revised. In section 6.1.2, the term "high-level" is changed to "span" to be consistent with the definition of span value discussed above. In section 16.3.2, the characters "|dverbar" are replaced with \bar{d} which is the average difference between

responses and the concentration/ responses. In section 18, Table 2–2 is detached from Figure 2–1, and the figure is clearly labeled as “Calibration Drift Determination.”

EE. Performance Specification 3 of Appendix B of Part 60

In Performance Specification 3, section 13.2 is revised to clarify how to calculate relative accuracy. The absolute value symbol is added to the proposed definition of absolute value of the mean of the differences.

FF. Performance Specification 4A of Appendix B of Part 60

In Performance Specification 4A, the response time test procedure in sections 8.3 and 8.3.1 is revised. In section 8.3.1, the next to the last sentence is reworded to “Repeat the entire procedure until you have three sets of data to determine the mean upscale and downscale response times.” Also, the proposed response time requirement in section 13.3 is revised to 240 seconds.

GG. Performance Specification 11 of Appendix B of Part 60

In Performance Specification 11, equations 11–1 and 11–2 are revised in section 12.1, and the response range is used in lieu of the upscale value in section 13.1. In section 12.1, the sentence in paragraph (3) that was inadvertently omitted is re-inserted.

HH. Performance Specification 15 of Appendix B of Part 60

In Performance Specification 15, the statement, “An audit sample is obtained from the Administrator,” is deleted from paragraph 9.1.2. Also, in Performance Specification 15, reserved sections 14.0 and 15.0 are added.

II. Performance Specification 16 of Appendix B of Part 60

In Performance Specification 16, Table 16–1 is changed to be consistent with conventional statistical applications; the values listed in the column labelled $n - 1$ (known as degrees of freedom) are corrected to coincide with standard t-tables, and the footnote is clarified. Section 12.2.3 is revised for selection of $n - 1$ degrees of freedom.

JJ. Procedure 2 of Appendix F of Part 60

In Procedure 2, equations 2–2 and 2–3 in section 12.0 are revised to correctly define the denominator when calculating calibration drift. Also, equation 2–4 in section 12.0 is revised to correctly define the denominator when calculating accuracy. The proposed equation 2–4 is revised to:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{|V_M - V_R|}{V_R} \times 100$$

KK. General Provisions (Subpart A) of Part 61

Section 61.13(e)(1)(i) of the General Provisions of Part 61 is revised to add Methods 30A and 30B to the list of methods not requiring the use of audit samples.

LL. Method 107 of Appendix B of Part 61

In Method 107, the term “Geon” is deleted from the heading in section 11.7.3.

MM. General Provisions (Subpart A) of Part 63

In the General Provisions of Part 63, section 63.7(c)(2)(iii)(A) is revised to add Methods 30A and 30B to the list of methods not requiring the use of audit samples.

Section 63.7(g)(2) is revised to require the reporting of specific emissions test data in test reports. These data elements are required regardless of whether the report is submitted electronically or in paper format. Revisions are made to the list of proposed data elements to provide clarity and to more appropriately define and limit the extent of elements reported for each test method included in a test report. These modifications ensure that emissions test reporting includes all data necessary to assess and assure the quality of the reported emissions data and that the reported information appropriately describes and identifies the specific unit covered by the emissions test report.

NN. Method 320 of Appendix A of Part 63

In Method 320, sections 13.1, 13.4, and 13.4.1 are revised to indicate the correct Method 301 reference.

IV. Public Comments on the Proposed Rule

Forty-two comment letters were received on the proposed rule. The public comments and the agency’s responses are summarized in the Summary of Comments and Responses document located in the docket for this rule. See the ADDRESSES section of this preamble.

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review

This action is not a “significant regulatory action” under the terms of

Executive Order (E.O.) 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and is, therefore, not subject to review under Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011).

B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the PRA. This action does not add information collection requirements; it makes corrections and updates to existing testing methodology. In addition, this action clarifies performance testing requirements.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA. In making this determination, the impact of concern is any significant adverse economic impact on small entities. An agency may certify that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities if the rule relieves regulatory burden, has no net burden or otherwise has a positive economic effect on the small entities subject to the rule. This action will not impose emission measurement requirements beyond those specified in the current regulations, nor does it change any emission standard. We have, therefore, concluded that this action will have no net regulatory burden for all directly regulated small entities.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)

This action does not contain any unfunded mandate as described in UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538, and does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. The action imposes no enforceable duty on any state, local or tribal governments or the private sector.

E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

This action does not have federalism implications. It will not have substantial direct effects on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This action does not have tribal implications, as specified in Executive Order 13175. This action simply corrects and updates existing testing regulations. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this action.

G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

The EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 as applying only to those regulatory actions that concern environmental health or safety risks that the EPA has reason to believe may disproportionately affect children, per the definition of “covered regulatory action” in section 2–202 of the Executive Order. This action is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it does not concern an environmental health risk or safety risk.

H. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13211, because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) and 1 CFR Part 51

This action involves technical standards. The EPA used ASTM D6911–15 for packaging and shipping samples in Method 30B. The ASTM D6911–15 standard provides guidance on the selection of procedures for proper packaging and shipment of environmental samples to the laboratory for analysis to ensure compliance with appropriate regulatory programs and protection of sample integrity during shipment.

The EPA used ASTM E617–13 for laboratory weights and precision mass standards in Methods 4, 5, 5H, 5I, 29, and 202. The ASTM E617–13 standard covers weights and mass standards used in laboratories for specific classes.

The ASTM D6911–15 and ASTM E617–13 standards were developed and adopted by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). These standards may be obtained from <http://www.astm.org> or from the ASTM at 100 Barr Harbor Drive, P.O. Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428–2959.

J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

The EPA believes that this action is not subject to Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994) because it does not establish an environmental health or safety standard. This action is a technical correction to previously promulgated regulatory actions and does not have an impact on human health or the environment.

K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

This action is subject to the CRA, and the EPA will submit a rule report to each house of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects

40 CFR Part 51

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

40 CFR Part 60

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Volatile organic compounds.

40 CFR Parts 61 and 63

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: August 5, 2016.

Gina McCarthy,
Administrator.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Environmental Protection Agency amends title 40, chapter I of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 51—REQUIREMENTS FOR PREPARATION, ADOPTION, AND SUBMITTAL OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

- 1. The authority citation for part 51 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 101; 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

- 2. Amend appendix M to part 51 as follows:
 - a. Revise section 4.0a.
 - b. Revise section 12.5, equations 8 and 9, in Method 201A.
 - c. In Method 202:
 - i. Add section 3.8.
 - ii. Revise sections 8.5.4.3 and 9.10.
 - iii. Add sections 10.3, 10.4, 11.2.2.1, 11.2.2.2, 11.2.2.3, and 11.2.2.4.
 - iv. Add Figure 7 to section 18.0.

The additions and revisions read as follows:

Appendix M to Part 51—Recommended Test Methods for State Implementation Plans

* * * * *

*4.0 * * **

- a. The source owner, operator, or representative of the tested facility shall

obtain an audit sample, if commercially available, from an AASP for each test method used for regulatory compliance purposes. No audit samples are required for the following test methods: Methods 3A and 3C of appendix A–3 of part 60 of this chapter, Methods 6C, 7E, 9, and 10 of appendix A–4 of part 60, Methods 18 and 19 of appendix A–6 of part 60, Methods 20, 22, and 25A of appendix A–7 of part 60, Methods 30A and 30B of appendix A–8 of part 60, and Methods 303, 318, 320, and 321 of appendix A of part 63 of this chapter. If multiple sources at a single facility are tested during a compliance test event, only one audit sample is required for each method used during a compliance test. The compliance authority responsible for the compliance test may waive the requirement to include an audit sample if they believe that an audit sample is not necessary. “Commercially available” means that two or more independent AASPs have blind audit samples available for purchase. If the source owner, operator, or representative cannot find an audit sample for a specific method, the owner, operator, or representative shall consult the EPA Web site at the following URL, <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/emc>, to confirm whether there is a source that can supply an audit sample for that method. If the EPA Web site does not list an available audit sample at least 60 days prior to the beginning of the compliance test, the source owner, operator, or representative shall not be required to include an audit sample as part of the quality assurance program for the compliance test. When ordering an audit sample, the source owner, operator, or representative shall give the sample provider an estimate for the concentration of each pollutant that is emitted by the source or the estimated concentration of each pollutant based on the permitted level and the name, address, and phone number of the compliance authority. The source owner, operator, or representative shall report the results for the audit sample along with a summary of the emissions test results for the audited pollutant to the compliance authority and shall report the results of the audit sample to the AASP. The source owner, operator, or representative shall make both reports at the same time and in the same manner or shall report to the compliance authority first and then report to the AASP. If the method being audited is a method that allows the samples to be analyzed in the field, and the tester plans to analyze the samples in the field, the tester may analyze the audit samples prior to collecting the emission samples provided a representative of the compliance authority is present at the testing site. The tester may request and the compliance authority may grant a waiver to the requirement that a representative of the compliance authority must be present at the testing site during the field analysis of an audit sample. The source owner, operator, or representative may report the results of the audit sample to the compliance authority and then report the results of the audit sample to the AASP prior to collecting any emission samples. The test protocol and final test report shall document whether an audit sample was ordered and

utilized and the pass/fail results as applicable.

* * * * *

Method 201A—Determination of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} Emissions From Stationary Sources (Constant Sampling Rate Procedure)

* * * * *

12.5 * * *

For N_{re} less than 3,162:

$$Q_{IV} = 0.0060639 \left[\frac{\mu}{C^{0.4242}} \right] \left[\frac{P_s M_w}{T_s} \right]^{-0.5759} \left[\frac{1}{D_{50}} \right]^{0.8481} \quad (\text{Eq. 8})$$

For N_{re} greater than 3,162:

$$Q_{IV} = 0.007657 \left[\frac{\mu}{C^{0.6205}} \right] \left[\frac{P_s M_w}{T_s} \right]^{-0.3795} \left[\frac{1}{D_{50}} \right]^{0.1241} \quad (\text{Eq. 9})$$

* * * * *

Method 202—Dry Impinger Method for Determining Condensable Particulate Emissions From Stationary Sources

* * * * *

3.8 *ASTM E617-13*. ASTM E617-13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precisions Mass Standards,” approved May 1, 2013, was developed and adopted by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). The standards cover weights and mass standards used in laboratories for specific classes. The ASTM E617-13 standard has been approved for incorporation by reference by the Director of the Office of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. The standard may be obtained from <http://www.astm.org> or from the ASTM at 100 Barr Harbor Drive, P.O. Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959. All approved material is available for inspection at EPA WJC West Building, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460, telephone number 202-566-1744. It is also available for inspection at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202-741-6030 or go to http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal_regulations/ibr_locations.html.

* * * * *

8.5.4.3 *CPM Container #2, Organic rinses*. Follow the water rinses of the back half of the filterable PM filter holder, probe extension, condenser, each impinger, and all of the connecting glassware and front half of the CPM filter with an acetone rinse. Recover the acetone rinse into a clean, leak-proof container labeled with test identification and “CPM Container #2, Organic Rinses.” Then repeat the entire rinse procedure with two rinses of hexane, and save the hexane rinses in the same container as the acetone rinse

(CPM Container #2). Mark the liquid level on the jar.

* * * * *

9.10 *Field Train Recovery Blank*. You must recover a minimum of one field train blank for each source category tested at the facility. You must recover the field train blank after the first or second run of the test. You must assemble the sampling train as it will be used for testing. Prior to the purge, you must add 100 ml of water to the first impinger and record this data on Figure 4. You must purge the assembled train as described in section 8.5.3. You must recover field train blank samples as described in section 8.5.4. From the field sample weight, you will subtract the condensable particulate mass you determine with this blank train or 0.002 g (2.0 mg), whichever is less.

