UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 7
901 NORTH 5TH STREET
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66101

SEP 26 2012

Mr. Kendall B Hale
Chief of Permit Section
Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Air Pollution Control Program
PO Box 176
Jefferson City, MO 65102

RE: Draft Part 70 Operating Permit
TAMKO Building Products, Inc.
Installation ID 097-0013
Project No. 2007-01-011

Dear Mr. Hale:

A draft of the TAMKO Building Products, Inc.—North High Street (TAMKO) Part 70 operating permit renewal was placed on public notice August 31, 2012, by the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). The United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 (EPA) has reviewed this draft operating permit and provides the following comments that we hope will improve this and future permits.

1.) The installation description on the cover page of the draft permit and installation description on pages 8 and 9 does not indicate the pollutant(s) which create the need for a Part 70 /Title V operating permit. The customary practice of MDNR is to include and specify the regulated air pollutants that make the source major and therefore subject to a Part 70 operating permit in the Installation Description on the permit cover sheet and the Installation Description and Equipment Listing section of the permit. However, the installation descriptions reviewed in the TAMKO draft permit do not indicate the major regulated air pollutant(s).

Therefore, EPA recommends MDNR consider listing the major air pollutant(s) in the installation description that makes the source subject to Title V.

2.) The **Documents Incorporated by Reference** section within **Section I Installation Description and Equipment Listing** includes two (2) documents which are frequently referred to through this draft operating permit. These documents include the permittee's *Control Device Operating Procedures* and the permittee's *GACT Compliance Monitoring Plan.* It appears that these documents provide the basis for the specific operating and compliance monitoring for most of the emission unit specific permit conditions. 10 CSR 10-6.065 (6) (C) 1.C.(I)(a) requires every operating permit to include all emission monitoring and analysis procedures and test methods required under applicable requirements. However, neither of these documents are included with the permit for review and public comment.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR add both of these documents as attachments to the TAMKO operating permit and make both documents available for public review.

Additionally, the references to the permittee's *Control Device Operating Procedures* and the permittee's *GACT Compliance Monitoring Plan* in the draft operating permit for TAMKO on public notice are not depicted consistently. Some of the references are italicized (as shown above) and some are not.

RECYCLE
PAPER CONTAINS RECYCLED FIBERS

The use of italicized type face is an effective approach for highlighting these particular documents and EPA recommends that MDNR use italicized typeface for all of the references to these two (2) documents.

3.) There are two (2) footnotes at the bottom of page 16 that refer the permittee to "Section V for General Permit Requirements, 10 CSR 10-6.065(6)(C)1.C General Record Keeping and Reporting Requirements and General Permit Requirements 10 CSR 10-6.065(6)(C)3 Compliance Requirements, respectively. However, these General Permit Requirements are presented in Section VI.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR make the necessary correction.

4.) The ***Emission Limitations*** in Plant Wide Permit Condition PW02, on page 17, cites 10 CSR 10-6.405 Maximum Allowable Emissions of Particulate Matter from Fuel Burning Equipment Used for Indirect Heating as the reference for this permit condition. The permit condition says that all indirect heating sources shall be limited to burning landfill gas, propane, natural gas, fuel oils #2 through #6 (with less than one and two-tenths percent (1.2%) sulfur) and / or other gases (with hydrogen sulfide levels less than or equal to four (4) parts per million as measured using ASTM D4084 or equivalent and mercury concentrations less than forty (40) micrograms per cubic meter as measured using ASTM D5954 or ASTM D6350, or equivalent).

Item 1) in the **Other Regulatory Determinations** section of the Statement of Basis says 10 CSR 10-6.405, *Maximum Allowable Emission of Particulate Matter from Fuel Burning Equipment Used for Indirect Heating* was not applied to the permittee's indirect combustion units individually because all the indirect heating sources use natural gas or propane for which there is an exemption in the rule from record keeping. It appears that the Plant Wide Permit Condition PW02 and Item 1) in the **Other Regulatory Determinations** are in contradiction. In fact, the draft Plant Wide Permit Condition PW02 includes a ***Monitoring / Record keeping*** requirement which includes all of the regulatory record keeping exemption language.

