SCHEDULED FOR ORAL ARGUMENT ON APRIL 17, 2017

Case No. 15-1381 (and consolidated cases)

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

State of North Dakota,

Petitioner,

v.

United States Environmental Protection Agency,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of Final Action of the
United States Environmental Protection Agency

Initial Brief for State Respondent-Intervenors in Support of Respondent by the States of California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawai'i, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington, the District of Columbia, and the City of New York

---

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
Attorney General of New York
BARBARA D. UNDERWOOD
Solicitor General
STEVEN C. WU
Deputy Solicitor General
BETHANY A. DAVIS NOLL
Assistant Solicitor General
MICHAEL J. MYERS
ANDREW G. FRANK
Assistant Attorneys General

MAURA HEALEY
Attorney General of Massachusetts
MELISSA A. HOFFER
CHRISTOPHE COURCHESNE
TRACY L. TRIPLETT
JILLIAN M. RILEY
Assistant Attorneys General

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
GAVIN G. MCCABE
DAVID A. ZONANA
Supervising Deputy Attorneys General
TIMOTHY E. SULLIVAN
JONATHAN WIENER
ELIZABETH B. RUMSEY
Deputy Attorneys General
1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 879-0987
Attorneys for the State of California, by and through Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., the California Air Resources Board, and Attorney General Kamala D. Harris

Additional counsel on signature pages

CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS, AND RELATED CASES

Pursuant to Circuit Rule 28(a)(1)(A), the undersigned State and Municipal Respondent-Intervenors adopt the certificate as to parties, rulings, and related cases in Respondent EPA's Brief.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

CCS	Carbon Capture and Storage
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
Enviro. Interv. Br.	Brief of Respondent-Intervenor Environmental and Public Health Organizations
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EPA Br.	Respondent EPA's Brief
EPAct	2005 Energy Policy Act
JA	Joint Appendix
Non-State Pet. Br.	Brief of Non-State Petitioners
Power Interv. Br.	Brief of Respondent-Intervenor Power Companies
State Pet. Br.	Brief of Petitioner West Virginia, et al.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The undersigned State and Municipal Respondent-Intervenors ("State Respondent-Intervenors") submit this brief in support of the Environmental Protection Agency's "Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units" ("Rule"). 80 Fed. Reg. 64,510 (Oct. 23, 2015). Power plants have been listed as an air pollution source category under section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act ("Act") since the 1970s, and they emit enormous quantities of carbon dioxide (CO_2), a greenhouse gas. EPA determined years ago that greenhouse gases endanger public health and welfare.[1] Thus, EPA is required to set performance standards for those emissions under section 111. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 7411(b); *see also Am. Electric Power Co. v. Connecticut*, 564 U.S. 410, 424 (2011) ("*AEP*") (discussing listing sources and establishing standards under section 111).

Our states are already experiencing harms from climate change, such as flooding from rising seas, increasingly severe storms, and prolonged droughts. Unless greenhouse gas emissions are significantly reduced,

[1] Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act, 74 Fed. Reg. 66,496 (Dec. 15, 2009), JA____.

climate change threatens to worsen these harms. Many State Respondent-Intervenors have already acted to reduce CO_2 emissions from existing and future power plants within their borders. For example, through the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, nine State Respondent-Intervenors limit these emissions under a trading program. Also, State Respondent-Intervenors California, Illinois, New York, Oregon, and Washington impose CO_2 emission limits on new fossil-fueled power plants that are even more stringent than the Rule. Further, half of the states in the country have established permitting and monitoring standards for carbon capture or storage or have provided regulatory or financial incentives to promote those technologies. California Comments, Exh. 6, EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0495-10881, JA___. Absent the meaningful federal regulation required by the Act, however, State Respondent-Intervenors' efforts to protect their citizens from the dangers of climate change may be frustrated by unnecessarily high emissions from new power plants built in other states.

In conformance with its statutory obligation, EPA's section 111(b) Rule will control these emissions for the benefit of the residents of all states. The Rule, which has now been in effect for over a year, sets numerical limits on CO_2 emissions from fossil-fuel fired power plants constructed after

January 8, 2014. The standard for new steam units (generally coal-fired power plants) is based on the amount of CO_2, per unit of electricity, that would be emitted by a new highly efficient plant capturing a portion of its CO_2 emissions for underground storage (i.e., partial carbon capture and storage, or "CCS").

All of the steps involved in CCS—capture of some CO_2 from a gas stream, transportation via pipeline, and permanent storage underground—have been demonstrated and are currently in use. CCS is already in full-scale, integrated operation in the energy and chemical industries. Given EPA's extensive record showing the availability of CCS, Petitioners' assertion that the Rule's standards are "impossibly high" for steam units is unfounded.[2] Indeed, outside of this proceeding, many State Petitioners appear to agree and assert that CCS is an established emission control system.[3] Finally, it is important to note that plants are not required to employ

[2] Petitioners are not challenging EPA's conclusion that the emission limit for gas-fired power plants is achievable.

[3] State CO_2-EOR Deployment Workgroup, *Putting the Puzzle Together: State & Federal Policy Drivers for Growing America's Carbon Capture & CO_2-EOR Industry* (Dec. 2016) 7, 24, 27, *available at* http://www.betterenergy.org/sites/default/files/PolicyDriversCO2_EOR_0.pdf.

CCS, but may instead choose to meet the standard through other cost-effective measures analyzed by EPA, such as co-firing with natural gas or employing integrated gasification.

ISSUES PRESENTED, STATUTES, AND REGULATIONS

The issues presented are set forth in EPA's brief. Except for the regulation in the Addendum, all applicable statutes and regulations are attached to EPA's brief.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

State Respondent-Intervenors adopt EPA's Statement of the Case and emphasize the following:

State Respondent-Intervenors have pursued more than a decade of litigation and regulatory efforts to limit CO_2 emissions. For instance, certain State Respondent-Intervenors' lawsuit to compel EPA to limit greenhouse gas emissions led the Supreme Court to rule that EPA was obliged "to regulate emissions of the deleterious pollutant" if it found that the emissions endanger public health or welfare. *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497, 528-29, 533 (2007). EPA subsequently found that greenhouse gases, including CO_2, endanger public health and welfare by causing more intense, frequent, and long-lasting heat waves; worse smog in cities; longer and more severe droughts; more intense storms, hurricanes, and floods; the spread of

disease; and a rise in sea levels. 74 Fed. Reg. at 66,497, 66,524-25, 66,532-33, JA____, ____, ____.

While *Massachusetts* was still pending, in the *AEP* case certain State Respondent-Intervenors also brought common law public nuisance claims directly against power plants, seeking reductions in the CO_2 pollution that was harming the health and welfare of their citizens. 564 U.S. at 418. When *AEP* reached the Supreme Court (after *Massachusetts*), the Court held that the Act "directly" authorized EPA to regulate CO_2 from power plants under section 111. *Id.* at 424.

In the seven years since EPA found that greenhouse gas pollution endangers public health and welfare, the evidence that these emissions harm this nation's people—including particularly vulnerable populations—has only grown stronger. 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,517-22 (detailing more recent evidence of effects of greenhouse gas emissions), JA____; California Comments, Exhs. 1 & 2, JA____-____; New York, et al. Comments, 2-4, EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0495-9660, JA____-____. While many states have made substantial progress in curbing greenhouse gas emissions, this progress does not render federal action unnecessary.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

After analyzing an exhaustive technical record, EPA appropriately determined that CCS was the best system of emission reduction for CO_2 pollution from steam units that has been adequately demonstrated. Petitioners lack support for their claim that a new source standard can be based only on technology found at facilities that never received any public economic support. Indeed, this unfounded claim appears designed solely to preclude EPA from considering the successful integration of CCS at the Boundary Dam steam unit. Similarly baseless is Petitioners' argument that EPA must ignore emission controls unless they are now available for purchase as a single package. Nor does the possibility that the cost of CCS will vary across the country distinguish the Rule from previous section 111(b) standards applied to steam units or preclude EPA's economically reasonable standard here. The Rule is a valid, careful, and necessary exercise of EPA's mandate in section 111(b) to regulate harmful CO_2 emissions from new sources.[4]

[4] State Respondent-Intervenors also support the Rule's standards for modified and reconstructed steam units. *See* EPA Br. 92-101.