* * * * *

10.3 *Field Balance Calibration Check*. Check the calibration of the balance used to weigh impingers with a weight that is at least 500g or within 50g of a loaded impinger. The weight must be ASTM E617-13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” Class 6 (or better). Daily before use, the field balance must measure the weight within ± 0.5g of the certified mass. If the daily balance calibration check fails, perform corrective measures and repeat the check before using balance.

10.4 *Analytical Balance Calibration*. Perform a multipoint calibration (at least five points spanning the operational range) of the analytical balance before the first use, and semiannually thereafter. The calibration of the analytical balance must be conducted using ASTM E617-13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” Class 2 (or better) tolerance weights. Audit the balance each day it is used for gravimetric measurements by weighing at least one ASTM E617-13 Class 2 tolerance (or better) calibration weight that corresponds to 50 to 150 percent of the weight of one filter or between 1g and

5g. If the scale cannot reproduce the value of the calibration weight to within 0.5mg of the certified mass, perform corrective measures, and conduct the multipoint calibration before use.

* * * * *

11.2.2.1 Determine the inorganic fraction weight. Transfer the aqueous fraction from the extraction to a clean 500-ml or smaller beaker. Evaporate to no less than 10 ml liquid on a hot plate or in the oven at 105 °C and allow to dry at room temperature (not to exceed 30 °C (85 °F)). You must ensure that water and volatile acids have completely evaporated before neutralizing nonvolatile acids in the sample. Following evaporation, desiccate the residue for 24 hours in a desiccator containing anhydrous calcium sulfate. Weigh at intervals of at least 6 hours to a constant weight. (See section 3.0 for a definition of constant weight.) Report results to the nearest 0.1 mg on the CPM Work Table (see Figure 6 of section 18) and proceed directly to section 11.2.3. If the residue cannot be weighed to constant weight, re-dissolve the residue in 100 ml of deionized distilled ultra-filtered water that contains 1 ppmw (1 mg/L) residual mass or less and continue to section 11.2.2.2.

11.2.2.2 Use titration to neutralize acid in the sample and remove water of hydration. If used, calibrate the pH meter with the neutral and acid buffer solutions. Then titrate the sample with 0.1N NH₄OH to a pH of 7.0, as indicated by the pH meter or colorimetric indicator. Record the volume of titrant used on the CPM Work Table (see Figure 6 of section 18).

11.2.2.3 Using a hot plate or an oven at 105 °C, evaporate the aqueous phase to approximately 10 ml. Quantitatively transfer the beaker contents to a clean, 50-ml pre-weighed tin and evaporate to dryness at room temperature (not to exceed 30 °C (85 °F)) and pressure in a laboratory hood. Following evaporation, desiccate the residue for 24 hours in a desiccator containing

anhydrous calcium sulfate. Weigh at intervals of at least 6 hours to a constant weight. (See section 3.0 for a definition of constant weight.) Report results to the nearest 0.1 mg on the CPM Work Table (see Figure 6 of section 18).

11.2.2.4 Calculate the correction factor to subtract the NH_4^+ retained in the sample using Equation 1 in section 12.

18.0 Tables, Diagrams, Flowcharts and Validation Data

* * * * *

BILLING CODE 6560-50-C




Figure 7. CPM Sample Processing Flow Chart

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

* * * * *

■ 3. Revise sections 3.3 and 5.1.3 of appendix P to part 51 to read as follows:

Appendix P to Part 51—Minimum Emission Monitoring Requirements

* * * * *

3.3 Calibration Gases. For nitrogen oxides monitoring systems installed on fossil fuel-

fired steam generators, the pollutant gas used to prepare calibration gas mixtures (section 6.1, Performance Specification 2, appendix B, part 60 of this chapter) shall be nitric oxide (NO). For nitrogen oxides monitoring systems

installed on nitric acid plants, the pollutant gas used to prepare calibration gas mixtures (section 6.1, Performance Specification 2, appendix B, part 60 of this chapter) shall be nitrogen dioxide (NO2). These gases shall also be used for daily checks under paragraph 3.7 of this appendix as applicable. For sulfur dioxide monitoring systems installed on fossil fuel-fired steam generators or sulfuric acid plants, the pollutant gas used to prepare calibration gas mixtures (section 6.1, Performance Specification 2, appendix B, part 60 of this chapter) shall be sulfur dioxide (SO2). Span and zero gases should be traceable to National Bureau of Standards reference gases whenever these reference gases are available. Every 6 months from date of manufacture, span and zero gases shall be reanalyzed by conducting triplicate analyses using the reference methods in appendix A, part 60 of this chapter as follows: for SO2, use Reference Method 6; for nitrogen oxides, use Reference Method 7; and for carbon dioxide or oxygen, use Reference Method 3. The gases may be analyzed at less frequent intervals if longer shelf lives are guaranteed by the manufacturer.

* * * * *

5.1.3 The values used in the equations under paragraph 5.1 are derived as follows:

E = pollutant emission, g/million cal (lb/million BTU),

C = pollutant concentration, g/dscm (lb/dscf), determined by multiplying the average concentration (ppm) for each hourly period by 4.16 x 10^-5 M g/dscm per ppm (2.64 x 10^-9 M lb/dscf per ppm) where M = pollutant molecular weight, g/g-mole (lb/lb-mole). M = 64 for sulfur dioxide and 46 for oxides of nitrogen.

%O2, %CO2 = Oxygen or carbon dioxide volume (expressed as percent) determined with equipment specified under paragraphs 3.1.4 and 3.1.5 of this appendix.

* * * * *

PART 60—STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES

■ 4. The authority citation for part 60 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et. seq.*

■ 5. In § 60.8, revise paragraph (f) to read as follows:

§ 60.8 Performance tests.

* * * * *

(f) Unless otherwise specified in the applicable subpart, each performance test shall consist of three separate runs using the applicable test method.

(1) Each run shall be conducted for the time and under the conditions specified in the applicable standard. For the purpose of determining compliance with an applicable standard, the arithmetic means of results of the three runs shall apply. In the event that a sample is accidentally lost or conditions occur in which one of the three runs must be discontinued because of forced shutdown, failure of an irreplaceable

portion of the sample train, extreme meteorological conditions, or other circumstances, beyond the owner or operator's control, compliance may, upon the Administrator's approval, be determined using the arithmetic mean of the results of the two other runs.

(2) Contents of report (electronic or paper submitted copy). Unless otherwise specified in a relevant standard or test method, or as otherwise approved by the Administrator in writing, the report for a performance test shall include the elements identified in paragraphs (f)(2)(i) through (vi) of this section.

(i) General identification information for the facility including a mailing address, the physical address, the owner or operator or responsible official (where applicable) and his/her email address, and the appropriate Federal Registry System (FRS) number for the facility.

(ii) Purpose of the test including the applicable regulation(s) requiring the test, the pollutant(s) and other parameters being measured, the applicable emission standard and any process parameter component, and a brief process description.

(iii) Description of the emission unit tested including fuel burned, control devices, and vent characteristics; the appropriate source classification code (SCC); the permitted maximum process rate (where applicable); and the sampling location.

(iv) Description of sampling and analysis procedures used and any modifications to standard procedures, quality assurance procedures and results, record of process operating conditions that demonstrate the applicable test conditions are met, and values for any operating parameters for which limits were being set during the test.

(v) Where a test method requires you record or report, the following shall be included: Record of preparation of standards, record of calibrations, raw data sheets for field sampling, raw data sheets for field and laboratory analyses, chain-of-custody documentation, and example calculations for reported results.

(vi) Identification of the company conducting the performance test including the primary office address, telephone number, and the contact for this test program including his/her email address.

* * * * *

■ 6. In § 60.17:

■ a. Revise paragraph (h)(180).

■ b. Redesignate paragraphs (h)(200) through (h)(206) as paragraphs (h)(202) through (h)(208).

■ c. Redesignate paragraphs (h)(190) through (h)(199) as (h)(191) through (h)(200).

■ d. Add new paragraphs (h)(190) and (h)(201).

The additions and revisions read as follows:

§ 60.17 Incorporations by reference.

* * * * *

(h) * * *

(180) ASTM D6348–03, Standard Test Method for Determination of Gaseous Compounds by Extractive Direct Interface Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR) Spectroscopy, (Approved October 1, 2003), IBR approved for § 60.73a(b), table 7 to subpart III, table 2 to subpart JJJJ, and § 60.4245(d).

* * * * *

(190) ASTM D6911–15, Standard Guide for Packaging and Shipping Environmental Samples for Laboratory Analysis, approved January 15, 2015, IBR approved for appendix A–8: Method 30B.

* * * * *

(201) ASTM E617–13, Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards, approved May 1, 2013, IBR approved for appendix A–3: Methods 4, 5, 5H, 5I, and appendix A–8: Method 29.

* * * * *

Subpart JJJJ—Standards of Performance for Stationary Spark Ignition Internal Combustion Engines

■ 7. Revise § 60.4245(d) to read as follows:

§ 60.4245 What are my notification, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements if I am an owner or operator of a stationary SI internal combustion engine?

* * * * *

(d) Owners and operators of stationary SI ICE that are subject to performance testing must submit a copy of each performance test as conducted in § 60.4244 within 60 days after the test has been completed. Performance test reports using EPA Method 18, EPA Method 320, or ASTM D6348–03 (incorporated by reference—see 40 CFR 60.17) to measure VOC require reporting of all QA/QC data. For Method 18, report results from sections 8.4 and 11.1.1.4; for Method 320, report results from sections 8.6.2, 9.0, and 13.0; and for ASTM D6348–03 report results of all QA/QC procedures in Annexes 1–7.

* * * * *

■ 8. Revise Table 2 to subpart JJJJ of part 60 to read as follows:

TABLE 2 TO SUBPART JJJJ OF PART 60—REQUIREMENTS FOR PERFORMANCE TESTS

[As stated in § 60.4244, you must comply with the following requirements for performance tests within 10 percent of 100 percent peak (or the highest achievable) load]

For each	Complying with the requirement to	You must	Using	According to the following requirements
1. Stationary SI internal combustion engine demonstrating compliance according to § 60.4244.	a. limit the concentration of NO _x in the stationary SI internal combustion engine exhaust.	<p>i. Select the sampling port location and the number/location of traverse points at the exhaust of the stationary internal combustion engine;</p> <p>ii. Determine the O₂ concentration of the stationary internal combustion engine exhaust at the sampling port location;</p> <p>iii. If necessary, determine the exhaust flowrate of the stationary internal combustion engine exhaust;</p> <p>iv. If necessary, measure moisture content of the stationary internal combustion engine exhaust at the sampling port location; and.</p> <p>v. Measure NO_x at the exhaust of the stationary internal combustion engine; if using a control device, the sampling site must be located at the outlet of the control device.</p>	<p>(1) Method 1 or 1A of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–1, if measuring flow rate.</p> <p>(2) Method 3, 3A, or 3B^b of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–2 or ASTM Method D6522–00 (Reapproved 2005)^{a,d}.</p> <p>(3) Method 2 or 2C of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–1 or Method 19 of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–7.</p> <p>(4) Method 4 of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–3, Method 320 of 40 CFR part 63, appendix A^c, or ASTM Method D6348–03^{d,e}.</p> <p>(5) Method 7E of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–4, ASTM Method D6522–00 (Reapproved 2005)^{a,d}, Method 320 of 40 CFR part 63, appendix A^c, or ASTM Method D6348–03^{d,e}.</p>	<p>(a) Alternatively, for NO_x, O₂, and moisture measurement, ducts ≤6 inches in diameter may be sampled at a single point located at the duct centroid and ducts >6 and ≤12 inches in diameter may be sampled at 3 traverse points located at 16.7, 50.0, and 83.3% of the measurement line ('3-point long line'). If the duct is >12 inches in diameter <i>and</i> the sampling port location meets the two and half-diameter criterion of Section 11.1.1 of Method 1 of 40 CFR part 60, Appendix A, the duct may be sampled at '3-point long line'; otherwise, conduct the stratification testing and select sampling points according to Section 8.1.2 of Method 7E of 40 CFR part 60, Appendix A.</p> <p>(b) Measurements to determine O₂ concentration must be made at the same time as the measurements for NO_x concentration.</p> <p>(c) Measurements to determine moisture must be made at the same time as the measurement for NO_x concentration.</p> <p>(d) Results of this test consist of the average of the three 1-hour or longer runs.</p>
	b. limit the concentration of CO in the stationary SI internal combustion engine exhaust.	<p>i. Select the sampling port location and the number/location of traverse points at the exhaust of the stationary internal combustion engine;</p>	<p>(1) Method 1 or 1A of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–1, if measuring flow rate.</p>	<p>(a) Alternatively, for CO, O₂, and moisture measurement, ducts ≤6 inches in diameter may be sampled at a single point located at the duct centroid and ducts >6 and ≤12 inches in diameter may be sampled at 3 traverse points located at 16.7, 50.0, and 83.3% of the measurement line ('3-point long line'). If the duct is >12 inches in diameter <i>and</i> the sampling port location meets the two and half-diameter criterion of Section 11.1.1 of Method 1 of 40 CFR part 60, Appendix A, the duct may be sampled at '3-point long line'; otherwise, conduct the stratification testing and select sampling points according to Section 8.1.2 of Method 7E of 40 CFR part 60, Appendix A.</p>

