[6560-01]

Title 40—Protection of Environment

CHAPTER I—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL 841-6]

PART 60—STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES

Basic Oxygen Process Furnaces: Opacity Standard

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action establishes an opacity standard for basic oxygen process furnace (BOPF) facilities. In March 1974 (39 FR 9308), EPA promulgated a standard limiting the concentration of particulate matter emissions from BOPF's, however, an opacity standard was not promulgated at that time becuase of insufficient data to define variations in visible emissions from well-controlled facilities. An opacity standard had been proposed on June 11, 1973 (38 FR 15406) and was reproposed on March 2, 1977 (42 FR 12130). Additional data have provided the basis for the opacity standard which will help insure that control equipment is properly operated and maintained. Like the concentration standard, this opacity standard applies to BOPF facilities the construction or modification of which was commenced after June 11, 1973 since both standards were proposed on that date.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 13, 1978.

ADDRESS: The public comments received may be inspected and copies at the Public Information Reference Unit (EPA Library), Room 2922, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

Don R. Goodwin, Emission Standards and Engineering Division (MD-13), Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone No. 919-541-5271.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments

A total of 10 comment letters were received—4 from industry, 5 from governmental agencies, and 1 from an environmental interest group. The significant comments received and EPA's responses are presented here.

Three commenters expressed the need for establishing an opacity standard for fugitive emissions. Fugitive emissions occur when off gases from the furnace are not completely captured by the furnance hood (which ducts waste gases to the control device). During some operations, the fugitive emissions can be significant. The fugitive emissions escape to the atmosphere through roof monitors.

EPA recognizes that fugitive emissions from BOPF shops are an important problem. However, it was not within the scope of this evaluation to consider an opacity standard for fugitive emissions. The particulate concentration standard covers only stack emissions. The purpose of the opacity standard for stack emissions is to serve as a means for enforcement personnel to insure that the particulate matter control system is being properly operated and maintained. EPA will be reviewing the standards of performance for new BOPF's in accordance with the 1977 amendments to the Clean Air Act. This review will address the need for limits on fugitive emissions as well as any revisions of the particulate concentration and opacity standards.

It should be noted that the absence of standards for fugitive emissions under this part does not preclude the establishment of standards as part of the new source review (NSR) and prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) programs of the Agency or as part of the programs of State and local agencies.

Two commenters questioned how the standard would apply to BOPF shops that have plenums to exhaust the emissions from more than one furnace into a single control device. They reasoned that if the production cycles overlap, it would be impossible to determine when an opacity of greater than 10 percent (but less than 20 percent) was attributable to a violation by one furnace or an acceptable emission by another furnace during oxygen blowing. EPA was aware that this situation would occur during the development of the opacity standard. Several of the plants at which visible emission tests were conducted had a single control device serving more than one furnace. The furnace production cycle data were recorded and it was not difficult to correlate the opacity data with the production cycle. Enforcement personnel can evaluate a plant's operation (length of cycle, degree of overlapping, etc.) prior to completing an inspection and correctly identify probable violations from a correlation of their opacity readings with the plant's production and monitoring records. Correlation of the data and the synchronization requirements described later will prevent the enforcement problems described by the commenters. Promulgation of an unduly complex standard that addresses the peculiarities of every BOPF installation would complicate rather than simplify enforcement. Although it is unlikely that two furnaces will be simultaneously started on a blow, production data should be examined for such peculiarities before drawing any conclusions from the opacity data.

Other issues raised include the effect of oxygen "reblows" on the standard and a request for a more lenient monitoring requirement. One industry commenter claimed that there would be a "significant" number of production cycles with more than one opacity reading greater than 10 percent due to the blowing of additional oxygen (after the initial oxygen blow) into a furnace to obtain the proper composition. The opacity standard, however, is based on 73 hours of BOPF operation during which numerous reblows occurred. It was found that although the opacities could be very large at these times, they were of short enough duration that the six-minute average was still 10 percent or less.

EPA agrees with the comment that the requirement for reporting of instantaneous scrubber differential and water supply pressures that are less than 10 percent of the average maintained during the most recent performance test needs further clarification. The requirement has been revised so that any deviation of more than 10 percent over a three hour averaging period must be reported. The three hour averaging period was chosen since it is the minimum duration of a performance test. Thus instantaneous monitoring device measurements caused by routing process fluctuations will not be reported. The reports needed are the periods of time when the average scrubber pressure drop is below the level used to demonstrate compliance at the time of the performance test. In addition, the requirement for a water pressure monitor has been retained (despite the comment that it will not indicate a plugged water line) since it will perform the function of assuring that the water pumps have not shut down. A flow monitoring device was not specified because they are susceptible to plugging.

To provide for the use of certain partial combustion systems on BOPFs, new requirements have been added to the monitoring section and two clarifications added to the test methods and procedures section. A partial combustion system uses a closed hood to limit gas combustion and exhaust gas volumes. To recover combustible exhaust gases, the system may be designed to duct its emissions away from the stack to a gas holding tank during part of the steel production cycle. Steel plants in this country may begin to make more use of this approach due to its significant energy benefits. This type of control/recovery system presents two problems for enforcement personnel. First is the problem of knowing

when the diversion of exhaust gases from the stack occurs. The new requirements of paragraphs (a), (b)(3), and (b)(4) of §60.143 address this question. Second is the problem of how to sample or observe stack emissions. New provisions under §60.144 clarify this question for determining the opacity of emissions (paragraph (a)(5)) and for determining the concentration of emissions (paragraph (c)).