ARGUMENT

I. PETITIONERS' UNPRECEDENTED INTERPRETATION OF SECTION 111 SHOULD BE REJECTED.

Section 111(b) directs EPA to establish "standards of performance" for air pollutants emitted from new sources, including CO_2 emitted by power plants. *See AEP*, 564 U.S. at 424. In setting those standards, EPA first must "identify the emission levels that are 'achievable' with 'adequately demonstrated technology.'" *Sierra Club v. Costle*, 657 F.2d 298, 330 (D.C. Cir. 1981). Next, EPA must "choose an achievable emission level which represents the best balance of economic, environmental, and energy considerations." *Id.* This balancing includes "consideration of technological innovation." *Id.* at 346-47. Section 111(b) is forward-looking, and resulting standards need not be constrained by the current state of the art. *Portland Cement Ass'n v. Ruckelshaus*, 486 F.2d 375, 391 (D.C. Cir. 1973).

During the more than four decades EPA has applied section 111(b) to control power plant pollution, courts have never adopted the constricted view of the Act Petitioners seek here. Section 111(b) requires "achievable" results based on "adequately demonstrated" controls. Petitioners' attempt to rewrite the Act so that it would instead authorize limits based only on those

practices already developed at steam units, solely through private investment, must be rejected.

A. Petitioners' Proposal to Limit "Adequately Demonstrated" Systems to Those Used at Facilities Funded Solely by Private Commercial Investment Is Contrary to the Purposes of Section 111 and Decades of Precedent.

According to Petitioners, if a facility has ever been supported by public funding or incentives (from any level of government), technology used there is not "commercially available"—a new legal standard invented by Petitioners—and it therefore cannot be considered "adequately demonstrated." State Pet. Br. 16, 27. This interpretation is not supported by statutory text or this Court's decisions.

When Congress added section 111(b) to the Act in 1970, its intent was to ensure "that new plants be controlled to the 'maximum possible degree.'" *Essex Chemical Corp. v. Ruckelshaus*, 486 F.2d 427, 437 (D.C. Cir. 1973) (quoting legislative history). Congress did not intend that EPA should look only to the status quo in determining which systems have been "adequately demonstrated" for the control of emissions by future sources. Instead, EPA may "hold the industry to a standard of improved design and operational advances, so long as there is substantial evidence that such improvements are feasible." *Sierra Club*, 657 F.2d at 364. Thus, when EPA issued

standards that "postpone[d] the time when the best technology must be employed and at best maintain[ed] the present level of emissions," this Court rejected the rule as too lenient on the ground that it "would undercut Section 111." *ASARCO Inc. v. EPA*, 578 F.2d 319, 328 (D.C. Cir. 1978).

Petitioners ask the Court to disregard Congress's intent that EPA require maximum possible controls on new sources and to instead apply their new criterion: when developing a section 111(b) performance standard, EPA may only consider emission control systems already in use at facilities that have never received any form of public economic support. State Pet. Br. 16, 27. This argument appears aimed at forbidding EPA from considering the successful use of fully integrated CCS at the Boundary Dam coal-fired power plant in Canada. Given the robust record of adequate demonstration of CCS at Boundary Dam (EPA Br. 20-26), Petitioners appear to realize that the success of Boundary Dam alone is fatal to their case.

There is no statutory basis to restrict EPA in this way. Granted, when Congress provided money to promote the use of CCS in the 2005 Energy Policy Act ("EPAct"), it placed a narrow limitation on the conclusion that could be drawn from the success of domestic facilities receiving those U.S. government funds. EPA Br. 51-56. But Petitioners ask the Court to apply a

much broader restriction to what is "adequately demonstrated," requiring EPA to categorically exclude any technology in use at any facility—not just power plants—that has received any sort of public financial support. Petitioners do not argue that their new restriction originates in the text of EPAct, but instead that it has always silently existed in section 111 and that EPAct only confirmed it, "if anything." State Pet. Br. 16. This interpretation is contrary to Congress's intent to limit harmful emissions from new sources to the maximum possible degree, and to encourage the development and deployment of new technology, and Petitioners cite no authority supporting their novel proposition.

Given the ubiquity of subsidies from federal and state governments, Petitioners' interpretation could extend well beyond this case to hamstring EPA's ability to use section 111 to achieve emission reductions from new and existing sources. For example, municipal solid waste landfills—often owned by public utilities—have historically received a variety of state tax credits and other incentives to capture methane and other gases, leading to

controls that have long formed the basis of the best system of emission reduction for that source category.[5]

Moreover, Petitioners' new interpretation would limit the benefits of state efforts to support emerging control measures, thus reducing opportunities for federal action to amplify the benefits of successful state innovation. For example, state efforts to achieve greater use of CCS through tax exemptions and financial assistance[6] can lead to much greater climate benefits if those technologies ultimately inform nationwide standards. Petitioners' new test of "commercial availability" would diminish the value of these state efforts. Petitioners provide no reason to believe that Congress intended this perverse result.

B. The Act Does Not Limit "Adequately Demonstrated" to Fully Integrated Systems Currently on the Shelf.

Petitioners ask the Court to impose another artificial and unsupported condition on EPA's determination of the best system of emission reduction:

---

[5] *See* 40 C.F.R. pt. 60, subpt. WWW (2016); Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, 81 Fed. Reg. 59,332 (Aug. 29, 2016) (to be codified at 40 C.F.R. § 60.760).

[6] Petitioner States Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and West Virginia, and Respondent-Intervenor States Illinois and Iowa, offer incentives to boost CCS technology. California Comments, Exh. 6, JA____-____.

only technology that is available for purchase as an "integrated system" may be considered. Non-State Pet. Br. 22; State Pet. Br. 3, 18. But that argument is based on the misleading premise that EPA had no evidence of an integrated system before it. In fact, EPA relied on the Boundary Dam steam unit's integration of all of the components of CCS. EPA Br. 40. There, post-combustion capture has been applied, and saline storage is used as a back-up to storage via enhanced oil recovery. EPA Br. 20-26. In addition, EPA appropriately relied on evidence showing that the technology supporting each step in the CCS process has been adequately demonstrated at power plants and in other industries that EPA concluded were comparable. *See* EPA Br. 26-33.

EPA's approach here is consistent with this Court's previous interpretations of section 111(b). From the early days of the Act, the Court has "reject[ed] the suggestion of [industry] that the Act's requirement that emission limitations be 'adequately demonstrated' necessarily implies that any . . . plant now in existence be able to meet the proposed standards." *Portland Cement Ass'n*, 486 F.2d at 391. In *Sierra Club v. Costle*, electric utilities claimed that EPA had failed to show its section 111 particulate standard was achievable because the performance of small-scale plants was

not representative of full-scale utilities. Rejecting that argument, this Court determined that EPA acted reasonably in concluding that the control technology could be scaled up to full-sized utilities. *Sierra Club*, 657 F.2d at 381-82. Similarly, in *Lignite Energy Council v. EPA*, 198 F.3d 930, 933-34 (D.C. Cir. 1990), this Court held that EPA reasonably set a performance standard for coal-fired industrial boilers by extrapolating from the performance of technology used on utility boilers. The absence of data for industrial boilers was "not surprising" because of the newness of the technology; as such, EPA could compensate for the lack of data by using other qualitative methods, "including the reasonable extrapolation of a technology's performance in other industries." *Id.* at 934.

Despite this precedent, Petitioners nonetheless argue that EPA must ignore evidence from any existing source that employs fewer than each and every step in CCS, and they attempt to obscure the sequential nature of CCS. Non-State Pet. Br. 23. But the record EPA relies on shows that each of the *sequential* steps in CCS is adequately demonstrated: carbon can be separated from a coal-fired emission stream, it can then be compressed and transported long distances via pipeline, and it can then safely be stored underground in geological formations. 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,548-51, 64,575-88, JA____, ____.

In fact, CCS is substantially analogous to the decades-old sequence of sulfur dioxide controls section 111 has required at coal-fired power plants: sulfur is captured from the emission stream by a scrubber, the sludge generated by the scrubber is collected and then transported off-site, and it is ultimately disposed of elsewhere. *See Essex Chemical*, 486 F.2d at 440-41 (describing sludge disposal resulting from sulfur dioxide controls); 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,555, JA____ (describing components of control technologies for other pollutants at steam units).