TABLE 2 TO SUBPART JJJJ OF PART 60—REQUIREMENTS FOR PERFORMANCE TESTS—Continued

[As stated in § 60.4244, you must comply with the following requirements for performance tests within 10 percent of 100 percent peak (or the highest achievable) load]

For each	Complying with the requirement to	You must	Using	According to the following requirements
	c. limit the concentration of VOC in the stationary SI internal combustion engine exhaust.	ii. Determine the O ₂ concentration of the stationary internal combustion engine exhaust at the sampling port location;. iii. If necessary, determine the exhaust flowrate of the stationary internal combustion engine exhaust;. iv. If necessary, measure moisture content of the stationary internal combustion engine exhaust at the sampling port location; and. v. Measure CO at the exhaust of the stationary internal combustion engine; if using a control device, the sampling site must be located at the outlet of the control device. i. Select the sampling port location and the number/location of traverse points at the exhaust of the stationary internal combustion engine;. ii. Determine the O ₂ concentration of the stationary internal combustion engine exhaust at the sampling port location;. iii. If necessary, determine the exhaust flowrate of the stationary internal combustion engine exhaust;. iv. If necessary, measure moisture content of the stationary internal combustion engine exhaust at the sampling port location; and.	(2) Method 3, 3A, or 3B ^b of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–2 or ASTM Method D6522–00 (Reapproved 2005) ^{a,d} . (3) Method 2 or 2C of 40 CFR 60, appendix A–1 or Method 19 of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–7. (4) Method 4 of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–3, Method 320 of 40 CFR part 63, appendix A ^c , or ASTM Method D6348–03 ^{d,e} . (5) Method 10 of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A4, ASTM Method D6522–00 (Reapproved 2005) ^{a,d,e} , Method 320 of 40 CFR part 63, appendix A ^e , or ASTM Method D6348–03 ^{d,e} . (1) Method 1 or 1A of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–1, if measuring flow rate. (2) Method 3, 3A, or 3B ^b of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–2 or ASTM Method D6522–00 (Reapproved 2005) ^{a,d} . (3) Method 2 or 2C of 40 CFR 60, appendix A–1 or Method 19 of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–7. (4) Method 4 of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–3, Method 320 of 40 CFR part 63, appendix A ^c , or ASTM Method D6348–03 ^{d,e} .	(b) Measurements to determine O ₂ concentration must be made at the same time as the measurements for CO concentration. (c) Measurements to determine moisture must be made at the same time as the measurement for CO concentration. (d) Results of this test consist of the average of the three 1-hour or longer runs. (a) Alternatively, for VOC, O ₂ , and moisture measurement, ducts ≤6 inches in diameter may be sampled at a single point located at the duct centroid and ducts >6 and ≤12 inches in diameter may be sampled at 3 traverse points located at 16.7, 50.0, and 83.3% of the measurement line ('3-point long line'). If the duct is >12 inches in diameter <i>and</i> the sampling port location meets the two and half-diameter criterion of Section 11.1.1 of Method 1 of 40 CFR part 60, Appendix A, the duct may be sampled at '3-point long line'; otherwise, conduct the stratification testing and select sampling points according to Section 8.1.2 of Method 7E of 40 CFR part 60, Appendix A. (b) Measurements to determine O ₂ concentration must be made at the same time as the measurements for VOC concentration. (c) Measurements to determine moisture must be made at the same time as the measurement for VOC concentration.

TABLE 2 TO SUBPART JJJJ OF PART 60—REQUIREMENTS FOR PERFORMANCE TESTS—Continued

[As stated in § 60.4244, you must comply with the following requirements for performance tests within 10 percent of 100 percent peak (or the highest achievable) load]

For each	Complying with the requirement to	You must	Using	According to the following requirements
		v. Measure VOC at the exhaust of the stationary internal combustion engine; if using a control device, the sampling site must be located at the outlet of the control device.	(5) Methods 25A and 18 of 40 CFR part 60, appendices A–6 and A–7, Method 25A with the use of a hydrocarbon cutter as described in 40 CFR 1065.265, Method 18 of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–6 ^c , Method 320 of 40 CFR part 63, appendix A ^c , or ASTM Method D6348–03 ^d .	(d) Results of this test consist of the average of the three 1-hour or longer runs.

^a Also, you may petition the Administrator for approval to use alternative methods for portable analyzer.
^b You may use ASME PTC 19.10–1981, Flue and Exhaust Gas Analyses, for measuring the O₂ content of the exhaust gas as an alternative to EPA Method 3B. AMSE PTC 19.10–1981 incorporated by reference, see 40 CFR 60.17
^c You may use EPA Method 18 of 40 CFR part 60, appendix A–6, provided that you conduct an adequate pre-survey test prior to the emissions test, such as the one described in OTM 11 on EPA’s Web site (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/emc/prelim/otm11.pdf>).
^d Incorporated by reference; see 40 CFR 60.17.
^e You must meet the requirements in § 60.4245(d).

- 9. In appendix A–1 to part 60:
- a. Revise section 11.2.1.2 in Method 1.
- b. Remove Figure 1–2 in section 17.0 after the table entitled “Table 1–1 Cross-Section Layout for Rectangular Stacks” in Method 1.
- c. Revise sections 6.7, 10.1.2.3, 10.1.3.4, 10.1.3.7, 10.1.4.1.3, 10.1.4.3, and Figure 2–10 in section 17.0 in Method 2.

The revisions read as follows:

Appendix A–1 to Part 60—Test Methods 1 Through 2F

* * * * *

Method 1-Sample and Velocity Traverses for Stationary Sources

* * * * *

11.2.1.2 When the eight- and two-diameter criterion cannot be met, the minimum number of traverse points is determined from Figure 1–1. Before referring to the figure, however, determine the distances from the measurement site to the nearest upstream and downstream disturbances, and divide each distance by the stack diameter or equivalent diameter, to determine the distance in terms of the number of duct diameters. Then, determine from Figure 1–1 the minimum number of traverse points that corresponds:

- (1) To the number of duct diameters upstream; and
- (2) To the number of diameters downstream. Select the higher of the two minimum numbers of traverse points, or a greater value, so that for circular stacks, the number is a multiple of 4, and for rectangular stacks, the number is one of those shown in Table 1–1.

* * * * *

Method 2—Determination of Stack Gas Velocity and Volumetric Flow Rate (Type S Pitot Tube)

* * * * *

6.7 Calibration Pitot Tube. Calibration of the Type S pitot tube requires a standard pitot tube for a reference. When calibration of the Type S pitot tube is necessary (see Section 10.1), a standard pitot tube shall be used for a reference. The standard pitot tube shall, preferably, have a known coefficient, obtained directly from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Gaithersburg, MD 20899, (301) 975–2002; or by calibration against another standard pitot tube with a NIST-traceable coefficient. Alternatively, a standard pitot tube designed according to the criteria given in sections 6.7.1 through 6.7.5 below and illustrated in Figure 2–5 (see also References 7, 8, and 17 in section 17.0) may be used. Pitot tubes designed according to these specifications will have baseline coefficients of 0.99 ± 0.01.

10.1.2.3 The flow system shall have the capacity to generate a test-section velocity around 910 m/min (3,000 ft/min). This velocity must be constant with time to guarantee constant and steady flow during the entire period of calibration. A centrifugal fan is recommended for this purpose, as no flow rate adjustment for back pressure of the fan is allowed during the calibration process. Note that Type S pitot tube coefficients obtained by single-velocity calibration at 910 m/min (3,000 ft/min) will generally be valid to ±3 percent for the measurement of velocities above 300 m/min (1,000 ft/min) and to ±6 percent for the measurement of velocities between 180 and 300 m/min (600 and 1,000 ft/min). If a more precise correlation between the pitot tube coefficient (C_p) and velocity is desired, the flow system

should have the capacity to generate at least four distinct, time-invariant test-section velocities covering the velocity range from 180 to 1,500 m/min (600 to 5,000 ft/min), and calibration data shall be taken at regular velocity intervals over this range (see References 9 and 14 in section 17.0 for details).

* * * * *

10.1.3.4 Read Δp_{std}, and record its value in a data table similar to the one shown in Figure 2–9. Remove the standard pitot tube from the duct, and disconnect it from the manometer. Seal the standard entry port. Make no adjustment to the fan speed or other wind tunnel volumetric flow control device between this reading and the corresponding Type S pitot reading.

* * * * *

10.1.3.7 Repeat Steps 10.1.3.3 through 10.1.3.6 until three pairs of Δp readings have been obtained for the A side of the Type S pitot tube, with all the paired observations conducted at a constant fan speed (no changes to fan velocity between observed readings).

* * * * *

10.1.4.1.3 For Type S pitot tube combinations with complete probe assemblies, the calibration point should be located at or near the center of the duct; however, insertion of a probe sheath into a small duct may cause significant cross-sectional area interference and blockage and yield incorrect coefficient values (Reference 9 in section 17.0). Therefore, to minimize the blockage effect, the calibration point may be a few inches off-center if necessary, but no closer to the outer wall of the wind tunnel than 4 inches. The maximum allowable blockage, as determined by a projected-area model of the probe sheath, is 2 percent or less of the duct cross-sectional area (Figure

2–10a). If the pitot and/or probe assembly blocks more than 2 percent of the cross-sectional area at an insertion point only 4 inches inside the wind tunnel, the diameter of the wind tunnel must be increased.

* * * * *

10.1.4.3 For a probe assembly constructed such that its pitot tube is always used in the same orientation, only one side of the pitot tube needs to be calibrated (the side which will face the flow). The pitot tube must still meet the alignment specifications of Figure 2–2 or 2–3, however, and must have an

average deviation (σ) value of 0.01 or less (see section 12.4.4).

* * * * *

17.0 Tables, Diagrams, Flowcharts, and Validation Data

* * * * *




Figure 2-10. Projected-area model for a typical pitot tube assembly.

* * * * *

- 10. In appendix A–2 to part 60:
- a. Revise sections 6.11.1, 6.11.2, 10.6.6, and 10.6.8 in Method 2G.
- b. Revise section 6.3 in Method 3C.
- c. Add sections 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.4, and 6.3.5 in Method 3C.