Therefore, EPA recommends MDNR eliminate Item 1) in the **Other Regulatory Determinations** section of the Statement of Basis.

5.) First, **Section III. Emission Unit Specific Emission Limitations** includes fifty (50) specific permit conditions for the fifty-five (55) emission points listed under the **Emission Units With Limitations** portion of the **Installation Description and Equipment Listing** section of the TAMKO draft operating permit. The draft permit identifies twenty-eight (28) of the Permit Conditions through the use of an operation name; fifteen (15) of these permit conditions by their emission point number; and seven (7) of these permit conditions by a control device number or control device group. The inconsistency in the permit condition naming convention could potentially lead to a misunderstanding by the permittee.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR select a common naming convention (preferably customary past practice) and use that convention consistently with all fifty (50) specific permit conditions.

Next, all fifty (50) of the emission unit specific permit conditions include a section on limitations, either emission limitations or operation limitations; a section on monitoring; and a section on record keeping. However, LRL Limestone Storage Tank Permit Condition 2; with the citation 10 CSR 10-6.400 Restriction of Emission of Particulate Matter from Industrial Processes (page 36 – 37), includes a section on reporting. This is the only emission unit specific permit condition with a reporting requirement; even though there are several other emission unit specific permit conditions written with the 10 CSR 10-6.400 Restriction of Emission of Particulate Matter from Industrial Processes citation.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR reconsider whether the LRL Limestone Storage Tank Permit Condition 2 is the only permit condition that should have a reporting requirement.

Third, the TAMKO draft operating permit emission unit specific permit condition requirements include the modal verbs "shall," "will," and "must" to describe the permittee's obligations. MDNR customary practice has been to use "shall" throughout all permit condition requirements.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR consider replacing the "will" and "must" with "shall."

Fourth, MDNR's customary practice within emission unit specific emission permit conditions written around New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS), has been to include a specific federal regulatory citation in brackets at the end of every applicable requirement. This customary approach is to meet the requirements specified in 10 CSR 10-6.065(6)(C)1.A.(I). The TAMKO draft operating includes several emission unit specific emission limitations as required by 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart UU, 40 CFR Part 60 Subpart OOO, and 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart AAAAAAA. However, none of the requirements associated with either of these federal standards include a reference to the authority for the term or condition.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR add the appropriate regulatory citation to the operating permit emission unit specific emission limitations written to incorporate 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart UU, 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO, and 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart AAAAAAA requirements.

6.) CD26 Permit Condition 1 and EP32B, EP32C, EP62C, EP62D, EP28B, EP28C & EP200 Permit Condition 3 are both included to identify the requirements for asphalt storage tanks associated with CVM #3 Device Group. These two (2) permit conditions both cite 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart A General Provisions and Subpart UU Standards of Performance for Asphalt Processing and Asphalt Roofing Manufacture-Standards for Asphalt Storage Tanks and 10 CSR 10-6.070 New Source Performance Regulation. EP32B, EP32C, EP62C, EP62D, EP28B, EP28C & EP200 Permit Condition 3 also cites 10 CSR 10-6.060 Construction Permits Required and Construction Permit #1096-020, issued October 15, 1996. However, the emission limitations and the monitoring and record keeping requirements of these two (2) permit conditions appear to be the same and it would appear as though they could be reduced to one (1) permit condition.

Additionally, both CD26 Permit Condition 1 and EP32B, EP32C, EP62C, EP62D, EP28B, EP28C & EP200 Permit Condition 3 include an operation limitation/emission limitation that allows the permittee to bypass the CVM Fume Control Device during periods of planned maintenance not exceeding 72 hours of duration as long as the opacity is not greater than zero percent (0%), except for one consecutive 15-minute period in any 24-hour period when maintenance is being performed on the control device. 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart UU does not authorize this by-passing of the control device.

EPA recommends that MDNR determine and list the authority for this by-pass allowance and consider combining these two (2) asphalt storage tank permit conditions into a single permit condition.