And, significantly, the Boundary Dam coal-fired plant has successfully integrated *all* of these steps, disproving Petitioners' assertion that such integration is purely speculative. EPA was not required to do more.

C. CCS Technology Is Adequately Demonstrated to Control CO_2 Emissions.

EPA reasonably concluded that CCS is adequately demonstrated to control CO_2 emissions and that the Rule's standard is achievable. (EPA Br. 20-51, 57-64; Enviro. Interv. Br. 2-9, 11-15.) The actions of numerous states, Petitioners among them, support EPA's determination that CCS is a demonstrated system of emission reduction and not mere "'crystal ball' speculation." Non-State Pet. Br. 65. Over the last 15 years, at least 25 states, including many Petitioner States, have adopted laws that encourage and

accommodate CCS. These state actions include permitting and monitoring rules, recognition of renewable energy credits for power plants using CCS, and allowance of cost recovery from ratepayers for deployment of CCS. California Comments, Exhs. 6 & 7, JA____-____. In contrast to their briefing to this Court, elsewhere many State Petitioners are actively vouching for the soundness of CCS. Earlier this month Petitioner States Montana and Wyoming released a report (on behalf of a workgroup of 14 states, 10 of them Petitioners) promoting the use of CCS for enhanced oil recovery, explaining that, "we have nearly a half century of successful commercial-scale carbon capture technology deployment to build on that spans myriad industry sectors" and that "vast" underground capacity exists to store CO_2.[7]

[7] State CO_2-EOR Deployment Workgroup, *supra* note 3, at 7, 24, 27 ("Contrary to common misconceptions, carbon capture is not a new technology . . . . Actually, carbon capture has been commercially deployed for decades and is widespread in certain industrial sectors.").

II. THE RULE IS VALID EVEN IF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF MEETING THE STANDARD WILL VARY DEPENDING ON THE LOCATION OF THE NEW STEAM UNIT.

Petitioners argue that the Rule is invalid because a new steam unit choosing to meet the performance standard by using CCS would find doing so more difficult in those few areas of the country without known CO_2 storage capacity, from which the CO_2 would have to be piped relatively longer distances. State Pet. Br. 28-29. Petitioners greatly overstate the difficulty of finding CO_2 storage capacity. EPA Br. 31-34. Further, the existence of geographical siting constraints that impact costs does not distinguish the Rule's standard from other valid performance standards for the energy sector EPA has issued in past decades.

A. The History of the Act and This Court's Precedent Allow a Power Plant Emission Standard That May Be More Expensive to Meet in Some Locations Than Others.

The new principle Petitioners purport to find in section 111(b), mandating that any performance standard provide steam plants an equal economic opportunity everywhere in the country, does not exist. Petitioners suggest that because a section 111(b) new source standard is applicable "nationwide" it can only be based on controls that would have the same economic effect on sources everywhere. State Pet. Br. 28; Non-State Pet. Br. 27. But section 111(b) was not intended to equalize compliance costs

nationwide so as to ensure that new sources could be built and operated in every conceivable location in the country for the same price. Instead, Congress designed section 111(b) so as to prevent states with cleaner air from using that to gain an advantage over other states and thereby allowing their own air quality to deteriorate. *ASARCO*, 578 F.2d at 328 n.25 (explaining that Congress sought to dis-incentivize "states with presently low levels of pollution [from] adopting lenient State Implementation Plans to attract industry until pollution reached the national limits" and to prevent industry from "forum shopping" on that basis). That is, Congress knew that section 111(b) standards would influence geographical patterns of industrial development.

From its inception, section 111(b) has allowed EPA to set emission standards that affect the relative cost of operating a new power plant in different areas of the country. *See Sierra Club*, 657 F.2d at 339 (discussing changes in economic incentives in different regions of the country due to evolution of section 111(b) controls on new coal plants); *Alliance for Clean Coal v. Miller*, 44 F.3d 591, 593 (7th Cir. 1995) (same). Congress has been fully aware that section 111(b) performance standards set by EPA affect economic incentives for where plants are built and what fuel they burn.

As Congress directed, EPA took costs into consideration in setting these standards. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(1). EPA performed this analysis and determined that the costs of meeting the standard will be reasonable and that the Rule will not cause adverse economic impacts. EPA Br. 65-76; 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,558-73, 64,592-94, JA____, ____. The Act has always allowed for the possibility that the costs associated with the transition to new, lower-polluting sources may vary, but it requires the transition nonetheless when necessary to protect public health and welfare.

B. Scarcity of Identified Storage Capacity in Certain Areas Does Not Require Invalidation of the Rule.

Petitioners purport to represent the interests of those eleven states that have no currently proven geological storage capacity for CO_2, claiming that those states may be at a competitive disadvantage in attracting new development. Non-State Pet. Br. 27; State Pet. Br. 28. But eight of those states have joined this brief in support of the Rule. Our states recognize that, as the record shows, in the event that an electricity supplier chooses to meet future demand by building a new steam unit, the captured CO_2 can be sent out of state for storage; alternatively, economically reasonable compliance options besides CCS are available, such as co-firing with gas or employing integrated gasification. 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,545, JA____.

Wisconsin is the only one of those eleven states lacking known storage capacity that opposes the Rule here, asserting that it has no sites for future coal plants. But Wisconsin has no coal resources itself.[8] A future developer of new electricity in Wisconsin thus has several options and would naturally evaluate whether it was more economical to first ship coal into the state for burning and then ship CO_2 back out for storage, or to co-fire the coal plant with gas to meet the standard, or to build a plant that is not powered by coal. These are the same choices that would be faced by a developer in the eight Respondent-Intervenor States lacking known storage capacity, and they are similar to location-specific considerations power plant developers always face. *See* Power Interv. Br. 17-18. The Rule is not an unusual application of section 111(b) just because it may affect the economic considerations of future developers.

[8] U.S. Energy Information Administration, State Energy Data 2014: Production, Table P2: Energy Production Estimates in Trillion Btu, 2014, https://www.eia.gov/state/seds/sep_prod/pdf/P2.pdf.

C. Petitioners' Proposed "Clear Statement" Rule Does Not Require Adoption of Their Unfounded Interpretation of Section 111.

Unable to overcome the showing of adequate demonstration in EPA's record, Petitioners attempt to give their challenge a constitutional dimension. Petitioners say that, under *Bond v. United States*, 134 S. Ct. 2077 (2014), the Court must interpret any ambiguity (which they do not identify) in the Act so that EPA is authorized to base a standard only on technology that is "commercially available" (as Petitioners perceive it). Otherwise, Petitioners argue, the Rule would infringe on states' authority over energy generation, which they say would require a clear statement from Congress.

Bond has no bearing on this case. It simply sets out a principle of statutory interpretation: "it is appropriate to refer to basic principles of federalism embodied in the Constitution to resolve ambiguity in a federal statute." *Bond*, 134 S. Ct. at 2090. The facts of *Bond* are unusual and wholly inapplicable to the Rule. In *Bond*, the federal government argued that the ambiguous term "chemical weapon," contained in a law implementing an international treaty, applied to a woman who caused a minor chemical burn on the thumb of her husband's lover. *Id.* at 2083. Because Congress had not "clearly indicated" in that statute that it intended to reach such an

"unremarkable local offense" (*id.*), the Court refused to interpret the term "chemical weapon" so broadly, as doing so would "intrude[] on the police power of the States" (*id.* at 2090).

Unlike the situation in *Bond*, Petitioners here have identified no alleged ambiguous statutory language in section 111. And, even if there were some relevant ambiguity, the Rule does not intrude into a traditional area of exclusive state control. Power plant emissions have been subject to federal environmental laws and other requirements for decades. *AEP*, 564 U.S. at 424; *cf. FERC. v. Elec. Power Supply Ass'n*, 136 S. Ct. 760, 776 (2016), *as revised* (Jan. 28, 2016) (noting that federally regulated wholesale electricity markets and state-regulated retail electricity market "are not hermetically sealed from each other"); *Oneok, Inc. v. Learjet, Inc.*, 135 S. Ct. 1591, 1601 (2015) ("platonic ideal" of "clear division between areas of state and federal authority in natural-gas regulation" does not exist). Indeed, it is Petitioners' interpretation of the Act that would upset basic, well-established principles of cooperative federalism by preventing EPA from setting minimum national emission standards for new power plants. *See*, *e.g.*, *EPA v. EME Homer City Generation, L.P.*, 134 S. Ct. 1584, 1593-94 (2014) (describing interstate pollution controls under the Act).