The revisions and additions read as follows:

Appendix A–2 to Part 60—Test Methods 2G Through 3C

* * * * *

Method 2G—Determination of Stack Gas Velocity and Volumetric Flow Rate With Two-Dimensional Probes

* * * * *

6.11.1 Test section cross-sectional area. The flowing gas stream shall be confined within a circular, rectangular, or elliptical duct. The cross-sectional area of the tunnel must be large enough to ensure fully developed flow in the presence of both the calibration pitot tube and the tested probe. The calibration site, or “test section,” of the wind tunnel shall have a minimum diameter of 30.5 cm (12 in.) for circular or elliptical duct cross-sections or a minimum width of 30.5 cm (12 in.) on the shorter side for

rectangular cross-sections. Wind tunnels shall meet the probe blockage provisions of this section and the qualification requirements prescribed in section 10.1. The projected area of the portion of the probe head, shaft, and attached devices inside the wind tunnel during calibration shall represent no more than 2 percent of the cross-sectional area of the tunnel. If the pitot and/or probe assembly blocks more than 2 percent of the cross-sectional area at an insertion point only 4 inches inside the wind tunnel, the diameter of the wind tunnel must be increased.

6.11.2 Velocity range and stability. The wind tunnel should be capable of achieving and maintaining a constant and steady velocity between 6.1 m/sec and 30.5 m/sec (20 ft/sec and 100 ft/sec) for the entire calibration period for each selected calibration velocity. The wind tunnel shall produce fully developed flow patterns that are stable and parallel to the axis of the duct in the test section.

* * * * *

10.6.6 Read the differential pressure from the calibration pitot tube (ΔP_{std}), and record its value. Read the barometric pressure to within ± 2.5 mm Hg (± 0.1 in. Hg) and the temperature in the wind tunnel to within 0.6 °C (1 °F). Record these values on a data form

similar to Table 2G–8. Record the rotational speed of the fan or indicator of wind tunnel velocity control (damper setting, variac rheostat, etc.) and make no adjustment to fan speed or wind tunnel velocity control between this observation and the Type S probe reading.

* * * * *

10.6.8 Take paired differential pressure measurements with the calibration pitot tube and tested probe (according to sections 10.6.6 and 10.6.7). The paired measurements in each replicate can be made either simultaneously (*i.e.*, with both probes in the wind tunnel) or by alternating the measurements of the two probes (*i.e.*, with only one probe at a time in the wind tunnel). Adjustments made to the fan speed or other changes to the system designed to change the air flow velocity of the wind tunnel between observation of the calibration pitot tube (ΔP_{std}) and the Type S pitot tube invalidates the reading and the observation must be repeated.

* * * * *

Method 3C—Determination of Carbon Dioxide, Methane, Nitrogen, and Oxygen From Stationary Sources

* * * * *

6.3 Analyzer Linearity Check and Calibration. Perform this test before sample analysis.

6.3.1 Using the gas mixtures in section 5.1, verify the detector linearity over the range of suspected sample concentrations with at least three concentrations per compound of interest. This initial check may also serve as the initial instrument calibration.

6.3.2 You may extend the use of the analyzer calibration by performing a single-point calibration verification. Calibration verifications shall be performed by triplicate injections of a single-point standard gas. The concentration of the single-point calibration must either be at the midpoint of the calibration curve or at approximately the source emission concentration measured during operation of the analyzer.

6.3.3 Triplicate injections must agree within 5 percent of their mean, and the average calibration verification point must agree within 10 percent of the initial calibration response factor. If these calibration verification criteria are not met, the initial calibration described in section 6.3.1, using at least three concentrations, must be repeated before analysis of samples can continue.

6.3.4 For each instrument calibration, record the carrier and detector flow rates, detector filament and block temperatures,

attenuation factor, injection time, chart speed, sample loop volume, and component concentrations.

6.3.5 Plot a linear regression of the standard concentrations versus area values to obtain the response factor of each compound. Alternatively, response factors of uncorrected component concentrations (wet basis) may be generated using instrumental integration.

Note: Peak height may be used instead of peak area throughout this method.

* * * * *

- 11. In appendix A-3 to part 60:
- a. Add sections 10.3 and 12.2.5 in Method 4.
- b. Revise section 16.4 in Method 4.
- c. Revise sections 6.1.1.9 and 8.7.6.2.5 in Method 5.
- d. Add sections 10.7 and 10.8 in Method 5.
- e. Add sections 10.4 and 10.5 in Method 5H.
- f. Add sections 10.1 and 10.2 in Method 5I.

The revisions and additions read as follows:

Appendix A-3 to Part 60-Test Methods 4 Through 5I

* * * * *

Method 4—Determination of Moisture Content in Stack Gases

* * * * *

10.3 Field Balance Calibration Check. Check the calibration of the balance used to weigh impingers with a weight that is at least 500g or within 50g of a loaded impinger. The weight must be ASTM E617-13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” (incorporated by reference-see 40 CFR 60.17) Class 6 (or better). Daily, before use, the field balance must measure the weight within ± 0.5g of the certified mass. If the daily balance calibration check fails, perform corrective measures and repeat the check before using balance.

* * * * *

12.2.5 Using F-factors to determine approximate moisture for estimating moisture content where no wet scrubber is being used, for the purpose of determining isokinetic sampling rate settings with no fuel sample, is acceptable using the average F_c or F_d factor from Method 19 (see Method 19, section 12.3.1). If this option is selected, calculate the approximate moisture as follows:

$$B_{ws} = B_H + B_A + B_F$$

Where:

B_A = Mole Fraction of moisture in the ambient air.

$$B_A = \frac{\%RH}{100 * P_{Bar}} * 10^{[6.6912 - (\frac{3144}{T+390.86})]}$$

B_F = Mole fraction of moisture from free water in the fuel.

$$B_F = \left[\frac{0.0036W^2 + 0.075W}{100} \right] \left[\frac{20.9 - O_2}{20.9} \right]$$

B_H = Mole fraction of moisture from the hydrogen in the fuel.

$$B_H = \left[1 - \frac{F_d}{F_w} \right] \frac{(20.9 - O_2)}{20.9}$$

B_{ws} = Mole fraction of moisture in the stack gas.

F_d = Volume of dry combustion components per unit of heat content at 0 percent oxygen, dscf/10⁶.

Btu (scm/). See Table 19-2 in Method 19.

F_w = Volume of wet combustion components per unit of heat content at 0 percent oxygen, wet.

scf/10⁶ Btu (scm/). See Table 19-2 in Method 19.

%RH = Percent relative humidity (calibrated hygrometer acceptable), percent.

P_{Bar} = Barometric pressure, in. Hg.

T = Ambient temperature, °F.

W = Percent free water by weight, percent.

O_2 = Percent oxygen in stack gas, dry basis, percent.

* * * * *

16.4 Using F-factors to determine moisture is an acceptable alternative to Method 4 for a combustion stack not using

a scrubber, and where a fuel sample is taken during the test run and analyzed for development of an F_d factor (see Method 19, section 12.3.2), and where stack O_2 content is measured by Method 3A or 3B during each test run. If this option is selected, calculate the moisture content as follows:

$$B_{ws} = B_H + B_A + B_F$$

Where:

B_A = Mole fraction of moisture in the ambient air.

$$B_A = \frac{\%RH}{100 P_{Bar}} \left[10^{6.6912 - \left(\frac{3144}{T+390.86} \right)} \right]$$

Note: Values of B_A should be between 0.00 and 0.06 with common values being about 0.015.

B_F = Mole fraction of moisture from free water in the fuel.

$$B_F = \left[\frac{0.0036 W^2 + 0.075 W}{100} \right] \left[\frac{20.9 - O_2}{20.9} \right]$$

Note: Free water in fuel is minimal for distillate oil and gases, such as propane and natural gas, so this step may be omitted for those fuels.

B_H = Mole fraction of moisture from the hydrogen in the fuel.

$$B_H = \left(1 - \frac{F_d}{F_w} \right) \frac{(20.9 - O_2)}{20.9}$$

B_{ws} = Mole fraction of moisture in the stack gas.

F_d = Volume of dry combustion components per unit of heat content at 0 percent oxygen, dscf/10⁶ Btu (scm/J). Develop a test specific F_d value using an integrated fuel sample from each test run and Equation 19–13 in section 12.3.2 of Method 19.

F_w = Volume of wet combustion components per unit of heat content at 0 percent oxygen, wet scf/10⁶ Btu (scm/J). Develop a test specific F_w value using an integrated fuel sample from each test run and Equation 19–14 in section 12.3.2 of Method 19.

%RH = Percent relative humidity (calibrated hygrometer acceptable), percent.

P_{Bar} = Barometric pressure, in. Hg.

T = Ambient temperature, °F.

W = Percent free water by weight, percent.

O_2 = Percent oxygen in stack gas, dry basis, percent.

* * * * *

Method 5—Determination of Particulate Matter Emissions From Stationary Sources

* * * * *

6.1.1.9 Metering System. Vacuum gauge, leak-free pump, calibrated temperature sensors, dry gas meter (DGM) capable of measuring volume to within 2 percent, and related equipment, as shown in Figure 5–1. Other metering systems capable of maintaining sampling rates within 10 percent of isokinetic and of determining sample volumes to within 2 percent may be used, subject to the approval of the Administrator. When the metering system is used in conjunction with a pitot tube, the system shall allow periodic checks of isokinetic rates.

* * * * *

8.7.6.2.5 Clean the inside of the front half of the filter holder by rubbing the surfaces with a Nylon bristle brush and rinsing with acetone. Rinse each surface three times or more if needed to remove visible particulate. Make a final rinse of the brush and filter

holder. Carefully rinse out the glass cyclone, also (if applicable). After all acetone washings and particulate matter have been collected in the sample container, tighten the lid on the sample container so that acetone will not leak out when it is shipped to the laboratory. Mark the height of the fluid level to allow determination of whether leakage occurred during transport. Label the container to clearly identify its contents.

* * * * *

10.7 Field Balance Calibration Check. Check the calibration of the balance used to weigh impingers with a weight that is at least 500g or within 50g of a loaded impinger. The weight must be ASTM E617–13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” (incorporated by reference—see 40 CFR 60.17) Class 6 (or better). Daily before use, the field balance must measure the weight within ±0.5g of the certified mass. If the daily balance calibration check fails, perform corrective measures and repeat the check before using balance.

10.8 Analytical Balance Calibration. Perform a multipoint calibration (at least five points spanning the operational range) of the analytical balance before the first use, and semiannually thereafter. The calibration of the analytical balance must be conducted using ASTM E617–13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” (incorporated by reference—see 40 CFR 60.17) Class 2 (or better) tolerance weights. Audit the balance each day it is used for gravimetric measurements by weighing at least one ASTM E617–13 Class 2 tolerance (or better) calibration weight that corresponds to 50 to 150 percent of the weight of one filter or between 1g and 5g. If the scale cannot reproduce the value of the calibration weight to within 0.5 mg of the certified mass, perform corrective measures, and conduct the multipoint calibration before use.

* * * * *

Method 5H—Determination of Particulate Matter Emissions From Wood Heaters From a Stack Location

* * * * *

10.4 Field Balance Calibration Check. Check the calibration of the balance used to weigh impingers with a weight that is at least 500g or within 50g of a loaded impinger. The weight must be ASTM E617–13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” (incorporated by reference—see 40 CFR 60.17) Class 6 (or better). Daily before use, the field balance

must measure the weight within ±0.5g of the certified mass. If the daily balance calibration check fails, perform corrective measures and repeat the check before using balance.