7.) CVM #3 Device Group Permit Condition 2; EP49, EP49A, EP50 & EP50A Permit Condition 4 and EP 49, EP49A, EP50 & EP50A Permit Condition 5 are all written to delineate the requirements of the saturator/coater operations described within the CVM #3 Device Group. It would appear that these three (3) permit conditions could be condensed to a single permit condition reflecting the requirements for asphalt coating equipment.

Second, CVM #3 Device Group Permit Condition 2 is written around a saturator/coater combined production line and MDNR has included an emission limitation that says the permittee shall not emit PM emission in excess of 0.06 pounds per ton of asphalt roofing product manufactured. However, Table 2 of 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart AAAAAA says that for combined saturator/coater production lines the PM emissions are limited to 0.36 pounds per ton of asphalt roofing product manufactured.

EPA recommends that MDNR verify the regulatory citation and respond accordingly. Also, in emission limitation 2, the word "shall," should be added between the words "permittee" and "operate."

8.) Twenty-four (24) of the emission unit specific emission limitation permit conditions include a ***Monitoring/Record keeping*** requirement that says "The permittee will refer to IV. Endnote References, Monitoring and Record Keeping for Visible Air Contaminants Monitoring, page 46. "The EPA recommends that MDNR add the word "Section" between the word "to" and the Roman numeral "IV" and replace the "will" with "shall."

9.) Five (5) of the emission unit specific emission limitation permit conditions include a ***Record keeping*** requirement that says "Refer to Endnote References, Record keeping on page 47 for a list of recordkeeping requirements."The EPA recommends that MDNR consider modifying this requirement to more accurately require a permittee action by stating: "The permittee shall refer to Section IV, Endnote References, Record keeping on page 47 for a list of recordkeeping requirements."

10.) AWA Precoater Permit Condition 1, AWA Precoater Permit Condition 2 and AWA Precoater Permit Condition 3 are included in the draft TAMKO operating permit to reflect the requirements associated with particulate matter from a single asphalt processing and asphalt manufacturing processing step; the AWA Precoater. AWA Precoater Permit Condition 1 requires the permittee to limit their PM emissions to 0.08 pounds per ton of asphalt shingle or mineral-surfaced roll roofing produced or 0.08 pounds per ton of saturated felt or smooth-surfaced roll roofing produced. AWA Precoater Permit Condition 3 (for the exact same equipment) limits the permittee to 0.06 pound per ton of asphalt product manufactured.

In an effort to eliminate redundant emission limits, EPA recommends that MDNR refer to EPA's White Paper #2 **(White Paper Number 2 for Improved Implementation of the Part 70 Operating Permits Program; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards; March 5, 1996)** for guidance on "streamlining" multiple applicable requirements that apply to the same emission unit(s).

11.) Eleven (11) of the emission unit specific emission limitations permit conditions include baghouses as control devices for the processing equipment. Four (4) of these require the use of attachments D and H to record the inspection / maintenance / repairs / malfunctions and pressure drop respectively. The other seven (7) permit conditions require collection of the same information but do not include any reference to the attachments provided for data collection.

EPA recommends that MDNR consider modifying the monitoring and record keeping requirements associated with the baghouse collection devices so that all eleven (11) include the use of attachments D and H.

12.) Bradley Mills Permit Condition 1 and Bradley Mills Permit Condition 2 are included to capture the applicable requirements associated with 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO; Standards of Performance for Nonmetallic Mineral Processing Plants. Bradley Mills Permit Condition 1 and Bradley Mills Permit Condition 2 in the draft TAMKO operating permit have the identical regulatory citations.

Bradley Mills Permit Condition 1 includes an emission limitation such the permittee shall not cause to be discharged into the atmosphere from Bradley Mills #1 and #2 (EP2 and EP2A) any stack emissions which contain particulate matter in excess of 0.022 grains per dry standard cubic foot (0.05 grams per dry standard cubic meter). This PM emission limit is found in Table 2 to 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO for affected facilities with capture systems that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction after August 31, 1983 but before April 22, 2008. However, according to the TAMKO draft operating permit, Bradley Mill #1 and Bradley Mill #2 were constructed in 2009. Therefore, according to Table 2, the stack emission limit for affected facilities with capture systems that commence construction, modification or reconstruction on or after April 22, 2008 is 0.014 grains per dry standard cubic foot (0.032 grams per dry standard cubic meter).