Plainly, Congress intended that plant location and fuel choice could be influenced by new source standards. *See supra* II.A.; *see also Train v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 421 U.S. 60, 64 (1975) (explaining that Congress reacted to the "disappointing" progress of states' air pollution control efforts by amending the Act in 1970, which "sharply increased federal authority and responsibility in the continuing effort to combat air pollution"); *ASARCO*, 578 F.2d at 321. Here, the effect is modest: the Rule does not prohibit coal-fired plants, and plants can choose to meet the standard by using means other than CCS. In this way, the Rule is an ordinary application of section 111(b) authorized by Congress long ago. *See Am. Farm Bureau Fed'n v. EPA*, 792 F.3d 281, 304 (3d Cir. 2015) (cautioning that "once an agency is operating in the weeds of a statute that obviously requires federal oversight of some state functions, we will not require subordinate clear statements of congressional intent every time an interpretation arguably varies the usual balance of responsibilities between federal and state sovereigns"), *cert. denied*, 136 S. Ct. 1246 (2016). The Court should reject Petitioners' attempt to create a constitutional dilemma out of a statutory provision that has been applied and interpreted to allow regulation of power plant emissions for over four decades.

CONCLUSION

The petitions for review must be denied.

Dated: December 21, 2016

Respectfully Submitted,

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
Attorney General of New York
BARBARA UNDERWOOD
Solicitor General
STEVEN C. WU
Deputy Solicitor General
BETHANY A. DAVIS NOLL
Assistant Solicitor General
MICHAEL J. MYERS
ANDREW G. FRANK
Assistant Attorneys General
Environmental Protection Bureau
The Capitol
Albany, NY 12224
(518) 776-2392

MAURA HEALEY
Attorney General of Massachusetts
MELISSA A. HOFFER
CHRISTOPHE COURCHESNE
TRACY L. TRIPLETT
JILLIAN M. RILEY
Assistant Attorneys General
Environmental Protection Division
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 963-2423

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
ROBERT W. BYRNE
SALLY MAGNANI
Senior Assistant Attorneys General
GAVIN G. MCCABE
DAVID A. ZONANA
Supervising Deputy Attorneys General

/s/ Timothy E. Sullivan
TIMOTHY E. SULLIVAN
JONATHAN WIENER
ELIZABETH B. RUMSEY
Deputy Attorneys General
Attorneys for the State of California, by and through Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., the California Air Resources Board, and Attorney General Kamala D. Harris
Office of the Attorney General
1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor
P.O. Box 70550
Oakland, CA 94612-0550
(510) 879-0987
Timothy.Sullivan@doj.ca.gov

GEORGE JEPSEN
Attorney General of Connecticut
MATTHEW I. LEVINE
KIRSTEN S. P. RIGNEY
SCOTT N. KOSCHWITZ
Assistant Attorneys General
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 120, 55 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06141-0120
(860) 808-5250

MATTHEW P. DENN
Attorney General of Delaware
VALERIE S. EDGE
Deputy Attorney General
Delaware Department of Justice
102 West Water Street, 3d Floor
Dover, DE 19904
(302) 739-4636

DOUGLAS S. CHIN
Attorney General of Hawai‘i
HEIDI M. RIAN
WILLIAM F. COOPER
Deputy Attorneys General
333 Queen Street, Rm. 905
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 586-4070

LISA MADIGAN
Attorney General of Illinois
MATTHEW J. DUNN
GERALD T. KARR
JAMES P. GIGNAC
Assistant Attorneys General
69 W. Washington St., 18th Floor
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 814-0660

TOM MILLER
Attorney General of Iowa
JACOB LARSON
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Law Division
Hoover State Office Building
1305 E. Walnut St., 2nd Floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
(515) 281-5341

JANET T. MILLS
Attorney General of Maine
GERALD D. REID
Assistant Attorney General
Chief, Natural Resources Division
6 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 626-8800

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General of Maryland
ROBERTA R. JAMES
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Maryland Department of the Environment
1800 Washington Blvd.
Baltimore, MD 21230
(410) 537-3748
Attorneys for State of Maryland, by and through Attorney General Brian E. Frosh

LORI SWANSON
Attorney General of Minnesota
KAREN D. OLSON
Deputy Attorney General
MAX KIELEY
Assistant Attorney General
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 900
St. Paul, MN 55101-2127
(651) 757-1244
Attorneys for State of Minnesota, by and through the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

JOSEPH A. FOSTER
Attorney General of New Hampshire
K. ALLEN BROOKS
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Chief, Environmental Bureau
33 Capitol Street
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 271-3679

HECTOR BALDERAS
Attorney General of New Mexico
JOSEPH YAR (admission pending)
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
408 Galisteo Street
Villagra Building
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 827-6000

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
Attorney General of Oregon
PAUL GARRAHAN
Attorney-in-Charge
Natural Resources Section
Oregon Department of Justice
1162 Court Street NE
Salem, OR 97301-4096
(503) 947-4593

PETER F. KILMARTIN
Attorney General of Rhode Island
GREGORY S. SCHULTZ
Special Assistant Attorney General
Rhode Island Department of Attorney General
150 South Main Street
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 274-4400

WILLIAM H. SORRELL
Attorney General of Vermont
NICHOLAS F. PERSAMPIERI
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
109 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05609-1001
(802) 828-6902

MARK HERRING
Attorney General of Virginia
JOHN W. DANIEL, II
Deputy Attorney General
DONALD D. ANDERSON
Senior Assistant Attorney General
and Chief
MATTHEW L. GOOCH
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Section
Office of the Attorney General
900 East Main Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 225-3193

ROBERT W. FERGUSON
Attorney General of Washington
KATHARINE G. SHIREY
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 40117
Olympia, WA 98504-0117
(360) 586-6769

KARL A. RACINE
Attorney General for the District
of Columbia
JAMES C. MCKAY, JR.
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General for
the District of Columbia
441 Fourth Street, NW
Suite 630 South
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 724-5690

ZACHARY W. CARTER
Corporation Counsel of the City of
New York
CARRIE NOTEBOOM
Senior Counsel
New York City Law Department
100 Church Street
New York, NY 10007
(212) 356-2319

OK2015950030
90734718.docx

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that the Brief for State Respondent-Intervenors in Support of Respondent, dated December 21, 2016, complies with the type-volume limitations of Rule 32 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, this Court's Circuit Rules, and this Court's briefing order issued on August 30, 2016, which limited the briefs for Respondent-Intervenors to a total of 13,300 words in no more than three briefs. I certify that this brief contains 4,386 words, as counted by the Microsoft Word software used to produce this brief, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(7)(B)(iii) and Circuit Rule 32(a)(1), and that when combined with the word court of the other Respondent-Intervenors, the total does not exceed 13,300 words.

/s/ Timothy E. Sullivan
TIMOTHY E. SULLIVAN

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Brief for State Respondent-Intervenors in Support of Respondent was filed on December 21, 2016, using the Court's CM/ECF system, and that, therefore, service was accomplished upon counsel of record by the Court's system.

/s/ Timothy E. Sullivan
TIMOTHY E. SULLIVAN

ADDENDUM

1. 40 C.F.R. pt. 60, subpt. WWW (2016)

(1) For months of compliance, semiannual reports to the Administrator stating that the affected coating operation was in compliance for each 1-month period; and

(2) For months of noncompliance, quarterly reports to the Administrator documenting the 1-month amount of VOC contained in the coatings, the 1-month amount of VOC recovered, and the percent emission reduction for each month.

(f) Each owner or operator of an affected coating operation, either by itself or with associated coating mix preparation equipment, shall submit the following with the reports required under paragraphs (d) and (e) of this section:

(1) All periods during actual mixing or coating operations when a required monitoring device (if any) was malfunctioning or not operating; and

(2) All periods during actual mixing or coating operations when the control device was malfunctioning or not operating.

(g) The reports required under paragraphs (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall be postmarked within 30 days of the end of the reporting period.

(h) Records required in § 60.747 must be retained for at least 2 years.

(i) The requirements of this section remain in force until and unless 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 States. In this event, affected sources within the State will be relieved of the obligation to comply with this subsection, provided that they comply with the requirements established by the State.