10.5 Analytical Balance Calibration. Perform a multipoint calibration (at least five points spanning the operational range) of the analytical balance before the first use, and semiannually thereafter. The calibration of the analytical balance must be conducted using ASTM E617–13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” (incorporated by reference—see 40 CFR 60.17) Class 2 (or better) tolerance weights. Audit the balance each day it is used for gravimetric measurements by weighing at least one ASTM E617–13 Class 2 tolerance (or better) calibration weight that corresponds to 50 to 150 percent of the weight of one filter or between 1g and 5g. If the scale cannot reproduce the value of the calibration weight to within 0.5 mg of the certified mass, perform corrective measures, and conduct the multipoint calibration before use.

* * * * *

Method 5I—Determination of Low Level Particulate Matter Emissions From Stationary Sources

* * * * *

10.1 Field Balance Calibration Check. Check the calibration of the balance used to weigh impingers with a weight that is at least 500g or within 50g of a loaded impinger. The weight must be ASTM E617–13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” (incorporated by reference—see 40 CFR 60.17) Class 6 (or better). Daily, before use, the field balance must measure the weight within ±0.5g of the certified mass. If the daily balance calibration check fails, perform corrective measures and repeat the check before using balance.

10.2 Analytical Balance Calibration. Perform a multipoint calibration (at least five points spanning the operational range) of the analytical balance before the first use, and semiannually thereafter. The calibration of the analytical balance must be conducted using ASTM E617–13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” (incorporated by reference—see 40 CFR 60.17) Class 2 (or better) tolerance weights. Audit the balance each day it is used for gravimetric measurements by weighing at least one ASTM E617–13 Class 2 tolerance (or better) calibration weight that corresponds to 50 to 150 percent of the weight of one filter or

between 1g and 5g. If the scale cannot reproduce the value of the calibration weight to within 0.5 mg of the certified mass, perform corrective measures and conduct the multipoint calibration before use.

* * * * *

- 12. In appendix A–4 to part 60:
- a. Revise section 8.3 in Method 6C.
- b. Revise sections 8.1.2, 8.2.7, and 12.8 in Method 7E.
- c. Revise sections 6.2.5 and 8.4.2 in Method 10.
- d. Add section 6.2.6 in Method 10.
- e. Revise sections 6.1.6, 6.1.7, 6.1.8, 6.1.9, 6.1.10, 8.1, 8.2.1 and 8.2.3 in Method 10A.
- f. Add section 6.1.11 in Method 10A.
- g. Revise section 6.1 in Method 10B.

The revisions and additions read as follows:

Appendix A–4 to Part 60—Test Methods 6 Through 10B

* * * * *

Method 6C—Determination of Sulfur Dioxide Emissions From Stationary Sources (Instrumental Analyzer Procedure)

* * * * *

8.3 *Interference Check.* You must follow the procedures of section 8.2.7 of Method 7E to conduct an interference check, substituting SO₂ for NO_x as the method pollutant. For dilution-type measurement systems, you must use the alternative interference check procedure in section 16 and a co-located, unmodified Method 6 sampling train.

* * * * *

Method 7E—Determination of Nitrogen Oxides Emissions From Stationary Sources (Instrumental Analyzer Procedure)

* * * * *

8.1.2 *Determination of Stratification.* Perform a stratification test at each test site to determine the appropriate number of sample traverse points. If testing for multiple pollutants or diluents at the same site, a stratification test using only one pollutant or diluent satisfies this requirement. A stratification test is not required for small stacks that are less than 4 inches in diameter.

To test for stratification, use a probe of appropriate length to measure the NO_x (or pollutant of interest) concentration at 12 traverse points located according to Table 1–1 or Table 1–2 of Method 1. Alternatively, you may measure at three points on a line passing through the centroidal area. Space the three points at 16.7, 50.0, and 83.3 percent of the measurement line. Sample for a minimum of twice the system response time (see section 8.2.6) at each traverse point. Calculate the individual point and mean NO_x concentrations. If the concentration at each traverse point differs from the mean concentration for all traverse points by no more than: ±5.0 percent of the mean concentration; or ±0.5 ppm (whichever is less restrictive), the gas stream is considered unstratified, and you may collect samples from a single point that most closely matches the mean. If the 5.0 percent or 0.5 ppm criterion is not met, but the concentration at each traverse point differs from the mean concentration for all traverse points by not more than: ±10.0 percent of the mean concentration; or ±1.0 ppm (whichever is less restrictive), the gas stream is considered to be minimally stratified and you may take samples from three points. Space the three points at 16.7, 50.0, and 83.3 percent of the measurement line. Alternatively, if a 12-point stratification test was performed and the emissions were shown to be minimally stratified (all points within ± 10.0 percent of their mean or within ±1.0 ppm), and if the stack diameter (or equivalent diameter, for a rectangular stack or duct) is greater than 2.4 meters (7.8 ft), then you may use 3-point sampling and locate the three points along the measurement line exhibiting the highest average concentration during the stratification test at 0.4, 1.2 and 2.0 meters from the stack or duct wall. If the gas stream is found to be stratified because the 10.0 percent or 1.0 ppm criterion for a 3-point test is not met, locate 12 traverse points for the test in accordance with Table 1–1 or Table 1–2 of Method 1.

* * * * *

8.2.7 *Interference Check.* Conduct an interference response test of the gas analyzer prior to its initial use in the field. If you have multiple analyzers of the same make and model, you need only perform this

alternative interference check on one analyzer. You may also meet the interference check requirement if the instrument manufacturer performs this or a similar check on an analyzer of the same make and model of the analyzer that you use and provides you with documented results.

(1) You may introduce the appropriate interference test gases (that are potentially encountered during a test; see examples in Table 7E–3) into the analyzer separately or as mixtures. Test the analyzer with the interference gas alone at the highest concentration expected at a test source and again with the interference gas and NO_x at a representative NO_x test concentration. For analyzers measuring NO_x greater than 20 ppm, use a calibration gas with a NO_x concentration of 80 to 100 ppm and set this concentration equal to the calibration span. For analyzers measuring less than 20 ppm NO_x, select an NO concentration for the calibration span that reflects the emission levels at the sources to be tested, and perform the interference check at that level. Measure the total interference response of the analyzer to these gases in ppmv. Record the responses and determine the interference using Table 7E–4. The specification in section 13.4 must be met.

(2) A copy of this data, including the date completed and signed certification, must be available for inspection at the test site and included with each test report. This interference test is valid for the life of the instrument unless major analytical components (e.g., the detector) are replaced with different model parts. If major components are replaced with different model parts, the interference gas check must be repeated before returning the analyzer to service. If major components are replaced, the interference gas check must be repeated before returning the analyzer to service. The tester must ensure that any specific technology, equipment, or procedures that are intended to remove interference effects are operating properly during testing.

* * * * *

12.8 NO₂—NO Conversion Efficiency Correction. If desired, calculate the total NO_x concentration with a correction for converter efficiency using Equation 7E–8.

$$NO_{x\text{Corr}} = NO + \left(\frac{(NO_x - NO)}{Eff_{NO_2}} \times 100 \right) \quad \text{Eq. 7E-8}$$

* * * * *

Method 10—Determination of Carbon Monoxide Emissions From Stationary Sources (Instrumental Analyzer Procedure)

* * * * *

6.2.5 *Flexible Bag.* Tedlar, or equivalent, with a capacity of 60 to 90 liters (2 to 3 ft³). (Verify through the manufacturer that the Tedlar alternative is suitable for CO and make this verified information available for inspection.) Leak-test the bag in the laboratory before using by evacuating with a

pump followed by a dry gas meter. When the evacuation is complete, there should be no flow through the meter.

6.2.6 *Sample Tank.* Stainless steel or aluminum tank equipped with a pressure indicator with a minimum volume of 4 liters.

* * * * *

8.4.2 *Integrated Sampling.* Evacuate the flexible bag or sample tank. Set up the equipment as shown in Figure 10–1 with the bag disconnected. Place the probe in the stack and purge the sampling line. Connect the bag, making sure that all connections are

leak-free. Sample at a rate proportional to the stack velocity. If needed, the CO₂ content of the gas may be determined by using the Method 3 integrated sample procedures, or by weighing an ascarite CO₂ removal tube used and computing CO₂ concentration from the gas volume sampled and the weight gain of the tube. Data may be recorded on a form similar to Table 10–1. If a sample tank is used for sample collection, follow procedures similar to those in sections 8.1.2, 8.2.3, 8.3, and 12.4 of Method 25 as appropriate to

prepare the tank, conduct the sampling, and correct the measured sample concentration.

Method 10A—Determination of Carbon Monoxide Emissions in Certifying Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems at Petroleum Refineries

6.1.6 Flexible Bag. Tedlar, or equivalent, with a capacity of 10 liters (0.35 ft³) and equipped with a sealing quick-connect plug. The bag must be leak-free according to section 8.1. For protection, it is recommended that the bag be enclosed within a rigid container.

6.1.7 Sample Tank. Stainless steel or aluminum tank equipped with a pressure indicator with a minimum volume of 10 liters.

6.1.8 Valves. Stainless-steel needle valve to adjust flow rate, and stainless-steel 3-way valve, or equivalent.

6.1.9 CO₂ Analyzer. Fyrite, or equivalent, to measure CO₂ concentration to within 0.5 percent.

6.1.10 Volume Meter. Dry gas meter, capable of measuring the sample volume under calibration conditions of 300 ml/min (0.01 ft³/min) for 10 minutes.

6.1.11 Pressure Gauge. A water filled U-tube manometer, or equivalent, of about 30 cm (12 in.) to leak-check the flexible bag.

8.1 Sample Bag or Tank Leak-Checks. While a leak-check is required after bag or sample tank use, it should also be done before the bag or sample tank is used for sample collection. The tank should be leak-checked according to the procedure specified in section 8.1.2 of Method 25. The bag should be leak-checked in the inflated and deflated condition according to the following procedure:

8.2.1 Evacuate and leak check the sample bag or tank as specified in section 8.1. Assemble the apparatus as shown in Figure 10A-1. Loosely pack glass wool in the tip of the probe. Place 400 ml of alkaline permanganate solution in the first two impingers and 250 ml in the third. Connect the pump to the third impinger, and follow this with the surge tank, rate meter, and 3-

$$ACE = \frac{C_{Dir} - C_v}{CS} \times 100$$

- 15. In appendix A-7 to part 60:
- a. Revise sections 9.1, 12.1, and 12.3 in Method 25C.
- b. Remove section 11.2 in Method 25C.

way valve. Do not connect the bag or sample tank to the system at this time.

8.2.3 Purge the system with sample gas by inserting the probe into the stack and drawing the sample gas through the system at 300 ml/min ±10 percent for 5 minutes. Connect the evacuated bag or sample tank to the system, record the starting time, and sample at a rate of 300 ml/min for 30 minutes, or until the bag is nearly full, or the sample tank reaches ambient pressure. Record the sampling time, the barometric pressure, and the ambient temperature. Purge the system as described above immediately before each sample.

Method 10B—Determination of Carbon Monoxide Emissions from Stationary Sources

6.1. Sample Collection. Same as in Method 10A, section 6.1 (paragraphs 6.1.1 through 6.1.11).

- 13. Revise section 8.3.2 in Method 15 of appendix A-5 to part 60 to read as follows:

Appendix A-5 to Part 60—Test Methods 11 Through 15A

Method 15—Determination of Hydrogen Sulfide, Carbonyl Sulfide, and Carbon Disulfide Emissions From Stationary Sources

8.3.2 Determination of Calibration Drift. After each run, or after a series of runs made within a 24-hour period, perform a partial recalibration using the procedures in section 10.0. Only H₂S (or other permeant) need be used to recalibrate the GC/FPD analysis system and the dilution system. Partial recalibration may be performed at the midlevel calibration gas concentration or at a concentration measured in the samples but not less than the lowest calibration standard used in the initial calibration. Compare the calibration curves obtained after the runs to the calibration curves obtained under section

- c. Add sections 12.4, 12.5, 12.5.1 and 12.5.2 in Method 25C.
- The revisions and additions read as follows:

Appendix A-7 to Part 60—Test Methods 19 Through 25E

10.3. The calibration drift should not exceed the limits set forth in section 13.4. If the drift exceeds this limit, the intervening run or runs should be considered invalid. As an option, the calibration data set that gives the highest sample values may be chosen by the tester.