Bradley Permit Condition 1 also includes a ***Monitoring/Record keeping:*** requirement where the permittee has calculated that they are always in compliance with this limitation. The calculations demonstrating compliance are in Attachment I. The requirement goes on to say that no additional monitoring, recordkeeping or reporting is required for the permit condition. However, if the emission limit for affected facilities that commence construction, modification or reconstruction on or after April 22, 2008, is substituted in Attachment I, the permittee may no longer always be in compliance.

Bradley Mills Permit Condition 2 includes an emission limitation such that the permittee shall not cause to be discharged into the atmosphere from Bradley Mills #1 and #2 (EP2 and EP2A) any stack emissions which exhibit greater than 7 percent opacity. This opacity emission limit is found in Table 2 to 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO for affected facilities with capture systems that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction after August 31, 1983 but before April 22, 2008. However, according to the TAMKO draft operating permit, Bradley Mill #1 and Bradley Mill #2 were constructed in 2009. Therefore, according to Table 2, the stack emission limit for affected facilities with capture systems that commence construction, modification or reconstruction on or after April 22, 2008 for opacity is not applicable (except for individual enclosed storage bins).

EPA strongly recommends that MDNR review the permit conditions included in the TAMKO draft operating permit associated with the Bradley Mills and correct as appropriate.

13.) Bradley Mills "OOO" Group Permit Condition 1 includes an emission limitation such that the permittee shall not cause to be discharged into the atmosphere from these emission units any fugitive emissions which exhibit greater than ten percent (10%) opacity. This opacity emission limit is found in Table 3 to 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO Fugitive Emission Limits for affected facilities that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction after August 31, 1983 but before April 22,2008. However, according to the TAMKO draft operating permit, Bradley Mill #1 and Bradley Mill #2 were constructed in 2009. Therefore, according to Table 3 the fugitive emission limit for affected facilities that commence construction, modification or reconstruction on or after April 22, 2008 is seven percent (7%) opacity.

EPA strongly recommends that MDNR review the permit conditions included in the TAMKO draft operating permit associated with the Bradley Mills and correct as appropriate

14.) The FGL Limestone Group portion of the emission unit specific emission limitation section of the TAMKO draft operating permit includes two (2) permit conditions titled FGL Limestone Group1 Permit Condition 2. Both permit conditions are written to control particulate matter and both involve the operating and monitoring of baghouses.

EPA recommends that MDNR review the potential of consolidating these two (2) permit conditions into a single permit condition. If consolidation is not possible, EPA recommends that MDNR rename / renumber one of the permit conditions.

15.) FGL Coater/Mixers Permit Condition 1, FGL Coaters/Mixers Permit Condition 2 and FGL Coaters/Mixers Permit Condition 3 are included in the draft TAMKO operating permit to reflect the requirements associated with particulate matter from a single asphalt processing and asphalt manufacturing processing step; the FGL Coater/Mixers. FGL Coater/Mixer Permit Condition 2 requires the permittee to limit their PM emissions to 0.08 pounds per ton of asphalt shingle or mineral-surfaced roll roofing produced or 0.08 pounds per ton of saturated felt or smooth-surfaced roll roofing produced. FGL Coater/Mixers Permit Condition 3 (for the exact same equipment) limits the permittee to 0.06 pound per ton of asphalt product manufactured.

In an effort to eliminate redundant emission limits, EPA recommends that MDNR refer to EPA's White Paper #2 **(White Paper Number 2 for Improved Implementation of the Part 70 Operating Permits Program; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards; March 5, 1996)** for guidance on "streamlining" multiple applicable requirements that apply to the same emission unit(s). Also, in emission limitation 2 in FGL Coater/Mixers Permit Condition 3, the word "shall," should be added between the words "permittee" and "operate."

16.) EP106 Permit Condition 3 on page 35 of the draft TAMKO operating permit is includes a citation to 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart A General Provision and Subpart UU Standards of Performance for Asphalt Processing and Asphalt Roofing Manufacture-Standards for Mineral Handling and Storage. Included on this citation is a footnote reference which says "pre 1983 installation therefore NSPS does not apply." If NSPS does not apply, then there is no reason to include a permit condition with emission limitations and monitoring and record keeping requirements.

