

**Technical Support Document for
NOC Approval Order No. 14AQ-C191 First Revision
Dirt Hugger
Dallesport, WA**

Prepared by: Ryan Vicente, PE

1.0 Project Summary

Dirt Hugger (herein referred to as ‘the Permittee’) is an existing compost facility in Dallesport. The facility is classified as a ‘synthetic minor 80% source’ with multiple emissions units and activities, both new and existing. This review is for: a facility expansion; an increase in permitted feedstock throughput (short and long term); approval of recent changes in compost process operations; and the permitting of four nonroad engines as stationary sources.

2.0 Application Processing

2.1 Public Notice

Receipt of the application was posted on Ecology’s Public Involvement Calendar from 10/18/16 through 11/2/16. No requests for a public comment period were received. However, public notice is required because the applicant submitted a petition for second-tier review under WAC 173-460-090.

2.2 Applicant Review

A draft of the order was sent to the Permittee on 5/9/19 for factual review. Comments were received from the Permittee on 5/15/19 via email, and on 5/21/19 in person. An updated modeling report was submitted on 5/31/19 to demonstrate compliance with for the requested changes to the order. Additional data was also submitted on 6/12/19, 7/15/19, and 7/18/19 to complete the application.

2.3 SEPA

A SEPA mitigated determination of non-significance (MDNS) was issued by the Klickitat County Health Department on 1/11/18 for the expansion.

3.0 Applicable Regulations

3.1 State Regulations

3.1.1 New Source Review Applicability

The unrestricted potential to emit (PTE) of the project exceeded the Table 110(5) exemption levels listed under WAC 173-400-110 for carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀), and VOC emissions. Therefore, the project is subject to new source review per WAC 173-400-110(2).

The unrestricted PTE of the project exceeded the de minimis emission values listed under WAC 173-460-150 for eleven toxic air pollutants (TAPs), as listed under Appendix A. Therefore, the project is subject to new source review per WAC 173-400-110(2) and WAC 173-460-040(1).

3.1.2 General Standards for Maximum Emissions

WAC 173-400-040(2) generally limits visible emissions from all sources to no more than three minutes of 20 percent opacity, in any one hour, of an air contaminant from any emissions unit. The standard applies to each of the compost processes (including stockpiling) and all four of the stationary-source diesel engines.

Condition 4.3.3 of the order restricts stationary engine emissions to 5% opacity. Meanwhile, Condition 4.3.4 states that visible emissions from both the stationary engines and composting processes are not allowed (0% opacity) at the property boundary.

3.1.3 Emission Standards for Combustion and Incineration Units

WAC 173-400-050(1) limits emissions of PM from combustion units to 0.10 grains per dry standard cubic foot (dscf) of exhaust gas. This standard applies to each of the four stationary engines. There was not sufficient emissions data submitted for the engines to evaluate particulate emissions in these units. However, I assume the emission units can comply with the standard, based on another recent project¹. If the engines cannot comply with Condition 4.3.3, the likelihood for compliance with this standard should be reevaluated.

WAC 173-400-050(2) limits emissions of total carbonyls from incinerators; the standard does not apply to this project, since there are no such proposed units.

3.1.4 Emission Standards for General Process Units

WAC 173-400-060 limits general process units to 0.10 grain/dscf of exhaust gas. Composting meets the WAC 173-400-030 definition of a general process unit, since it involves a combination of procedures for the purpose of causing a change in material by either chemical or physical means. Meanwhile, the definition excludes combustion from procedures which would trigger such categorization. Therefore, the standard applies only to composting. However, the standard was not included in the order, as compost emissions are unlikely to contain significant amounts of particulate matter.

¹ NOC Approval Order No. 19AQ-C234 for Sabey Data Center Properties; see corresponding TSD for the observations which lead to this assumption.

3.1.5 Emission Standards for Sources Emitting Hazardous Air Pollutants

No area source rules applicable to this source category are adopted by reference at WAC 173-400-075(6)(c)(i).

3.1.6 Standards of Performance for New Sources

By way of the adoption-by-reference specified at WAC 173-400-115(1)(a), Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 60 Subpart IIII applies to each of the stationary-source engines, as the regulation existed on January 24, 2018. The rule was last revised on July 7, 2016; therefore, requirements of the state-adopted version are equivalent to the current federal version (discussed below).

3.2 Federal Regulations

3.2.1 National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories

Title 40 CFR Part 63 Subpart ZZZZ (a.k.a. the 'RICE NESHAP') applies to each of the stationary-source engines. Condition 1 of the Order requires compliance with this regulation. However, each engine is also subject to the ICE NSPS (see below). Title 40 CFR §63.6590(c) specifies that the engines shall meet the requirements of the NESHAP by meeting the requirements of NSPS; therefore, no further requirements apply to the engines.

3.2.2 Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources

Title 40 CFR Part 60 Subpart IIII (a.k.a. the 'ICE NSPS') applies to each of the stationary-source engines. Condition 1 of the Order requires general compliance with Subpart IIII. The non-administrative requirements of the regulation are:

- Emission standards for the engines. These standards are the basis of the limits specified under Condition 4.3.3.
- A requirement to only use diesel fuel with a maximum sulfur content of 15 ppm (i.e. ultra-low sulfur diesel). This requirement is included as Condition 4.2.5.
- Monitoring requirements for diesel particulate filters, where equipped. These requirements are listed under Conditions 6.6.1-6.6.2.

4.0 Emissions

4.1 Emission Factors

For composting, I identified San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) 2010 'Compost VOC Emission Factors' report as containing the best available baseline VOC emission factor. The study presented the results of many compost source tests; the VOC emission factor was based on four of those tests. Three of the referenced source tests also contained data on NH₃ emissions; therefore, I averaged that

data to form an NH₃ emission factor. I found that two of the four tests listed in the SJVAPCD report also had sufficient data to calculate stockpile VOC and NH₃ emission factors.

Ecology then consulted with numerous air agencies, both within and outside of the state, as well as two compost-industry source testing experts regarding selected emission factors. This was an effort of multiple staff at Ecology from three different offices. Those discussions reinforced the use of the SJVAPCD-based emission factors as the best available data. Alternate emission factors were presented by the Permittee; however, those factors were not utilized¹. PM emissions from composting were not calculated, due to the size distribution and moisture content of the feedstock and compost (less likely to blow away).

For control efficiencies of compost pile emissions, one of the four tests listed in the SJVAPCD report presented data on the distribution of emissions during the compost processes. This information was utilized in the modeling of emissions from the facility. The referenced report also presented a VOC destruction efficiency related to application of a finished compost layer (pseudo biofilter) to piles. Finally, I also found sufficient data in the report to calculate an NH₃ destruction efficiency related to pseudo-biofilter application. These destruction efficiencies were applied to this project for traditional biofilter control, as I was unable to find acceptable alternative data.

The consultants could not identify emission factors specific to the stationary engines. Therefore, the applicable emission standards listed under 40 CFR Part 60 Subpart III were largely utilized for the CO, NO_x, PM, and VOC engine emissions (the VOC emission factor for the shredder was calculated by the consultant per Table 3.3-1 of AP-42 Chapter 3.3). The emission factors for SO₂ were calculated on a mass-balance basis, based on the sulfur content of ultra-low-sulfur diesel and the average heating value of diesel fuel. Generic stationary diesel-engine emissions factors for 19 TAP were taken from EPA's AP-42 Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, 5th Edition, Volume 1, Chapter 3.3, Table 3.3-2.

4.2 Best Available Control Technology | Best Available Control Technology for Toxics

The Permittee proposed use of positive aeration, frequent turning, and good operational practices as BACT/tBACT in their permit application. However, I think the starting point for BACT for this sector is enclosure of tipping activities, finished compost application to newly formed beds, minimized pile turning, and negative aeration of active emissions with traditional biofilter control. In any case a formal BACT analysis was not performed.

The Permittee proposed negative aeration and biofilter control to reduce emissions under Title V the applicability threshold for VOC. The Permittee also agreed to apply an unscreened finished compost cover to newly formed portions of the compost bed. I

¹ For detail concerning why the emission factors were rejected, see the "response to comments questions and requests.pdf" attachment in my 6/4/19 email to Pierce Louis.

accepted the emissions reductions corresponding to these practices as likely meeting or exceeding BACT for VOC and tBACT for NH₃. For this existing facility, discussions with the Permittee and other air jurisdictions indicated that enclosure may be cost prohibitive due to physical property constraints.

For the stationary engines, the consultant verified that each unit was manufactured according to the emissions standards specified by 40 CFR Part §60.4204. Ecology's permit engineer accepted uncontrolled emissions from the engines as likely meeting or exceeded tBACT for benzene, carbon monoxide, diesel particulate matter (DPM), naphthalene, and nitrogen dioxide.

4.3 Additional Voluntary Emission Controls

The Permittee proposed application of finished compost to the stockpile to help reduce site-wide VOC emissions below the Title V applicability threshold.

5.0 **Ambient Air Quality Standards**

5.1 Criteria Pollutants

Dispersion modeling to demonstrate compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality (NAAQS) was not conducted for this project because VOC is not a criteria air pollutant. While, under the right conditions, VOC is a precursor for ozone and secondary PM_{2.5} (criteria pollutants), this source's VOC emissions are not expected to contribute to NAAQS exceedances.

Modeling was required for CO, NO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ as those criteria pollutants are emitted above their respective criteria pollutant WAC 173-400-110 Table 110(5) exemption levels.

5.1.1 Modeling for CO and NO_x

The modeling conducted by the consultant demonstrated that estimated concentrations of will remain below the cause or contribute threshold values listed under Table 4a of WAC 173-400-113.

5.1.2 Modeling for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀

Due to an error in calculations, the consultant did not realize modeling was needed for particulate. Therefore, I used the modeling performed for DPM to estimate PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ concentrations, starting with the maximum modeled DPM annual concentration and the highest 24-hour DPM concentration. Since we direct that the PM emissions include hydrocarbons (they are assumed to condense and contribute to PM), the modeled concentration for each engine was independently scaled using the PM and VOC emission factors (NSPS emission standards for PM and hydrocarbons).

My analysis showed that maximum annual PM_{2.5}, 24-hour PM₁₀, and annual PM₁₀ emissions are not likely to exceed the cause or contribute values listed under Table 4a of WAC 173-400-113. Therefore, NAAQS demonstrations for PM₁₀ emissions and annual PM_{2.5} emissions aren't required per WAC 173-400-113(3).

The maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ emissions were over the Table 4a cause or contribute value. However, when I combined the calculated value with the background¹ value for the Dallesport area, the result was below the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Therefore, the emissions are not expected to contribute to a violation of that NAAQS.

5.2 Toxic Air Pollutants

As limited by the Order, emissions of 1,3-butadiene, acetaldehyde, acrolein, CO (as a TAP), dibenz[a,h]anthracene, formaldehyde, and naphthalene are below the small quantity emission rate (SQER) listed for each TAP under WAC 173-460-150. Therefore, modeling for those pollutants was not required.

Modeling was required for diesel particulate matter, NH₃, and NO₂, as those TAPs are emitted above their respective SQER values. The modeling demonstrated estimated concentrations of benzene and 1-hour NO₂ were below the acceptable source impact level (ASIL) concentrations listed for each TAP under WAC 173-460-150. The Permittee submitted a petition for second-tier review under WAC 173-460-090 for NH₃ and diesel particulate matter, as those emissions were modeled above their ASIL.

Ecology determined that the NH₃ and diesel particulate matter health risk in the area near the Permittee will not likely result in excessive risk or cause short- or long- term health effects. These findings are documented in the health impact analysis associated with the second-tier review petition.

¹ The background value was retrieved from the 'Background Concentrations 2014 - 2017' tool (<https://arcg.is/1jXmHH>) for Dallesport, accessed 7/19/19.

Appendix A – TAPs that Triggered Minor New Source Review

The table below lists the toxic air pollutants evaluated as part of this project; those emitted above the de minimis emission values listed under WAC 173-460-150 triggered review. The PTE for the four stationary engines and composting activities was calculated without operational limits and emissions control.

CAS No.	Pollutant	De Minimis Exceeded?
106-99-0	1,3-butadiene	yes
75-07-0	acetaldehyde	yes
107-02-8	acrolein	yes
7664-41-7	ammonia	yes
56-55-3	benz[a]anthracene	-
71-43-2	benzene	yes
50-32-8	benzo[a]pyrene	-
205-99-2	benzo[b]fluoranthene	-
207-08-9	benzo[k]fluoranthene	-
218-01-9	chrysene	-
630-08-0	CO	yes
53-70-3	dibenz[a,h]anthracene	yes
-	diesel engine exhaust, particulate	yes
50-00-0	formaldehyde	yes
193-39-5	indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	-
108-38-3	m-xylene	-
91-20-3	naphthalene	yes
10102-44-0	nitrogen dioxide	yes
95-47-6	o-xylene	-
115-07-1	propylene	-
106-42-3	p-xylene	-
7446-09-5	sulfur dioxide	-
108-88-3	toluene	-