- 14. In appendix A-6 to part 60:
- a. Revise sections 12.1 and 12.2 in Method 16C.
- b. Remove section 8.2.1.5.2.3 in Method 18.

The revisions read as follows:

Appendix A-6 to Part 60—Test Methods 16 Through 18

Method 16C—Determination of Total Reduced Sulfur Emissions From Stationary Sources

- 12.1 Nomenclature.
- ACE = Analyzer calibration error, percent of calibration span.
- CD = Calibration drift, percent.
- C_{Dir} = Measured concentration of a calibration gas (low, mid, or high) when introduced in direct calibration mode, ppmv.
- C_{H2S} = Concentration of the system performance check gas, ppmv H₂S.
- C_S = Measured concentration of the system performance gas when introduced in system calibration mode, ppmv H₂S.
- C_V = Manufacturer certified concentration of a calibration gas (low, mid, or high), ppmv SO₂.
- C_{SO2} = Unadjusted sample SO₂ concentration, ppmv.
- C_{TRS} = Total reduced sulfur concentration corrected for system performance, ppmv.
- CS = Calibration span, ppmv.
- DF = Dilution system (if used) dilution factor, dimensionless.
- SP = System performance, percent.
- 12.2 Analyzer Calibration Error. For non-dilution systems, use Equation 16C-1 to calculate the analyzer calibration error for the low-, mid-, and high-level calibration gases.

Eq. 16C-1

Method 25C—Determination of Nonmethane Organic Compounds (NMOC) in Landfill Gases

9.1 Miscellaneous Quality Control Measures.

Section	Quality control measure	Effect
8.4.2	Verify that landfill gas sample contains less than 20 percent N ₂ or 5 percent O ₂ .	Ensures that ambient air was not drawn into the landfill gas sample and gas was sampled from an appropriate location.

Section	Quality control measure	Effect
10.1, 10.2	NMOC analyzer initial and daily performance checks	Ensures precision of analytical results.

* * * * *

12.1 Nomenclature
 B_w = Moisture content in the sample, fraction.
 C_{N2} = N₂ concentration in the diluted sample gas.
 C_{mN2} = Measured N₂ concentration, fraction in landfill gas.
 C_{mOx} = Measured Oxygen concentration, fraction in landfill gas.
 C_{Ox} = Oxygen concentration in the diluted sample gas.
 C_t = Calculated NMOC concentration, ppmv C equivalent.

C_{tm} = Measured NMOC concentration, ppmv C equivalent.
 P_b = Barometric pressure, mm Hg.
 P_t = Gas sample tank pressure after sampling, but before pressurizing, mm Hg absolute.
 P_{tf} = Final gas sample tank pressure after pressurizing, mm Hg absolute.
 P_{ti} = Gas sample tank pressure after evacuation, mm Hg absolute.
 P_w = Vapor pressure of H₂O (from Table 25C-1), mm Hg.
 r = Total number of analyzer injections of sample tank during analysis (where j = injection number, 1 . . . r).

T_t = Sample tank temperature at completion of sampling, °K.
 T_{ti} = Sample tank temperature before sampling, °K.
 T_{tf} = Sample tank temperature after pressuring, °K.

* * * * *
 12.3 Nitrogen Concentration in the landfill gas. Use equation 25C-2 to calculate the measured concentration of nitrogen in the original landfill gas.

$$C_{N2} = \left[\frac{\left(\frac{P_{tf}}{T_{tf}}\right)}{\left(\left(\frac{P_t}{T_t}\right) - \left(\frac{P_{ti}}{T_{ti}}\right)\right)} \right] C_{mN2} \tag{Eq. 25C-2}$$

12.4 Oxygen Concentration in the landfill gas. Use equation 25C-3 to calculate the measured concentration of oxygen in the original landfill gas.

$$C_{Ox} = \left[\frac{\left(\frac{P_{tf}}{T_{tf}}\right)}{\left(\left(\frac{P_t}{T_t}\right) - \left(\frac{P_{ti}}{T_{ti}}\right)\right)} \right] C_{mOx} \tag{Eq. 25C-3}$$

12.5 You must correct the NMOC Concentration for the concentration of nitrogen or oxygen based on which gas or gases passes the requirements in section 9.1.

12.5.1 NMOC Concentration with nitrogen correction. Use Equation 25C-4 to calculate the concentration of NMOC for each

sample tank when the nitrogen concentration is less than 20 percent.

$$C_t = \frac{\frac{P_{tf}}{T_{tf}}}{\left(\frac{P_t}{T_t} - \frac{P_{ti}}{T_{ti}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{99}{78} C_{N2}\right) - B_w} \frac{1}{r} \sum_{j=1}^r C_{tm(j)} \tag{Eq. 25C-4}$$

12.5.2 NMOC Concentration with oxygen correction. Use Equation 25C-5 to calculate

the concentration of NMOC for each sample tank if the landfill gas oxygen is less than 5

percent and the landfill gas nitrogen concentration is greater than 20 percent.

$$C_t = \frac{\frac{P_{tf}}{T_{tf}}}{\left(\frac{P_t}{T_t} - \frac{P_{ti}}{T_{ti}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{99}{21} C_{Ox}\right) - B_w} \frac{1}{r} \sum_{j=1}^r C_{tm(j)} \tag{Eq. 25C-5}$$

* * * * *

- 16. In appendix A-8 to Part 60:
- a. Revise section 13.3 in Method 26.
- b. Revise sections 4.3 and 8.1.6 in Method 26A.

- c. Revise section 8.2.9.3 in Method 29.
- d. Add sections 10.4 and 10.5 in Method 29.
- e. Revise the section heading for section 8.1 in Method 30A.

- f. Revise the section heading for section 8.1, and revise 8.3.3.8 in Method 30B.
- The revisions and additions read as follows:

Appendix A–8 to Part 60—Test Methods 26 Through 30B

* * * * *

Method 26—Determination of Hydrogen Chloride Emissions From Stationary Sources

* * * * *

13.3 Detection Limit. A typical IC instrumental detection limit for Cl⁻ is 0.2 µg/ml. Detection limits for the other analyses should be similar. Assuming 50 ml liquid recovered from both the acidified impingers, and the basic impingers, and 0.12 dscm (4.24 dscf) of stack gas sampled, then the analytical detection limit in the stack gas would be about 0.05 ppm for HCl and Cl₂, respectively.

* * * * *

Method 26A—Determination of Hydrogen Halide and Halogen Emissions From Stationary Sources Isokinetic Method

* * * * *

4.3 High concentrations of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) may produce sufficient nitrate (NO₃⁻) to interfere with measurements of very low Br⁻ levels. Dissociating chloride salts (e.g., ammonium chloride) at elevated temperatures interfere with halogen acid measurement in this method. Maintaining particulate probe/filter temperatures between 120 °C and 134 °C (248 °F and 273 °F) minimizes this interference.

* * * * *

8.1.6 Post-Test Moisture Removal (Optional). When the optional cyclone is included in the sampling train or when liquid is visible on the filter at the end of a sample run even in the absence of a cyclone, perform the following procedure. Upon completion of the test run, connect the ambient air conditioning tube at the probe inlet and operate the train with the filter heating system between 120 and 134 °C (248 and 273 °F) at a low flow rate (e.g., ΔH = 1 in. H₂O) to vaporize any liquid and hydrogen halides in the cyclone or on the filter and pull them through the train into the impingers. After 30 minutes, turn off the flow, remove the conditioning tube, and examine the cyclone and filter for any visible liquid. If liquid is visible, repeat this step for 15 minutes and observe again. Keep repeating until the cyclone is dry.

Note: It is critical that this procedure is repeated until the cyclone is completely dry.

* * * * *

Method 29—Determination of Metals Emissions From Stationary Sources

* * * * *

8.2.9.3 Wash the two permanganate impingers with 25 ml of 8 N HCl, and place the wash in a separate sample container labeled No. 5C containing 200 ml of water. First, place 200 ml of water in the container. Then wash the impinger walls and stem with the 8 N HCl by turning the impinger on its side and rotating it so that the HCl contacts all inside surfaces. Use a total of only 25 ml of 8 N HCl for rinsing *both permanganate impingers combined*. Rinse the first impinger, then pour the actual rinse used for the first impinger into the second impinger for its rinse. Finally, pour the 25 ml of 8 N

HCl rinse carefully into the container with the 200 ml of water. Mark the height of the fluid level on the outside of the container in order to determine if leakage occurs during transport.

* * * * *

10.4 Field Balance Calibration Check. Check the calibration of the balance used to weigh impingers with a weight that is at least 500g or within 50g of a loaded impinger. The weight must be ASTM E617–13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” (incorporated by reference—see 40 CFR 60.17) Class 6 (or better). Daily before use, the field balance must measure the weight within ±0.5g of the certified mass. If the daily balance calibration check fails, perform corrective measures and repeat the check before using balance.

10.5 Analytical Balance Calibration. Perform a multipoint calibration (at least five points spanning the operational range) of the analytical balance before the first use, and semiannually thereafter. The calibration of the analytical balance must be conducted using ASTM E617–13 “Standard Specification for Laboratory Weights and Precision Mass Standards” (incorporated by reference—see 40 CFR 60.17) Class 2 (or better) tolerance weights. Audit the balance each day it is used for gravimetric measurements by weighing at least one ASTM E617–13 Class 2 tolerance (or better) calibration weight that corresponds to 50 to 150 percent of the weight of one filter or between 1g and 5g. If the scale cannot reproduce the value of the calibration weight to within 0.5 mg of the certified mass, perform corrective measures, and conduct the multipoint calibration before use.

* * * * *

Method 30A—Determination of Total Vapor Phase Mercury Emissions From Stationary Sources (Instrumental Analyzer Procedure)

* * * * *

8.1 Selection of Sampling Sites and Sampling Points * * *

* * * * *

Method 30B—Determination of Total Vapor Phase Mercury Emissions From Coal-Fired Combustion Sources Using Carbon Sorbent Traps

* * * * *

8.1 Selection of Sampling Sites and Sampling Points * * *

* * * * *

8.3.3.8 Sample Handling, Preservation, Storage, and Transport. While the performance criteria of this approach provides for verification of appropriate sample handling, it is still important that the user consider, determine and plan for suitable sample preservation, storage, transport, and holding times for these measurements. Therefore, procedures in ASTM D6911–15 “Standard Guide for Packaging and Shipping Environmental Samples for Laboratory Analysis” (incorporated by reference—see 40 CFR 60.17) shall be followed for all samples, where appropriate. To avoid Hg contamination of the samples, special attention should be paid to cleanliness during transport, field

handling, sampling, recovery, and laboratory analysis, as well as during preparation of the sorbent cartridges. Collection and analysis of blank samples (e.g., reagent, sorbent, field, etc.) is useful in verifying the absence or source of contaminant Hg.

* * * * *

- 17. In appendix B to part 60:
 - a. Add the entry “Performance Specification 16—Specifications and Test Procedures for Predictive Emission Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources” at the end of the table of contents for appendix B to part 60.
 - b. Add a sentence to the end of section 8.1(2)(i) in Performance Specification 1.
 - c. Revise sections 3.11, 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 16.3.2, and section 18.0 in Performance Specification 2.
 - d. Revise section 13.2 in Performance Specification 3.
 - e. Revise sections 8.3, 8.3.1, and 13.3 in Performance Specification 4A.
 - f. Revise sections 12.1 and 13.1 in Performance Specification 11.
 - g. Revise section 9.1.2 in Performance Specification 15.
 - h. Add reserved sections 14.0 and 15.0 in Performance Specification 15.
 - i. Revise the introductory text of section 12.2.3 in Performance Specification 16.
 - j. Revise table 16–1 in Performance Specification 16.