EPA recommends that MDNR remove this permit condition and provide an explanation in the Statement of Basis describing why the NSPS does not apply to the Backing Silo System.

17.) CD31A Permit Condition 2 and EP106 Permit Condition 4 of the TAMKO draft operating permit are both included to provide limitations and controls of particulate matter from the Backing Silo System.

EPA recommends that MDNR review the potential of consolidating these two (2) permit conditions into a single permit condition.

18.) LRL Limestone Storage Tank Permit Condition 2 and CD16A Condition 3 of the TAMKO draft operating permit are both included to provide limitations and controls of particulate matter from the LRL Limestone Storage Tank system.

EPA recommends that MDNR review the potential of consolidating these two (2) permit conditions into a single permit condition.

19.) EP18 and EP19 Permit Condition 2 and (EP18 and EP19) Permit Condition 3 of the TAMKO draft operating permit are both included to provide limitations and controls of particulate matter from the LRL Limestone Heat Transfer Tank: LRL Limestone Surge Tank.

EPA recommends that MDNR review the potential of consolidating these two (2) permit conditions into a single permit condition.

20.) EP6C, EP6D, EP23C & EP23D Permit Condition 2 includes a control device operation limitation/emission limitation that allows the permittee to bypass the CVM Fume Control Device during periods of planned maintenance not exceeding 72 hours of duration as long as the opacity is not greater than zero percent (0%), except for one consecutive 15-minute period in any 24-hour period when maintenance is being performed on the control device. 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart UU does not authorize this by-passing of the control device.

EPA recommends that MDNR determine and list the authority for this by-pass allowance.

21.) EP13, EP13D Permit Condition includes a control device operation limitation/emission limitation that allows the permittee to bypass the CVM Fume Control Device during periods of planned maintenance not exceeding 72 hours of duration as long as the opacity is not greater than zero percent (0%), except for one consecutive 15-minute period in any 24-hour period when maintenance is being performed on the control device. 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart UU does not authorize this by-passing of the control device.

EPA recommends that MDNR determine and list the authority for this by-pass allowance.

22.) EP14A, EP120A Permit Condition includes a control device operation limitation/emission limitation that allows the permittee to bypass the CVM Fume Control Device during periods of planned maintenance not exceeding 72 hours of duration as long as the opacity is not greater than zero percent (0%), except for one consecutive 15-minute period in any 24-hour period when maintenance is being performed on the control device. 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart UU does not authorize this by-passing of the control device.

EPA recommends that MDNR determine and list the authority for this by-pass allowance.

23.) The recordkeeping section in Section IV. Endnotes References portion of the TAMKO draft operating permit (page 47) says "(c) You must maintain the records specified in paragraphs (c)(1) through (c)(10) of this section." In as much as all of the record keeping requirements are shown, EPA recommends that MDNR revise this introductory statement to: "Permittee shall maintain the records specified below." In addition, EPA recommends that MDNR make the following wording modifications within this section:

a) In item (1), eliminate the word "this" before the word subpart and add "AAAAAAA" after the word subpart;

b) In item (3)(iii) eliminate the word "this" before the word subpart and add AAAAAAA after the word subpart;

c) In item (4), eliminate the words "of this subpart and" after the words Table 4 and insert "(see below) after the words Table 4.

d) In item (10), eliminate the words "of this subpart" after the parenthetical (see below).

24.) The United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 is relocating their offices in October 2012. The TAMKO Part 70 operating permit is likely to be issued after the relocation and therefore EPA recommends that the draft permit be modified to reflect the new EPA address which will be: Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219.