§ 60.748 Delegation of authority.

(a) In delegating implementation and enforcement authority to a State under section 111(c) of the Act, the authorities contained in paragraph (b) of this section shall be retained by the Administrator and not transferred to a State.

(b) Authorities that will not be delegated to States: §§ 60.743(a)(3)(v) (A) and (B); 60.743(e); 60.745(a); 60.746.

Subpart WWW—Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills

SOURCE: 61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, unless otherwise noted.

§ 60.750 Applicability, designation of affected facility, and delegation of authority.

(a) The provisions of this subpart apply to each municipal solid waste landfill that commenced construction, reconstruction or modification on or after May 30, 1991. Physical or operational changes made to an existing MSW landfill solely to comply with subpart Cc of this part are not considered construction, reconstruction, or modification for the purposes of this section.

(b) The following authorities shall be retained by the Administrator and not transferred to the State: § 60.754(a)(5).

(c) Activities required by or conducted pursuant to a CERCLA, RCRA, or State remedial action are not considered construction, reconstruction, or modification for purposes of this subpart.

[61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 32750, June 16, 1998]

§ 60.751 Definitions.

As used in this subpart, all terms not defined herein shall 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 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 § 60.752(b)(2)(i).

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.

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).

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 title. 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.

Modification means an increase in the permitted volume design capacity of the landfill by either horizontal or vertical expansion based on its permitted design capacity as of May 30, 1991. Modification does not occur until the owner or operator commences construction on the horizontal 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 § 60.754.

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.

Sludge means any solid, semisolid, or liquid waste generated from a municipal, commercial, or industrial wastewater treatment plant, water supply treatment plant, or air pollution control facility, exclusive of the treated effluent from a wastewater treatment plant.

Solid waste means any garbage, sludge from a wastewater treatment plant, water supply treatment plant, or air pollution control facility and other discarded material, including solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gaseous material resulting from industrial, commercial, mining, and agricultural operations, and from community activities, but does not include solid or dissolved material in domestic sewage, or solid or dissolved materials in irrigation return flows or industrial discharges that are point sources subject to permits under 33 U.S.C. 1342, or source, special nuclear, or by-product material as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C 2011 *et seq.*).

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.

[61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 32750, June 16, 1998; 64 FR 9262, Feb. 24, 1999]

§ 60.752 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 shall submit an initial design capacity report to the Administrator as provided in § 60.757(a). The landfill may calculate design capacity in either megagrams or cubic meters for comparison with the exemption values. Any density conversions shall be documented and submitted with the report. Submittal of the initial design capacity report shall fulfill the requirements of this subpart except as provided for in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this section.

(1) The owner or operator shall submit to the Administrator an amended design capacity report, as provided for in § 60.757(a)(3).

(2) When an increase in the maximum design capacity of a landfill exempted from the provisions of § 60.752(b) through § 60.759 of this subpart 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 shall comply with the provision 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, shall either comply with paragraph (b)(2) of this section or calculate an NMOC emission rate for the landfill using the procedures specified in § 60.754. The NMOC emission rate shall be recalculated annually, except as provided in § 60.757(b)(1)(ii) of this subpart. 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 50 megagrams per year, the owner or operator shall:

(i) Submit an annual emission report to the Administrator, except as provided for in § 60.757(b)(1)(ii); and

(ii) Recalculate the NMOC emission rate annually using the procedures specified in § 60.754(a)(1) until such time as the calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 50 megagrams per year, or the landfill is closed.

(A) If the NMOC emission rate, upon recalculation required in paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section, is equal to or greater than 50 megagrams per year, the owner or operator shall install a collection and control system in compliance with paragraph (b)(2) of this section.

(B) If the landfill is permanently closed, a closure notification shall be submitted to the Administrator as provided for in § 60.757(d).

(2) If the calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 50 megagrams per year, the owner or operator shall:

(i) Submit a collection and control system design plan prepared by a professional engineer to the Administrator within 1 year:

(A) The collection and control system as described in the plan shall meet the design requirements of paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section.

(B) The collection and control system design plan shall include any alternatives to the operational standards, test methods, procedures, compliance measures, monitoring, recordkeeping or reporting provisions of §§ 60.753 through 60.758 proposed by the owner or operator.

(C) The collection and control system design plan shall either conform with specifications for active collection systems in § 60.759 or include a demonstration to the Administrator's satisfaction of the sufficiency of the alternative provisions to § 60.759.

(D) The Administrator shall review the information submitted under paragraphs (b)(2)(i) (A),(B) and (C) 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.

(ii) Install a collection and control system that captures the gas generated within the landfill as required by paragraphs (b)(2)(ii)(A) or (B) and (b)(2)(iii) of this section within 30 months after the first annual report in which the emission rate equals or exceeds 50 megagrams per year, unless Tier 2 or Tier 3 sampling demonstrates that the emission rate is less than 50 megagrams per year, as specified in § 60.757(c)(1) or (2).

(A) An active collection system shall:

(*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 or treatment 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:

(*i*) 5 years or more if active; or

(*ii*) 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.

(B) A passive collection system shall:

(*1*) Comply with the provisions specified in paragraphs (b)(2)(ii)(A)(*1*), (*2*), and (2)(ii)(A)(*4*) 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 shall be installed as required under § 258.40.

(iii) 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) An open flare designed and operated in accordance with § 60.18 except as noted in § 60.754(e);

(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 shall 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 § 60.754(d).

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

(*2*) The control device shall be operated within the parameter ranges established during the initial or most recent performance test. The operating parameters to be monitored are specified in § 60.756;

(C) Route the collected gas to a treatment system that processes the collected gas for subsequent sale or use. All emissions from any atmospheric vent from the gas treatment system shall be subject to the requirements of paragraph (b)(2)(iii) (A) or (B) of this section.

(iv) Operate the collection and control device installed to comply with this subpart in accordance with the provisions of §§ 60.753, 60.755 and 60.756.

(v) The collection and control system may be capped or removed provided that all the conditions of paragraphs (b)(2)(v) (A), (B), and (C) of this section are met:

(A) The landfill shall be a closed landfill as defined in § 60.751 of this subpart. A closure report shall be submitted to the Administrator as provided in § 60.757(d);

(B) The collection and control system shall have been in operation a minimum of 15 years; and

(C) Following the procedures specified in § 60.754(b) of this subpart, the calculated NMOC gas produced by the landfill shall be less than 50 megagrams per year on three successive test dates. The test dates shall 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 Act, the owner or operator of a 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 a 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) June 10, 1996 for MSW landfills that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction on or after May 30, 1991 but before March 12, 1996;

(2) Ninety days after the date of commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction for MSW landfills that commence construction, modification, or reconstruction on or after March 12, 1996.

(d) When a MSW landfill subject to this subpart is closed, 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.

[61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 32751, June 16, 1998; 65 FR 18908, Apr. 10, 2000; 71 FR 55127, Sept. 21, 2006]

§ 60.753 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 § 60.752(b)(2)(ii) of this subpart shall:

(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 shall record instances when positive pressure occurs in efforts to avoid a fire. These records shall be submitted with the annual reports as provided in § 60.757(f)(1);

(2) Use of a geomembrane or synthetic cover. The owner or operator shall 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 shall be approved by the Administrator;

(c) Operate each interior wellhead in the collection system with a landfill gas temperature less than 55 °C and with either a nitrogen level less than 20 percent or an oxygen level less than 5 percent. The owner or operator may establish a higher operating temperature, nitrogen, or oxygen value at a particular well. A higher operating value demonstration shall show supporting data that the elevated parameter does not cause fires or significantly inhibit anaerobic decomposition by killing methanogens.

(1) The nitrogen level shall be determined using Method 3C, unless an alternative test method is established as allowed by § 60.752(b)(2)(i) of this subpart.

(2) Unless an alternative test method is established as allowed by § 60.752(b)(2)(i) of this subpart, the oxygen shall be determined by an oxygen meter using Method 3A or 3C except that:

(i) The span shall be set so that the regulatory limit is between 20 and 50 percent of the span;

(ii) A data recorder is not required;

(iii) Only two calibration gases are required, a zero and span, and ambient air may be used as the span;

(iv) A calibration error check is not required;

(v) The allowable sample bias, zero drift, and calibration drift are ±10 percent.