The revisions and additions read as follows:

Appendix B to Part 60—Performance Specifications

* * * * *

Performance Specification 1—Specifications and Test Procedures for Continuous Opacity Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources

* * * * *

8.1 * * *
 (2) * * *
 (i) * * * Alternatively, you may select a measurement location specified in paragraph 8.1(2)(ii) or 8.1(2)(iii).

* * * * *

Performance Specification 2—Specifications and Test Procedures for SO₂ and NO_x Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources

* * * * *

3.11 *Span Value* means the calibration portion of the measurement range as specified in the applicable regulation or other requirement. If the span is not specified in the applicable regulation or other requirement, then it must be a value approximately equivalent to two times the emission standard. For spans less than 500 ppm, the span value may either be rounded upward to the next highest multiple of 10 ppm, or to the next highest multiple of 100 ppm such that the equivalent emission concentration is not less than 30 percent of the selected span value.

* * * * *

6.1.1 Data Recorder. The portion of the CEMS that provides a record of analyzer output. The data recorder may record other pertinent data such as effluent flow rates, various instrument temperatures or abnormal CEMS operation. The data recorder output range must include the full range of expected concentration values in the gas stream to be sampled including zero and span values.

6.1.2 The CEMS design should also allow the determination of calibration drift at the

zero and span values. If this is not possible or practical, the design must allow these determinations to be conducted at a low-level value (zero to 20 percent of the span value) and at a value between 50 and 100 percent of the span value. In special cases, the Administrator may approve a single-point calibration drift determination.

* * * * *

16.3.2 For diluent CEMS:
RA=d; ≤0.7 percent O₂ or CO₂, as applicable.

Note: Waiver of the relative accuracy test in favor of the alternative RA procedure does not preclude the requirements to complete the CD tests nor any other requirements specified in an applicable subpart for reporting CEMS data and performing CEMS drift checks or audits.

* * * * *

18.0 Tables, Diagrams, Flowcharts, and Validation Data

TABLE 2-1—t-VALUES

n ^a	t _{0.975}	n ^a	t _{0.975}	n ^a	t _{0.975}
2	12.706	7	2.447	12	2.201
3	4.303	8	2.365	13	2.179
4	3.182	9	2.306	14	2.160
5	2.776	10	2.262	15	2.145
6	2.571	11	2.228	16	2.131

^a The values in this table are already corrected for n – 1 degrees of freedom. Use n equal to the number of individual values.

TABLE 2-2—MEASUREMENT RANGE

Measurement point	Pollutant monitor	Diluent monitor for	
		CO ₂	O ₂
1	20–30% of span value	5–8% by volume	4–6% by volume.
2	50–60% of span value	10–14% by volume	8–12% by volume.

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FIGURE 2-2. RELATIVE ACCURACY DETERMINATION.

Run No.	Date and time	SO ₂			NO _x ^b			CO ₂ or O ₂ ^a		SO ₂ ^a			NO _x ^a		
		RM	CEMS	Diff	RM	CEMS	Diff	RM	CEMS	RM	CEMS	Diff	RM	CEMS	Diff
		ppm ^c			ppm ^c			% ^c	% ^c	mass/GCV			mass/GCV		
1															
2															
3															
4															
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
Average															
Confidence Interval															
Accuracy															

^aFor Steam generators.

^bAverage of three samples.

^cMake sure that RM and CEMS data are on a consistent basis, either wet or dry.

BILLING CODE 6560-50-C

* * * * *

Performance Specification 3—Specifications and Test Procedures for O₂ and CO₂ Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources

* * * * *

13.2 CEMS Relative Accuracy Performance Specification. The RA of the

CEMS must be no greater than 20.0 percent of the mean value of the reference method (RM) data when calculated using equation 3-1. The results are also acceptable if the result of Equation 3-2 is less than or equal to 1.0 percent O₂ (or CO₂).

$$RA = \frac{[|\bar{d}| + |CC|]}{\overline{RM}} \times 100$$

Eq. 3-1

Where:

$|\bar{d}|$ = Absolute value of the mean of the differences (from Equation 2-3 of Performance Specification 2).

$|CC|$ = Absolute value of the confidence coefficient (from Equation 2-5 of Performance Specification 2).

\overline{RM} = Average Reference Method value.

$$RA = \overline{RM} - \overline{CEMS} \quad \text{Eq. 3-2}$$

\overline{RM} = Average Reference Method value.

\overline{CEMS} = Average CEMS value.

* * * * *

**Performance Specification 4A—
Specifications and Test Procedures for
Carbon Monoxide Continuous Emission
Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources**

* * * * *

8.3 Response Time Test Procedure. The response time test applies to all types of CEMS, but will generally have significance only for extractive systems. The entire system is checked with this procedure including applicable sample extraction and transport, sample conditioning, gas analyses, and data recording.

8.3.1 Introduce zero gas into the system. When the system output has stabilized (no change greater than 1 percent of full scale for

30 sec), introduce an upscale calibration gas and wait for a stable value. Record the time (upscale response time) required to reach 95 percent of the final stable value. Next, reintroduce the zero gas and wait for a stable reading before recording the response time (downscale response time). Repeat the entire procedure until you have three sets of data to determine the mean upscale and downscale response times. The slower or longer of the two means is the system response time.

* * * * *

13.3 Response Time. The CEMS response time shall not exceed 240 seconds to achieve 95 percent of the final stable value.

* * * * *

**Performance Specification 11—
Specifications and Test Procedures for
Particulate Matter Continuous Emission
Monitoring Systems at Stationary Sources**

* * * * *

12.1 How do I calculate upscale drift and zero drift? You must determine the difference in your PM CEMS output readings from the established reference values (zero and upscale check values) after a stated period of operation during which you performed no unscheduled maintenance, repair or adjustment.

(1) Calculate the upscale drift (UD) using Equation 11-1:

$$UD = \frac{|R_{CEM} - R_U|}{R_r} \times 100 \quad \text{Eq. 11-1}$$

Where:

UD = The upscale (high-level) drift of your PM CEMS in percent,

R_{CEM} = The measured PM CEMS response to the upscale reference standard,
 R_U = The pre-established numerical value of the upscale reference standard, and

R_r = The response range of the analyzer.

(2) Calculate the zero drift (ZD) using Equation 11-2:

$$ZD = \frac{|R_{CEM} - R_L|}{R_r} \times 100 \quad \text{Eq. 11-2}$$

Where:

ZD = The zero (low-level) drift of your PM CEMS in percent,
 R_{CEM} = The measured PM CEMS response to the zero reference standard,
 R_L = The pre-established numerical value of the zero reference standard, and
 R_r = The response range of the analyzer.

(3) Summarize the results on a data sheet similar to that shown in Table 2 (see section 17).

* * * * *

13.1 What is the 7-day drift check performance specification? Your daily PM CEMS internal drift checks must demonstrate that the average daily drift of your PM CEMS does not deviate from the value of the reference light, optical filter, Beta attenuation signal, or other technology-suitable reference standard by more than 2 percent of the response range. If your CEMS includes diluent and/or auxiliary monitors (for temperature, pressure, and/or moisture) that are employed as a necessary part of this performance specification, you must determine the calibration drift separately for

each ancillary monitor in terms of its respective output (see the appropriate performance specification for the diluent CEMS specification). None of the calibration drifts may exceed their individual specification.

* * * * *

Performance Specification 15—Performance Specification for Extractive FTIR Continuous Emissions Monitor Systems in Stationary Sources

* * * * *

9.1.2 Test Procedure. Spike the audit sample using the analyte spike procedure in section 11. The audit sample is measured directly by the FTIR system (undiluted) and then spiked into the effluent at a known dilution ratio. Measure a series of spiked and unspiked samples using the same procedures as those used to analyze the stack gas. Analyze the results using sections 12.1 and 12.2. The measured concentration of each analyte must be within ±5 percent of the expected concentration (plus the uncertainty), *i.e.*, the calculated correction

factor must be within 0.93 and 1.07 for an audit with an analyte uncertainty of ±2 percent.

* * * * *

14.0 *Pollution Prevention [Reserved]*

15.0 *Waste Management [Reserved]*

* * * * *

Performance Specification 16—Specifications and Test Procedures for Predictive Emission Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources

* * * * *

12.0 *Calculations and Data Analysis*

* * * * *

12.2.3 Confidence Coefficient. Calculate the confidence coefficient using Equation 16-3 and Table 16-1 for n - 1 degrees of freedom.

* * * * *

17.0 *Tables, Diagrams, Flowcharts, and Validation Data*

TABLE 16-1—t-VALUES FOR ONE-SIDED, 97.5 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR SELECTED SAMPLE SIZES *

n - 1 *	t-value	n - 1	t-value
1	12.706	15	2.131
2	4.303	16	2.120
3	3.182	17	2.110
4	2.776	18	2.101
5	2.571	19	2.093
6	2.447	20	2.086
7	2.365	21	2.080
8	2.306	22	2.074
9	2.262	23	2.069
10	2.228	24	2.064
11	2.201	25	2.060
12	2.179	26	2.056
13	2.160	27	2.052
14	2.145	>28	t-Table

* The value n is the number of RM runs; n - 1 equals the degrees of freedom.

* * * * *

■ 18. Revise section 12.0 paragraphs (3) and (4) in Procedure 2 of appendix F to part 60 to read as follows:

Appendix F to Part 60—Quality Assurance Procedures

* * * * *

$$UD = \frac{|R_{CEM} - R_U|}{R_r} \times 100 \quad \text{Eq. 2-2}$$

Where:

UD = The upscale drift of your PM CEMS, in percent,

R_{CEM} = Your PM CEMS response to the upscale check value,

R_U = The upscale check value, and

R_r = The response range of the analyzer.

Procedure 2—Quality Assurance Requirements for Particulate Matter Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems at Stationary Sources

* * * * *

12.0 *What calculations and data analysis must I perform for my PM CEMS?*

* * * * *

(3) How do I calculate daily upscale and zero drift? You must calculate the upscale drift using Equation 2-2 and the zero drift using Equation 2-3:

$$ZD = \frac{|R_{CEM} - R_L|}{R_r} \times 100$$

Eq. 2-3

Where:

ZD = The zero (low-level) drift of your PM CEMS, in percent,

R_{CEM} = Your PM CEMS response of the zero check value,

R_L = The zero check value, and

R_r = The response range of the analyzer.

(4) How do I calculate SVA accuracy? You must use Equation 2-4 to calculate the accuracy, in percent, for each of the three SVA tests or the daily sample volume check:

$$SVA \text{ Accuracy} = \frac{|V_M - V_R|}{V_R} \times 100$$

Eq. 2-4

Where:

SVA Accuracy = The SVA accuracy at each audit point, in percent,

V_M = Sample gas volume determined/ reported by your PM CEMS (e.g., dscm), and

V_R = Sample gas volume measured by the independent calibrated reference device (e.g., dscm) for the SVA or the reference value for the daily sample volume check.

Note: Before calculating SVA accuracy, you must correct the sample gas volumes measured by your PM CEMS and the independent calibrated reference device to the same basis of temperature, pressure, and moisture content. You must document all data and calculations.

* * * * *

PART 61—NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS

■ 19. The authority citation for part 61 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

■ 20. In § 61.13, revise paragraph (e)(1)(i) to read as follows:

§ 61.13 Emission tests and waiver of emission tests.