25.) The TAMKO draft Part 70 operating permit on public notice for review indicates that the "Responsible Official" for this facility, at the time of permit issuance, is General Manager. 10 CSR 10-6.020 defines the "Responsible Official" to include one of the following:

A. The president, secretary, treasurer, or vice-president of a corporation in charge of a principal business function, any other person who performs similar policy and decision-making functions for the corporation, or a duly-authorized representative of this person if the representative is responsible for the overall operation of one (1) or more manufacturing, production, or operating facilities applying for or subject to a permit and either—

(I) The facilities employ more than two hundred fifty (250) persons or have a gross annual sales or expenditures exceeding twenty-five (25) million dollars (in second quarter 1980 dollars); or

(II) The delegation of authority to this representative is approved in advance by the permitting authority;

B. A general partner in a partnership or the proprietor in a sole proprietorship;

C. Either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official in a municipality or state, federal, or other public agency. For the purpose of this subparagraph, 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; or

D. The designated representative of an affected source insofar as actions, standards, requirements, or prohibitions under Title IV of the Act or the regulations promulgated under the Act is concerned and the designated representative for any other purposes under 40 CFR part 70.

Additionally, the definition section of 40 CFR 70.2 for *Responsible official* (1)(i) states that the "Plant Manager" may sign the compliance certification as a responsible official if "The delegation of authority to such representatives is approved in advance by the permitting authority". This delegation is further clarified in the Part 70 preamble on page 32275 of the July 21, 1992 *Federal Register*. It states: In the final rule, the definition of "responsible official" has been expanded to allow for delegation of authority to a plant manager where the delegation has been approved in advance by the permitting authority. The individual referred to as General Manager does not appear anywhere in the allowance for the "Responsible Official."

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR should include, in the statement of basis the preapproved authority for allowing the General Manager to serve as the facility "Responsible Official."

26.) The Statement of Basis in the TAMKO draft Part 70 operating permit includes a list of ***Permit Reference Documents.*** However, Factor Information Retrieval Systems (FIRE) is not listed, even though it is referenced in both attachments G and I.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR add the reference to FIRE to the list of references in the Statement of Basis.

27.) The Statement of Basis in the TAMKO draft Part 70 operating permit includes a section titled ***Construction Permit Revisions***. Item 2) indicates that APCP Construction Permit #0889-001 special conditions are contained in Permit Conditions (EP39 through EP41)-001 and 002. However, this draft permit does not contain any Permit Conditions (EP39 through EP41)-001 and 002. Additionally, Item 4) indicates that APCP Construction Permit #1096-020 special conditions are contained in Permit Condition (EP28B and EP28C)-001. However, this TAMKO draft permit does not include a Permit Condition (EP28B and EP28C)-001.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR revise their references to the construction permit special conditions to reflect the Permit Conditions in this draft operating permit.

28.) The Statement of Basis for the TAMKO draft Part 70 operating permit contains a section titled ***New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) Availability***. Item 1) a) discusses Bradley Mill #1 (EP2) and Bradley Mill #2 (EP2A) and provides the reasoning for the applicability of 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO, *Standards of Performance for Nonmetallic Mineral Processing Plants*. The Statement of Basis indicates Attachment I demonstrates that these units are in compliance with the particulate matter emission limitation. However, Attachment I uses the emission limits for affected facilities with capture systems that commenced construction, modification or reconstruction after August 31, 1983 but before April 22, 2008. The emission point descriptions for Bradley Mill #1 and Bradley Mill #2 included in the **Emission Units With Limitations** listing in Section I. of this draft permit shows a construction date of 2009. Stack emission limits for affected facilities with capture systems that commence construction, modification or reconstruction on or after April 22, 2008 are significantly less than those for affected facilities with capture systems that commenced construction, modification or reconstruction after August 31, 1983 but before April 22, 2008.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR review their Attachment I calculations using the correct emission limit and revise their discussion in the Statement of Basis accordingly.

29.) The Statement of Basis for the TAMKO draft Part 70 operating permit contains a section titled ***New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) Availability***. Item 2) b) says "FGL Granule/Headlap Tank (EP12), FGL Blender & Mineral Application (EP12A), and FGL Backing Run Tank (EP12B) emit through a common emission point (CD-12). EP12B is subject to the opacity requirements of Part 60 Subpart UU because it is a mineral (sand) storage tank constructed in 1984. EP12 and EP12A are not affected facilities under Part 60 Subpart UU. EP12 and EP12A are subject to the opacity limits of 10 CSR 10-6.220. Therefore, Permit Condition (EP12 through EP12B)-

001 was written such that EP12B must meet the more stringent requirements of Part 60 Subpart UU whenever EP12B is operating alone. Otherwise, the combined emissions of EP12, EP12A and EP12B shall meet the opacity requirements of 10 CSR 10-6.220." However, this TAMKO draft operating permit does not contain a Permit Condition (EP12 through EP12B)-001.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR modify this item in the Statement of Basis to include the appropriate permit condition reference.

30.) Statement of Basis for the TAMKO draft Part 70 operating permit includes a section titled ***National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS) Applicability***. MDNR has indicated there are "no issues" in this section. However, the draft permit includes four (4) emission unit specific emission limitations permit conditions citing 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart AAAAAAA—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Asphalt Processing and Asphalt Roofing Manufacturing. Additionally, section **IV. Endnote References** includes a Recordkeeping section which also cites 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart AAAAAAA—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Asphalt Processing and Asphalt Roofing Manufacturing.

EPA recommends MDNR review their Statement of Basis regarding national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESAHPS) and add appropriate explanation regarding the CVM #3 Device Group, AWA Precoater, Asphalt Coaters and LRL Coating Mixers.

31.) The Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM) Applicability section in the Statement of Basis indicates that 40 CFR Part 64 is not applicable because none of the pollutant-specific emission units uses a control device to achieve compliance with a relevant standard. This draft permit includes several control devices as well as referencing a "*Control Device Operating Procedures* and a *GACT Compliance Monitoring Plan.* There are several permit conditions that indicate the permittee shall control emissions using control devices particularly the Bradley Mills, which seem to contradict the Statement of Basis.

Also, item 4) c) in the Other Regulatory Determinations section of the Statement of Basis indicates that several emission units are in compliance with both the PM emission rate and the PM concentration provided that the required control devices are in operation and working properly.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR review whether or not compliance assurance monitoring is applicable.

32.) Item 4) a) in the **Other Regulatory Determinations** section of the Statement of Basis says 10 CSR 10-6.400 applies to Bradley Mills #1 and #2 (EP2 and EP2A); however, the particulate matter emission limitation established by Part 60 Subpart OOO (1.5 pounds per hour) is more stringent than the emission limit established by 10 CSR 10-6.400. The particulate matter limit established by Part 60 Subpart OOO is contained in Permit Condition (EP2 and EP50)-001. However, the draft operating permit does not include a Permit Condition (EP2 and EP50)-001.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR modify this item in the Statement of Basis to include the appropriate permit condition reference.

33.) The Statement of Basis includes a section on ***Greenhouse Gas Emissions*** and indicates TAMKO is required to report Greenhouse Gas Emission data directly to EPA. The section goes on to indicate that the public may obtain CO2 emissions data for this installation by visiting EPA's Clean Air Markets website. The Clean Air Markets website is for coal-fired electric generating units and not for Asphalt Processing and Asphalt Roofing Manufacturing.

Therefore, EPA recommends MDNR modify their Greenhouse Gas Emission information in the Statement of Basis.

34.) Item 7) in the **Other Regulatory Determinations** section of the Statement of Basis says "The following table demonstrates that the installation does not have the potential to exceed major source thresholds for Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAP).

Installation-Wide Potential to Emit Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs)

However, the only table that follows this statement is "Enclosure A, 10 CSR 10-6.400 Exemption Listing" which does not include anything related to HAPs.

Therefore, EPA recommends that MDNR revise the draft permit with the addition of the HAP table.

35.) MDNR has customarily included in the Statement of Basis a tabular listing of the sources regulated air pollutants and the potential to emit for each individual pollutant. However, the Statement of Basis reviewed in the TAMKO draft permit does not include the installation-wide potential-to~emit (PTE) table.

Therefore, EPA recommends MDNR consider adding a potential- to- emit table to the permit Statement of Basis.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide what we hope you will find to be constructive comments. If you have any questions, please contact Bob Cheever by phone at 913-551-7980 or email at cheever.robert@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Mark A. Smith
Air Permitting and Compliance Branch Chief
EPA Region 7

cc: Mike Stansfield – Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Randy Raymond, Missouri Department of Natural Resources