(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 shall conduct surface testing around the perimeter of the collection area and along a pattern that traverses the landfill at 30 meter intervals and where visual observations indicate elevated concentrations of landfill gas, such as distressed vegetation and cracks or seeps in the cover. The owner or operator may establish an alternative traversing pattern that ensures equivalent coverage. A surface monitoring design plan shall 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 § 60.752(b)(2)(iii). In the event the collection or control system is inoperable, the gas mover system shall be shut down and all valves in the collection and control system contributing to venting of the gas to the atmosphere shall be closed within 1 hour; and

(f) Operate the control or treatment 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 shall be taken as specified in § 60.755(a)(3) through (5) or § 60.755(c) of this subpart. If corrective actions are taken as specified in § 60.755, the monitored exceedance is not a violation of the operational requirements in this section.

[61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 32751, June 16, 1998; 65 FR 61778, Oct. 17, 2000]

§ 60.754 Test methods and procedures.

(a)(1) The landfill owner or operator shall calculate the NMOC emission rate using either the equation provided in paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section or the equation provided in paragraph (a)(1)(ii) of this section. Both equations may be used if the actual year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate is known, as specified in paragraph (a)(1)(i), 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), for part of the life of the landfill. The values to be used in both equations 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 thirty 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) The following equation shall be used if the actual year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate is known.

$$M_{NMOC} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2\,k\,L_o M_i \left(e^{-kt_i}\right)\left(C_{NMOC}\right)\left(3.6\times10^{-9}\right)$$

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

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) The following equation shall be used if the actual year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate is unknown.

$M_{NMOC} = 2L_o\ R\ (e^{-kc} - e^{-kt})\ C_{NMOC}\ (3.6 \times 10^{-9})$

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 = O and $e^{-kc}1$
$3.6\times10-9$ = conversion factor

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 shall compare the calculated NMOC mass emission rate to the standard of 50 megagrams per year.

(i) If the NMOC emission rate calculated in paragraph (a)(1) of this section is less than 50 megagrams per year, then the landfill owner shall submit an emission rate report as provided in § 60.757(b)(1), and shall recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate annually as required under § 60.752(b)(1).

(ii) If the calculated NMOC emission rate is equal to or greater than 50 megagrams per year, then the landfill

owner shall either comply with §60.752(b)(2), or determine a site-specific NMOC concentration and recalculate the NMOC emission rate using the procedures provided in paragraph (a)(3) of this section.

(3) *Tier 2.* The landfill owner or operator shall determine the NMOC concentration using the following sampling procedure. The landfill owner or operator shall install at least two sample probes per hectare of 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 sample probes should be located to avoid known areas of nondegradable solid waste. The owner or operator shall 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. Method 18 of appendix A of this part may be used to analyze the samples collected by the Method 25 or 25C sampling procedure. 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 using Method 18, the owner or operator must identify all compounds in the sample and, as a minimum, test for those compounds published in the most recent Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors (AP–42), minus carbon monoxide, hydrogen sulfide, and mercury. As a minimum, the instrument must be calibrated for each of the compounds on the list. Convert the concentration of each Method 18 compound to C_{NMOC} as hexane by multiplying by the ratio of its carbon atoms divided by six. 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 before the gas moving or condensate removal equipment. For these systems, a minimum of three samples must be collected from the header pipe.

(i) The landfill owner or operator shall recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate using the equations provided in paragraph (a)(1)(i) or (a)(1)(ii) of this section and using the average NMOC concentration from the collected samples instead of the default value in the equation provided in paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

(ii) If the resulting mass emission rate calculated using the site-specific NMOC concentration is equal to or greater than 50 megagrams per year, then the landfill owner or operator shall either comply with §60.752(b)(2), or determine the site-specific methane generation rate constant and recalculate the NMOC emission rate using the site-specific methane generation rate using the procedure specified in paragraph (a)(4) of this section.

(iii) If the resulting NMOC mass emission rate is less than 50 megagrams per year, the owner or operator shall submit a periodic estimate of the emission rate report as provided in §60.757(b)(1) and retest the site-specific NMOC concentration every 5 years using the methods specified in this section.

(4) *Tier 3.* The site-specific methane generation rate constant shall be determined using the procedures provided in Method 2E of appendix A of this part. The landfill owner or operator shall estimate the NMOC mass emission rate using equations in paragraph (a)(1)(i) or (a)(1)(ii) of this section and

using a site-specific methane generation rate constant k, 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 shall compare the resulting NMOC mass emission rate to the standard of 50 megagrams per year.

(i) If the NMOC mass emission rate as calculated using the site-specific methane generation rate and concentration of NMOC is equal to or greater than 50 megagrams per year, the owner or operator shall comply with § 60.752(b)(2).

(ii) If the NMOC mass emission rate is less than 50 megagrams per year, then the owner or operator shall submit a periodic emission rate report as provided in § 60.757(b)(1) and shall recalculate the NMOC mass emission rate annually, as provided in § 60.757(b)(1) using the equations in paragraph (a)(1) of this section and using the site-specific methane generation rate constant and NMOC concentration obtained in paragraph (a)(3) of this section. The calculation of the methane generation rate constant is performed only once, and the value obtained from this test shall be used in all subsequent annual NMOC emission rate calculations.

(5) The owner or operator may use other methods to determine the NMOC concentration or a site-specific k as an alternative to the methods required in paragraphs (a)(3) and (a)(4) of this section if the method has been approved by the Administrator.

(b) After the installation of a collection and control system in compliance with § 60.755, the owner or operator shall calculate the NMOC emission rate for purposes of determining when the system can be removed as provided in § 60.752(b)(2)(v), using the following equation:

$$M_{NMOC} = 1.89 \times 10^{-3} Q_{LFG} C_{NMOC}$$

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}, shall be determined by measuring the total landfill gas flow rate at the common header pipe that leads to the control device using a gas flow measuring device calibrated according to the provisions of section 4 of Method 2E of appendix A of this part.

(2) The average NMOC concentration, C_{NMOC}, shall 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 25C or Method 18 of appendix A of this part. If using Method 18 of appendix A of this part, the minimum list of compounds to be tested shall be those published in the most recent Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors (AP–42). The sample location on the common header pipe shall be before any condensate removal or other gas refining units. The landfill owner or operator shall divide the NMOC concentration from 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.

(c) When calculating emissions for PSD purposes, the owner or operator of each MSW landfill subject to the provisions of this subpart shall estimate the NMOC emission rate for comparison to the PSD major source and significance levels in §§ 51.166 or 52.21 of this chapter using AP–42 or other approved measurement procedures.

(d) For the performance test required in § 60.752(b)(2)(iii)(B), Method 25, 25C, or Method 18 of appendix A of this part must be used to determine compliance with the 98 weight-percent efficiency or the 20 ppmv outlet concentration level, unless another method to demonstrate compliance has been approved by the Administrator as provided by § 60.752(b)(2)(i)(B). Method 3 or 3A shall 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. If using Method 18

of appendix A of this part, the minimum list of compounds to be tested shall be those published in the most recent Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors (AP–42). The following equation shall be used to calculate efficiency:

$$\text{Control Efficiency} = (NMOC_{in} - NMOC_{out})/(NMOC_{in})$$

where,

$NMOC_{in}$ = mass of NMOC entering control device

$NMOC_{out}$ = mass of NMOC exiting control device

(e) For the performance test required in §60.752(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).

[61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 32751, June 16, 1998; 65 FR 18908, Apr. 10, 2000; 65 FR 61778, Oct. 17, 2000; 71 FR 55127, Sept. 21, 2006]

§60.755 Compliance provisions.

(a) Except as provided in §60.752(b)(2)(i)(B), the specified methods in paragraphs (a)(1) through (a)(6) of this section shall be used to determine whether the gas collection system is in compliance with §60.752(b)(2)(ii).