* * * * *

- (e) * * *
- (1) * * *

(i) The source owner, operator, or representative of the tested facility shall obtain an audit sample, if commercially available, from an AASP for each test method used for regulatory compliance purposes. No audit samples are required for the following test methods: Methods 3A and 3C of appendix A-3 of part 60 of this chapter; Methods 6C, 7E, 9, and 10 of appendix A-4 of part 60; Method 18 and 19 of appendix A-6 of part 60; Methods 20, 22, and 25A of appendix A-7 of part 60; Methods 30A and 30B of appendix A-8 of part 60; and Methods 303, 318, 320, and 321 of appendix A of part 63 of this chapter. If multiple sources at a single facility are tested during a compliance test event, only one audit sample is required for each method used during a compliance test. The compliance authority

responsible for the compliance test may waive the requirement to include an audit sample if they believe that an audit sample is not necessary.

“Commercially available” means that two or more independent AASPs have blind audit samples available for purchase. If the source owner, operator, or representative cannot find an audit sample for a specific method, the owner, operator, or representative shall consult the EPA Web site at the following URL, www.epa.gov/ttn/emc, to confirm whether there is a source that can supply an audit sample for that method. If the EPA Web site does not list an available audit sample at least 60 days prior to the beginning of the compliance test, the source owner, operator, or representative shall not be required to include an audit sample as part of the quality assurance program for the compliance test. When ordering an audit sample, the source owner, operator, or representative shall give the sample provider an estimate for the concentration of each pollutant that is emitted by the source or the estimated concentration of each pollutant based on the permitted level and the name, address, and phone number of the compliance authority. The source owner, operator, or representative shall report the results for the audit sample along with a summary of the emission test results for the audited pollutant to the compliance authority and shall report the results of the audit sample to the AASP. The source owner, operator, or representative shall make both reports at the same time and in the same manner or shall report to the compliance authority first and then report to the AASP. If the method being audited is a method that allows the samples to be analyzed in the field and the tester plans to analyze the samples in the field, the tester may analyze the audit samples prior to collecting the emission samples provided a representative of the compliance authority is present at the testing site. The tester may request, and the compliance authority may grant, a

waiver to the requirement that a representative of the compliance authority must be present at the testing site during the field analysis of an audit sample. The source owner, operator, or representative may report the results of the audit sample to the compliance authority and then report the results of the audit sample to the AASP prior to collecting any emission samples. The test protocol and final test report shall document whether an audit sample was ordered and utilized and the pass/fail results as applicable.

* * * * *

■ 21. Revise the section heading for section 11.7.3 in Method 107 of appendix B to part 61 to read as follows:

Appendix B to Part 61—Test Methods

* * * * *

Method 107—Determination of Vinyl Chloride Content of In-Process Wastewater Samples, and Vinyl Chloride Content of Polyvinyl Chloride Resin Slurry, Wet Cake, and Latex Samples

* * * * *

11.0 Analytical Procedure

* * * * *

11.7.3 Dispersion Resin Slurry and Latex Samples.

* * * * *

PART 63—NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS FOR SOURCE CATEGORIES

■ 22. The authority citation for part 63 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

■ 23. In § 63.7:

■ a. Revise paragraph (c)(2)(iii)(A).

■ b. Add paragraph (g)(2).

The revision and addition read as follows:

§ 63.7 Performance testing requirements.

* * * * *

- (c) * * *
- (2) * * *
- (iii) * * *

(A) The source owner, operator, or representative of the tested facility shall

obtain an audit sample, if commercially available, from an AASP for each test method used for regulatory compliance purposes. No audit samples are required for the following test methods: Methods 3A and 3C of appendix A-3 of part 60 of this chapter; Methods 6C, 7E, 9, and 10 of appendix A-4 of part 60; Methods 18 and 19 of appendix A-6 of part 60; Methods 20, 22, and 25A of appendix A-7 of part 60; Methods 30A and 30B of appendix A-8 of part 60; and Methods 303, 318, 320, and 321 of appendix A of this part. If multiple sources at a single facility are tested during a compliance test event, only one audit sample is required for each method used during a compliance test. The compliance authority responsible for the compliance test may waive the requirement to include an audit sample if they believe that an audit sample is not necessary. "Commercially available" means that two or more independent AASPs have blind audit samples available for purchase. If the source owner, operator, or representative cannot find an audit sample for a specific method, the owner, operator, or representative shall consult the EPA Web site at the following URL, www.epa.gov/ttn/emc, to confirm whether there is a source that can supply an audit sample for that method. If the EPA Web site does not list an available audit sample at least 60 days prior to the beginning of the compliance test, the source owner, operator, or representative shall not be required to include an audit sample as part of the quality assurance program for the compliance test. When ordering an audit sample, the source owner, operator, or representative shall give the sample provider an estimate for the concentration of each pollutant that is emitted by the source or the estimated concentration of each pollutant based on the permitted level and the name, address, and phone number of the compliance authority. The source owner, operator, or representative shall report the results for the audit sample along with a summary of the emission test results for the audited pollutant to the compliance authority and shall report the results of the audit sample to the AASP. The source owner, operator, or representative shall make both reports at the same time and in the same manner or shall report to the compliance authority first and then report to the AASP. If the method being

audited is a method that allows the samples to be analyzed in the field and the tester plans to analyze the samples in the field, the tester may analyze the audit samples prior to collecting the emission samples provided a representative of the compliance authority is present at the testing site. The tester may request, and the compliance authority may grant, a waiver to the requirement that a representative of the compliance authority must be present at the testing site during the field analysis of an audit sample. The source owner, operator, or representative may report the results of the audit sample to the compliance authority and then report the results of the audit sample to the AASP prior to collecting any emission samples. The test protocol and final test report shall document whether an audit sample was ordered and utilized and the pass/fail results as applicable.

* * * * *

(g) * * *
 (2) Contents of report (electronic or paper submitted copy). Unless otherwise specified in a relevant standard or test method, or as otherwise approved by the Administrator in writing, the report for a performance test shall include the elements identified in paragraphs (g)(2)(i) through (vi) of this section.

(i) General identification information for the facility including a mailing address, the physical address, the owner or operator or responsible official (where applicable) and his/her email address, and the appropriate Federal Registry System (FRS) number for the facility.

(ii) Purpose of the test including the applicable regulation requiring the test, the pollutant(s) and other parameters being measured, the applicable emission standard, and any process parameter component, and a brief process description.

(iii) Description of the emission unit tested including fuel burned, control devices, and vent characteristics; the appropriate source classification code (SCC); the permitted maximum process rate (where applicable); and the sampling location.

(iv) Description of sampling and analysis procedures used and any modifications to standard procedures, quality assurance procedures and results, record of process operating conditions that demonstrate the applicable test conditions are met, and

values for any operating parameters for which limits were being set during the test.

(v) Where a test method requires you record or report, the following shall be included in your report: Record of preparation of standards, record of calibrations, raw data sheets for field sampling, raw data sheets for field and laboratory analyses, chain-of-custody documentation, and example calculations for reported results.

(vi) Identification of the company conducting the performance test including the primary office address, telephone number, and the contact for this test including his/her email address.

* * * * *

■ 24. Revise sections 13.1, 13.4, and 13.4.1 in Method 320 of appendix A to part 63 to read as follows:

Appendix A to Part 63—Test Methods Pollutant Measurement Methods From Various Waste Media

* * * * *

Method 320—Measurement of Vapor Phase Organic and Inorganic Emissions by Extractive Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR) Spectroscopy

* * * * *

13.0 Method Validation Procedure

* * * * *

13.1 Section 6.0 of Method 301 (40 CFR part 63, appendix A), the Analyte Spike procedure, is used with these modifications. The statistical analysis of the results follows section 12.0 of EPA Method 301. Section 3 of this method defines terms that are not defined in Method 301.

* * * * *

13.4 *Statistical Treatment.* The statistical procedure of EPA Method 301 of this appendix, section 12.0 is used to evaluate the bias and precision. For FTIR testing a validation "run" is defined as spectra of 24 independent samples, 12 of which are spiked with the analyte(s) and 12 of which are not spiked.

13.4.1 *Bias.* Determine the bias (defined by EPA Method 301 of this appendix, section 12.1.1) using equation 7:

$$B = S_m - CS$$

Where:

B = Bias at spike level.

S_m = Mean concentration of the analyte spiked samples.

CS = Expected concentration of the spiked samples.

* * * * *

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 63**

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0696; FRL-9950-26-OAR]

RIN 2060-AS86

Technical Amendments to Performance Specification 18 and Procedure 6**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Partial withdrawal of direct final rule.

SUMMARY: Because the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) received adverse comment, we are withdrawing a portion of the May 19, 2016, direct final rule that made several minor technical amendments to the performance specifications and test procedures for hydrogen chloride (HCl) continuous emission monitoring systems (CEMS). The adverse comments related to revisions to Procedure 6 and thus the EPA is withdrawing the portion of the direct final rule that revised Procedure 6.

DATES: Effective August 8, 2016, the EPA withdraws the revisions to Procedure 6, sections 4.1.5, 4.1.5.1, 4.1.5.3, and 5.2.4.2, published at 81 FR 31515, on May 19, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Candace Sorrell, U.S. EPA, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Air Quality Assessment Division, Measurement Technology Group (Mail Code: E143-02), Research Triangle Park, NC 27711; telephone number: (919) 541-1064; fax number: (919) 541-0516; email address: sorrell.candace@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 19, 2016, the EPA published a direct final rule that makes minor technical amendments to the performance specifications and test procedures for hydrogen chloride (HCl) continuous emission monitoring systems (CEMS). 81 FR 31515. In the direct final rule, the EPA stated that if we received adverse comment by July 5, 2016, the EPA would publish a timely withdrawal and address the comments in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule also published on May 19, 2016 (81 FR 31577). The May 19, 2016, direct final rule noted that if the EPA received adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and, if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, the EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

In this instance, the EPA received an adverse comment on an amendment to the quality assurance provision in Procedure 6, related to above span requirements. 81 FR 31517. The portions of the direct final rule revising Performance Standard 18 are severable from the revisions to Procedure 6. Thus, the EPA is only withdrawing the revisions to Procedure 6. The EPA will address the comment in a subsequent final action, which will be based on the parallel proposed rule also published on May 19, 2016 (81 FR 31515). As stated in the parallel proposal, we will not institute a second comment period on this proposed action. The revisions to Performance Standard 18 in the May 19, 2016, direct final rule are not affected and will become effective on August 17, 2016, as provided in the direct final rule.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 60

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Continuous emission monitoring systems, Hydrogen chloride, Performance specifications, Test methods and procedures.

Dated: July 28, 2016.

Janet G. McCabe,*Acting Assistant Administrator.*

Accordingly, amendatory instruction 3 in the direct final rule published in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 2016, at 81 FR 31520, is withdrawn as of August 8, 2016.

[FR Doc. 2016-18682 Filed 8-5-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 180**

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0561; FRL-9949-19]

Flonicamid; Pesticide Tolerances**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes tolerances for residues of flonicamid in or on hops, tree nuts (crop group 14-12 except pistachio), and pistachio. ISK Biosciences Corporation requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

DATES: This regulation is effective August 8, 2016. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before October 7, 2016, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also

Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

ADDRESSES: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0561, is available at <http://www.regulations.gov> or at the Office of Pesticide Programs Regulatory Public Docket (OPP Docket) in the Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), West William Jefferson Clinton Bldg., Rm. 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305-5805. Please review the visitor instructions and additional information about the docket available at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan T. Lewis, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; main telephone number: (703) 305-7090; email address: RDfrNotices@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. General Information***A. Does this action apply to me?*

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

- Crop production (NAICS code 111).
- Animal production (NAICS code 112).
- Food manufacturing (NAICS code 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

B. How can I get electronic access to other related information?

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of EPA's tolerance regulations at 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl.

C. How can I file an objection or hearing request?

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation