July 7, 1999

Ms. Maria Zannes
President
Integrated Waste Services Association
1401 H Street, NW, Suite 220
Washington, DC 20005

Re: Applicability of Maximum Achievable Control Technology Standard Monitoring to Satisfy Title V Periodic or Compliance Assurance Monitoring

Dear Ms. Zannes:

This letter is in response to your letter, dated April 22, 1999, in which you seek our views on using monitoring contained in subparts Eb of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), part 60, and referenced in subpart Cb to satisfy title V periodic monitoring (40 CFR part 70) or compliance assurance monitoring (CAM) (40 CFR part 64) requirements for other applicable requirements under existing air pollution regulations, such as State implementation plans (SIP's). We understand that facility owners are now installing and operating monitoring that satisfies subpart Cb or Eb requirements before those emissions limitations become effective. Your question is whether you can expect that same monitoring to be adequate to show compliance with similar existing emissions limitations and can avoid having to provide additional monitoring to satisfy periodic monitoring or CAM requirements.

The monitoring requirements in subpart Eb are rigorous and specify use of continuous monitoring systems for opacity, for emissions of acid gases, organic gases, and nitrogen oxides, and for operational parameters that serve as surrogates for monitoring compliance particulate matter, dioxins and furans, and metals emissions limits. See generally 40 CFR, sections 60.58b and 60.38b. We expect that in most cases monitoring that complies with the requirements in subpart Eb will also provide the assurance of compliance required by part 70 or part 64 for other emissions limitations or standards for the same or similar pollutants. On the other hand, it is impossible for us to state definitively that monitoring that complies with subpart Eb requirements will provide adequate assurance of compliance for all other emissions limitations or standards. For example, a local or State agency may impose a volatile organic compounds (VOC) emissions limit, an emissions limit not directly addressed in subpart Eb. Whether the monitoring in subpart Eb alone is sufficient to satisfy part 70 or part 64 monitoring requirements for emissions

limitations not addressed in subpart Eb must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the permitting authority in the title V permit application review and approval process.

Factors to consider in making this evaluation include whether the other applicable requirements regulate the same or similar pollutants (e.g., metals other than cadmium, mercury, or lead). Other factors include whether different pollutant emission limitations share a common format (e.g., pounds per hour or parts per million) or can be converted easily to a common format (e.g., convert pounds per hour to tons per year). Applying monitoring required in subpart Eb to show compliance with an emission limitation for a pollutant whose emissions are related to those of a regulated pollutant may also be possible (e.g., using the carbon monoxide continuous emissions monitoring system for monitoring for compliance with a VOC emissions limit). Where possible, as determined through the permitting authority on a case-by-case basis, we fully support simplifying monitoring requirements for permits, including through the application of one monitoring approach for multiple emissions limitations of the same pollutant or dissimilar pollutants.

Should you have questions concerning this response, please contact Barrett Parker at (919) 541-5635.

Sincerely,

/s/

Steven J. Hitte
Group Leader
Operating Permits Group

cc: Zofia Kosim, OECA
Barrett Parker, OAQPS
Walt Stevenson, OAQPS
Peter Westlin, OAQPS
Title V Contacts, Regions I-X