(1) For the purposes of calculating the maximum expected gas generation flow rate from the landfill to determine compliance with §60.752(b)(2)(ii)(A)(*1*), one of the following equations shall be used. The k and L_o 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 §60.754(a)(4), the value of k determined from the test shall be used. A value of no more than 15 years shall 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:

$$Q_m = 2L_o R (e^{-kc} - e^{-kt})$$

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 = O and $e^{-kc} = 1$)

(ii) For sites with known year-to-year solid waste acceptance rate:

$$Q_M = \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2 k L_o M_i \left(e^{-kt}i\right)$$

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, the equations 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 the equations in paragraphs (a)(1) (i) or (ii) or other methods shall 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 §60.752(b)(2)(ii)(A)(*2*), the owner or operator shall 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 §60.752(b)(2)(ii)(A)(*3*), the owner or operator shall measure gauge pressure in the gas collection header at each individual well, monthly. If a positive pressure exists, action shall be initiated to correct the exceedance within 5 calendar days, except for the three conditions allowed under §60.753(b). If negative pressure cannot be achieved without excess air infiltration within 15 calendar days of the first measurement, the gas collection system shall be expanded to correct the exceedance within 120 days of the initial measurement of positive pressure. Any attempted corrective measure shall not cause exceedances of other operational or performance standards. An alternative timeline for correcting the exceedance may be submitted to the Administrator for approval.

(4) Owners or operators are not required to expand the system as required in paragraph (a)(3) of this section during the first 180 days after gas collection system startup.

(5) For the purpose of identifying whether excess air infiltration into the landfill is occurring, the owner or operator shall monitor each well monthly for temperature and nitrogen or oxygen as provided in §60.753(c). If a well exceeds one of these operating parameters, action shall be initiated to correct the exceedance within 5 calendar days. If correction of the exceedance cannot be achieved within 15 calendar days of the first measurement, the gas collection system shall be expanded to correct the exceedance within 120 days of the initial exceedance. Any attempted corrective measure shall not cause exceedances of other operational or performance standards. An alternative timeline for correcting the exceedance may be submitted to the Administrator for approval.

(6) An owner or operator seeking to demonstrate compliance with §60.752(b)(2)(ii)(A)(*4*) through the use of a collection system not conforming to the specifications provided in §60.759 shall provide information satisfactory to the Administrator as specified in §60.752(b)(2)(i)(C) demonstrating that off-site migration is being controlled.

(b) For purposes of compliance with §60.753(a), each owner or operator of a controlled landfill shall place each well or design component as specified in the approved design plan as provided in §60.752(b)(2)(i). Each well shall 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) 5 years or more if active; or

(2) 2 years or more if closed or at final grade.

(c) The following procedures shall be used for compliance with the surface methane operational standard as provided in §60.753(d).

(1) After installation of the collection system, the owner or operator shall 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 shall 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 shall be performed in accordance with section 4.3.1 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, except that the probe inlet shall be placed within 5 to 10 centimeters of the ground. Monitoring shall be performed during typical meteorological conditions.

(4) Any reading of 500 parts per million or more above background at any location shall be recorded as a monitored exceedance and the actions specified in paragraphs (c)(4) (i) through (v) of this section shall be taken. As long as the specified actions are taken, the

exceedance is not a violation of the operational requirements of § 60.753(d).

(i) The location of each monitored exceedance shall be marked and the location recorded.

(ii) Cover maintenance or adjustments to the vacuum of the adjacent wells to increase the gas collection in the vicinity of each exceedance shall be made and the location shall 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 shall be taken and the location shall 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 shall be taken, and no further monitoring of that location is required until the action specified in paragraph (c)(4)(v) 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 shall 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 remonitoring shows an exceedance, the actions specified in paragraph (c)(4) (iii) or (v) shall 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 shall 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 shall 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 shall comply with the following instrumentation specifications and procedures for surface emission monitoring devices:

(1) The portable analyzer shall meet the instrument specifications provided in section 3 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, except that ''methane'' shall replace all references to VOC.

(2) The calibration gas shall be methane, diluted to a nominal concentration of 500 parts per million in air.

(3) To meet the performance evaluation requirements in section 3.1.3 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part, the instrument evaluation procedures of section 4.4 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part shall be used.

(4) The calibration procedures provided in section 4.2 of Method 21 of appendix A of this part shall be followed immediately before commencing a surface monitoring survey.

(e) The provisions of this subpart apply at all times, except during periods of start-up, shutdown, or malfunction, provided that the duration of start-up, shutdown, or malfunction shall not exceed 5 days for collection systems and shall not exceed 1 hour for treatment or control devices.

[61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 32752, June 16, 1998]

§ 60.756 Monitoring of operations.

Except as provided in § 60.752(b)(2)(i)(B),

(a) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.752(b)(2)(ii)(A) for an active gas collection system shall 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 § 60.755(a)(3); and

(2) Monitor nitrogen or oxygen concentration in the landfill gas on a monthly basis as provided in § 60.755(a)(5); and

(3) Monitor temperature of the landfill gas on a monthly basis as provided in § 60.755(a)(5).

(b) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.752(b)(2)(iii) using an enclosed combustor shall 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 or bypass of the control device. The owner or operator shall either:

(i) Install, calibrate, and maintain a gas flow rate measuring device that shall record the flow to the control device at least every 15 minutes; or

(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 shall 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 §60.752(b)(2)(iii) using an open flare shall 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 or bypass of the flare. The owner or operator shall either:

(i) Install, calibrate, and maintain a gas flow rate measuring device that shall record the flow to the control device at least every 15 minutes; or

(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 shall 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 §60.752(b)(2)(iii) using a device other than an open flare or an enclosed combustor shall provide information satisfactory to the Administrator as provided in §60.752(b)(2)(i)(B) describing the operation of the control device, the operating parameters that would indicate proper performance, and appropriate monitoring procedures. The Administrator shall 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 §60.759 or seeking to monitor alternative parameters to those required by §60.753 through §60.756 shall provide information satisfactory to the Administrator as provided in §60.752(b)(2)(i) (B) and (C) 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 §60.755(c), shall monitor surface concentrations of methane according to the instrument specifications and procedures provided in §60.755(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.

[61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 32752, June 16, 1998; 65 FR 18909, Apr. 10, 2000]

§60.757 Reporting requirements.

Except as provided in §60.752(b)(2)(i)(B),

(a) Each owner or operator subject to the requirements of this subpart shall submit an initial design capacity report to the Administrator.

(1) The initial design capacity report shall fulfill the requirements of the notification of the date construction is

commenced as required by § 60.7(a)(1) and shall be submitted no later than:

(i) June 10, 1996, for landfills that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction on or after May 30, 1991 but before March 12, 1996 or

(ii) Ninety days after the date of commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction for landfills that commence construction, modification, or reconstruction on or after March 12, 1996.

(2) The initial design capacity report shall 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 shall be calculated using good engineering practices. The calculations shall be provided, along with the relevant parameters as part of the 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) An amended design capacity report shall 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 or above 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 § 60.758(f).

(b) Each owner or operator subject to the requirements of this subpart shall submit an NMOC emission rate report to the Administrator initially and annually thereafter, except as provided for in paragraphs (b)(1)(ii) or (b)(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 shall contain an annual or 5-year estimate of the NMOC emission rate calculated using the formula and procedures provided in § 60.754(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 shall be submitted no later than indicated in paragraphs (b)(1)(i)(A) and (B) of this section. Subsequent NMOC emission rate reports shall be submitted annually thereafter, except as provided for in paragraphs (b)(1)(ii) and (b)(3) of this section.

(A) June 10, 1996, for landfills that commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction on or after May 30, 1991, but before March 12, 1996, or

(B) Ninety days after the date of commenced construction, modification, or reconstruction for landfills that commence construction, modification, or reconstruction on or after March 12, 1996.

(ii) If the estimated NMOC emission rate as reported in the annual report to the Administrator is less than 50 megagrams per year in each of the next 5 consecutive years, the owner or operator may elect to submit an estimate of the NMOC emission rate for the next 5-year period in lieu of the annual report. This estimate shall 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 shall be provided to the Administrator. This estimate shall 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 shall be submitted to

the Administrator. The revised estimate shall 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 shall 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 of paragraphs (b)(1) and (2) of this section, after the installation of a collection and control system in compliance with § 60.752(b)(2), during such time as the collection and control system is in operation and in compliance with §§ 60.753 and 60.755.

(c) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of § 60.752(b)(2)(i) shall submit a collection and control system design plan to the Administrator within 1 year of the first report required under paragraph (b) of this section in which the emission rate equals or exceeds 50 megagrams per year, except as follows:

(1) If the owner or operator elects to recalculate the NMOC emission rate after Tier 2 NMOC sampling and analysis as provided in § 60.754(a)(3) and the resulting rate is less than 50 megagrams per year, annual periodic reporting shall be resumed, using the Tier 2 determined site-specific NMOC concentration, until the calculated 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 emission rate based on NMOC sampling and analysis, shall be submitted within 180 days of the first calculated exceedance of 50 megagrams per year.

(2) 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 § 60.754(a)(4), and the resulting NMOC emission rate is less than 50 Mg/yr, annual periodic reporting shall be resumed. The resulting site-specific methane generation rate constant (k) shall 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 § 60.754(a)(4) and the resulting site-specific methane generation rate constant (k) shall be submitted to the Administrator within 1 year of the first calculated emission rate exceeding 50 megagrams per year.

(d) Each owner or operator of a controlled landfill shall 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).

(e) Each owner or operator of a controlled landfill shall 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 shall contain all of the following items:

(i) A copy of the closure report submitted in accordance with paragraph (d) of this section;

(ii) A copy of the initial performance test report demonstrating that the 15 year minimum control period has expired; and

(iii) 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.

(2) The Administrator may request such additional information as may be necessary to verify that all of the conditions for removal in § 60.752(b)(2)(v) have been met.

(f) Each owner or operator of a landfill seeking to comply with § 60.752(b)(2) using an active collection system designed in accordance with § 60.752(b)(2)(ii) shall submit to the Administrator annual reports of the recorded information in (f)(1) through (f)(6) of this paragraph. The initial annual report shall be submitted within 180 days of installation and start-up of the collection and control system, and shall include the initial performance

test report required under § 60.8. For enclosed combustion devices and flares, reportable exceedances are defined under § 60.758(c).

(1) Value and length of time for exceedance of applicable parameters monitored under § 60.756(a), (b), (c), and (d).

(2) Description and duration of all periods when the gas stream is diverted from the control device through a bypass line or the indication of bypass flow as specified under § 60.756.

(3) Description and duration of all periods when the control device was not operating for a period exceeding 1 hour and length of time the control device was not operating.

(4) All periods when the collection system was not operating in excess of 5 days.

(5) The location of each exceedance of the 500 parts per million methane concentration as provided in § 60.753(d) and the concentration recorded at each location for which an exceedance was recorded in the previous month.

(6) The date of installation and the location of each well or collection system expansion added pursuant to paragraphs (a)(3), (b), and (c)(4) of § 60.755.

(g) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.752(b)(2)(iii) shall 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.

[61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 32752, June 16, 1998; 65 FR 18909, Apr. 10, 2000]

§ 60.758 Recordkeeping requirements.

(a) Except as provided in § 60.752(b)(2)(i)(B), each owner or operator of an MSW landfill subject to the provisions of § 60.752(b) shall keep for at least 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible, on-site records of the design capacity report which triggered § 60.752(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 § 60.752(b)(2)(i)(B), each owner or operator of a controlled landfill shall keep up-to-date, readily accessible records for the life of the control equipment of the data listed in paragraphs (b)(1) through (b)(4) of this section as measured during the initial performance test or compliance determination. Records of subsequent tests or monitoring shall be maintained for a minimum of 5 years. Records of the control device vendor specifications shall be maintained until removal.

(1) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.752(b)(2)(ii):

(i) The maximum expected gas generation flow rate as calculated in § 60.755(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 § 60.759(a)(1).

(2) Where an owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart seeks to demonstrate compliance with § 60.752(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 combustion 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 § 60.752(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 § 60.752(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 § 60.752(b)(2)(iii)(A) through use of an open 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.

(c) Except as provided in § 60.752(b)(2)(i)(B), each owner or operator of a controlled landfill subject to the provisions of this subpart shall keep for 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible continuous records of the equipment operating parameters specified to be monitored in § 60.756 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 shall be recorded and reported under § 60.757(f):

(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 combustion temperature was more than 28 oC below the average combustion temperature during the most recent performance test at which compliance with § 60.752(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 shall keep up-to-date, readily accessible continuous records of the indication of flow to the control device or 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 § 60.756.

(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 § 60.752(b)(2)(iii) shall 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 an open flare shall keep up-to-date, readily accessible continuous records of the flame or flare pilot flame monitoring specified under § 60.756(c), and up-to-date, readily accessible records of all periods of operation in which the flame or flare pilot flame is absent.

(d) Except as provided in § 60.752(b)(2)(i)(B), each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart shall 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 shall keep up-to-date, readily accessible records of the installation date and location of all newly installed collectors as specified under § 60.755(b).

(2) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart shall 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 § 60.759(a)(3)(i) as well as any nonproductive areas excluded from collection as provided in § 60.759(a)(3)(ii).

(e) Except as provided in § 60.752(b)(2)(i)(B), each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart shall keep for at least 5 years up-to-date, readily accessible records of all collection and control system exceedances of the operational standards in § 60.753, the reading in the subsequent month whether or not the second reading is an exceedance, and the location of each exceedance.

(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'', shall keep readily accessible, on-site records of the annual recalculation of site-specific density, design capacity, and the supporting documentation. Offsite records may be maintained if they are retrievable within 4 hours. Either paper copy or electronic formats are acceptable.

[61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 32752, June 16, 1998; 65 FR 18909, Apr. 10, 2000]

§ 60.759 Specifications for active collection systems.

(a) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.752(b)(2)(i) shall 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 § 60.752(b)(2)(i)(C) and (D):

(1) The collection devices within the interior and along the perimeter areas shall be certified to achieve comprehensive control of surface gas emissions by a professional engineer. The following issues shall be addressed in the design: depths of refuse, refuse gas generation rates and flow characteristics, cover properties, gas system expandibility, leachate and condensate management, accessibility, compatibility with filling operations, integration with closure end use, air intrusion control, corrosion resistance, fill settlement, and resistance to the refuse decomposition heat.

(2) The sufficient density of gas collection devices determined in paragraph (a)(1) of this section shall 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 shall control all gas producing areas, except as provided by paragraphs (a)(3)(i) and (a)(3)(ii) of this section.

(i) Any segregated area of asbestos or nondegradable material may be excluded from collection if documented as provided under § 60.758(d). The documentation shall provide the nature, date of deposition, location and amount of asbestos or nondegradable material deposited in the area, and shall 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 shall be documented and provided to the Administrator upon request. A separate NMOC emissions estimate shall be made for each section proposed for exclusion, and the sum of all such sections shall be compared to the NMOC emissions estimate for the entire landfill. Emissions from each section shall be computed using the following equation:

$Q_i = 2\ k\ L_o\ M_i\ (e^{-kt\ i})\ (C_{NMOC})\ (3.6 \times 10^{-9})$

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

(iii) The values for k and C_{NMOC} determined in field testing shall 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 § 60.754(a)(1) or the alternative values from § 60.754(a)(5) shall 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 § 60.752(b)(2)(i)(A) shall construct the gas collection devices using the following equipment or procedures:

(1) The landfill gas extraction components shall 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 shall extend as necessary to comply with emission and migration standards. Collection devices such as wells and horizontal collectors shall be perforated to allow gas entry without head loss sufficient to impair performance across the intended extent of control. Perforations shall be situated with regard to the need to prevent excessive air infiltration.

(2) Vertical wells shall be placed so as not to endanger underlying liners and shall address the occurrence of water within the landfill. Holes and trenches constructed for piped wells and horizontal collectors shall 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 shall 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 shall include a positive closing throttle valve, any necessary seals and couplings, access couplings and at least one sampling port. The collection devices shall be constructed of PVC, HDPE, fiberglass, stainless steel, or other nonporous material of suitable thickness.

(c) Each owner or operator seeking to comply with § 60.752(b)(2)(i)(A) shall convey the landfill gas to a control system in compliance with § 60.752(b)(2)(iii) through the collection header pipe(s). The gas mover equipment shall 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 shall be used to project the maximum flow rate. If no flow data exists, the procedures in paragraph (c)(2) of this section shall be used.

(2) For new collection systems, the maximum flow rate shall be in accordance with § 60.755(a)(1).

[61 FR 9919, Mar. 12, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 32753, June 16, 1998; 64 FR 9262, Feb. 24, 1999; 65 FR 18909, Apr. 10, 2000]