

From: [Langman, Michael](#)
To: [Deskings, Matthew \(EGLE\)](#)
Cc: [Lane, Rex \(EGLE\)](#); [Ethridge, Christopher \(EGLE\)](#); [Myott, Brad \(EGLE\)](#); [Brunner, Julie \(EGLE\)](#); [Orent, Kelly \(EGLE\)](#); [Blathras, Constantine](#); [Damico, Genevieve](#); [Danesh, Paymon](#)
Subject: Orchard Hill Sanitary Landfill and Energy Developments Watervliet - N5719 - Comments
Date: Monday, November 21, 2022 9:05:50 AM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Hi Matt,

I have reviewed the draft ROP for Orchard Hill Sanitary Landfill and Energy Developments Watervliet, SRN N5719. Based on my review, I have the following comments. Please let me know if you have any questions.

1. Section 1, EUASBESTOS SC III.1(d) (draft ROP page 22/110) allows an alternative emission control method upon prior written approval from the appropriate AQD District Supervisor. However, the underlying requirement at 40 CFR 61.154(d) only allows the use of an alternative emission control method if it has received prior approval by the Administrator. Although implementation and enforcement authority of 40 CFR Part 61 Subpart M has been delegated to Michigan, 40 CFR 61.157(b)(5) states that the authority specified in 40 CFR 61.154(d) will not be delegated to States. I request that you either revise EUASBESTOS SC III.1(d) to specify that the Administrator is the approving authority for the alternative emissions control method or remove EUASBESTOS SC III.1(d) from the ROP if you determine that 40 CFR 61.154(d) is not applicable.
2. Section 1, EUASBESTOS SC VI.1(c) (draft ROP page 23/110) incorporates a portion of 40 CFR 61.154(e)(3). However, it appears that this condition does not completely incorporate 40 CFR 61.154(e)(3) since it is missing the portion of the rule that follows “[...] (identified in the waste shipment record)”. I request that you verify the incorporation of 40 CFR 61.154(e)(3) into the ROP and revise EUASBESTOS SC VI.1(c) as necessary to ensure that all applicable portions of 40 CFR 61.154(e)(3) are incorporated into the ROP.
3. Section 1, FGOPENFLARE-AAAA-1 SC VI.2(b) (page 54/110) requires the source to record the indication of bypass flow pursuant to 40 CFR 63.1961(c)(2)(ii), suggesting that flow can bypass the open flare. However, 40 CFR 63.1961(c)(2)(ii) also requires the source to secure bypass line valves in the closed position with a car-seal or a lock-and-key type configuration. It is not clear whether the source can bypass the flare, making it unclear whether bypass lines must be secured. I request that you evaluate whether the flare can be bypassed and whether a bypass line valve must be secured in accordance with 40 CFR 63.1961(c)(2)(ii). If this is an applicable requirement, then I also request that you also incorporate the monthly visual inspection requirement in FGOPENFLARE-AAAA-1 SC VI as a requirement separate from the already-included recordkeeping requirement.
4. Section 2, FGTREATMENTSYS-AAAA SC IV.2 (page 97/110) incorporates 40 CFR 63.1961(g) which

requires the source to secure the bypass line valve in the closed position. Monthly recordkeeping requirements are included in the permit at SC VI.1(b). SC VI.1(b) cites 40 CFR 63.1983(c)(2) instead of 40 CFR 63.1983(g)(2), but both (c)(2) and (g)(2) have largely similar requirements. As part of the requirement at 40 CFR 63.1983(c)(2) and (g)(2), the owner or operator must conduct a visual inspection of the seal or closure mechanism on a monthly basis. However, the draft ROP does not specifically require the source to conduct a monthly visual inspection. Instead, the draft ROP only requires the source to maintain records of the monthly inspections. For permit clarity and to ensure the implementation of the monthly visual inspections, I request that you incorporate into FG TREATMENTSYS-AAAA SC VI a requirement to conduct monthly visual inspections.

5. As part of my review, I've noted the following minor typographical errors in Appendix 7-1.
 - a. The last sentence of the first paragraph of page 63/110 states "[...] and amount of the non-degradable material is documented as provided in 40 CFR 62.16728(a)(3)(iii)". However, I believe that the text should instead refer to 40 CFR 62.16728(a)(3)(i) while noting that the applicable requirement can be found at 40 CFR 62.16728(a)(3)(iii).
 - b. The equation for "K" on page 65/110 of the draft ROP should have an equal sign following the word "Constant" and should define "n" as the number of sample components. See 40 CFR 63.11(b)(6)(ii).
 - c. Page 65/110 and 110/110 includes a section for the calculation for Vmax steam-assisted and non-assisted flares. Both sections of the permit refer to 40 CFR 63.18(b)(7)(iii), but it appears that both should instead refer to 40 CFR 63.11(b)(7)(iii).

Thanks,
Michael Langman
Physical Scientist
Air Permits Section, US EPA Region 5
Email: langman.michael@epa.gov
Phone: 312-886-6867