In addition to addressing the problem posed by exhaust gas diversion, the new requirements of paragraphs (a), (b)(3), and (b)(4) of §60.143 are also designed to minimize errors in recording the time and duration of the steel production cycle for all types of BOPFs. Accurate records are essential for determining compliance with the opacity standard. Likewise the synchronization of daily logs with the chart recorders of monitoring devices is necessary for determining that acceptable operation and maintenance procedures are being used as required by paragraph (d) of §60.11.

An alternative to the manual method of synchronization under paragraph (b)(3) of §60.143 which may minimize costs of this requirement would be to have the chart recorder automatically mark the beginning and end of the steel production cycle and any period of gas diversion from the stack. Such marking could be electrically relayed from the production equipment and exhaust duct damper operation in order to be fully automatic. Source owners or operators who wish to employ this method or equivalent methods in lieu of the synchronization procedure prescribed by the regulations may submit their plans to the Administrator for approval under paragraph 60.13(i).

The concentration standard promulgated in March, 1974, applies to both top and bottom-blown BOPFs. In developing the proposed opacity standard, data from both types of BOPFs were considered. Scrubber-controlled top and bottom-blown BOPFs were demonstrated capable of meeting the opacity limits proposed and here promulgated. Thus the promulgated opacity standard applies to bottom as well as top-blown BOPFs.

Although there was no announced intentions to utilize electrostatic precipitators (ESPs) as a control device (rather than venturi scrubbers), during the development of the proposed standard, one industry commenter asserted that ESPs may become more attractive in the future, especially in the semi-arid regions of the West where the water and energy demands of scrubbers are not easily met. If a BOPF furnace is constructed with an ESP control device, the establishment of a site-specific opacity standard may be necessary. Upon request by the owner or operator of the BOPF furnace, a determination will be made by EPA pursuant to §60.11(e) if performance tests demonstrate compliance with the mass concentration standard.

Miscellaneous

It should be noted that standards of performance for new sources established under section 111 of the Act reflect emission limits achievable with the best adequately demonstrated technological system of continuous emission reduction (taking into consideration the cost of achieving such emission reduction, and any nonair quality health and environmental impact and energy requirements). State implementation plans (SIPs) approved or promulgated under section 110 of the Act, on the other hand, must provide for the attainment and maintenance of national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) designed to protect public health and welfare. For that purpose, SIPs must in some cases require greater emission reductions than those required by standards of performance for new sources. Section 173(2) of the Clean Air Act, requires, among other things, that a new or modified source constructed in an area which exceeds the NAAQS must reduce emissions to the level which reflects the "lowest achievable emission rate" for such category of source, unless the owner or operator demonstrates that the source cannot achieve such an emission rate. In no event can the emission rate exceed any applicable standard of performance.

A similar situation may arise when a major emitting facility is to be constructed in a geographic area which falls under the prevention of significant deterioration of air quality provisions of the Act (Part C). These provisions require, among other things, that major emitting facilities to be constructed in such areas are to be subject to best available control technology. The term "best available control technology" (BACT) means "an emission limitation based on the maximum degree of reduction of each pollutant subject to regulation under this Act emitted from or which results from any major emitting facility, which the permitting authority, on a case-by-case basis, taking into account energy, environmental, and economic impacts and other costs, determines is achievable for such facilities through application of production processes and available methods, systems, and techniques, including fuel cleaning or treatment or innovative fuel combustion techniques for control of each such pollutant. In no event shall application of 'best available control technology' result in emissions of any pollutants which will exceed the emissions allowed by any applicable standard established pursuant to section 111 or 112 of this Act."

Standards of performance should not be viewed as the ultimate in achievable emission control and should not preclude the imposition of a more stringent emission standard, where appropriate. For example, while cost of achievement may be an important factor in determining standards of performance applicable to all areas of the country (clean as well as dirty), costs must be accorded for less weight in determining the "lowest achievable emission rate for the new or modified sources locating in areas violating statutorily-mandated health and welfare standards. Although there may be emission control technology available that can reduce emissions below the level required to comply with standards of performance, this technology might be selected as the basis of standards of performance due to costs associated with its use. This in no way should preclude its use in situations where cost is a lesser consideration, such as determination of the "lowest achievable emission rate." Furthermore, since partial combustion systems and bottom blown BOPFs have been shown to be inherently less polluting, more stringent emission limits may be placed on such sources for the purposes of defining "best available control technology" (under Prevention of Significant Deterioration regulation) and "lowest achievable emission rate" in non-attainment areas.

In addition, States are free under section 116 of the Act to establish even more stringent emission limits than those established under section 111 or those necessary to attain or maintain the NAAQS under secton 110. Thus, new sources may in some cases be subject to limitations more stringent than standards of performance under section 111, and prospective owners and operators of new sources should be aware of this possibility in planning for such facilities.

The effective date of this regulation is (date of publication), because section 111(b)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act provides that standards of performance or revisions thereof become effective upon promulgation.

The opacity standard, like the concentration standard, applies to BOPFs which commenced construction or modification after June 11, 1973. That is the date on which both standards were originally proposed. The opacity standard will add no new control burden to the sources affected, but will provide an effective means of monitoring the compliance of these facilities. The relief provided under §60.11(e) insures that the opacity standard requires no greater reduction in emissions than the concentration standard.

NOTE.—The Environmental Protection Agency has determined that this document does not contain a major proposal requiring

preparation of an Economic Impact Analysis under Executive Orders 11821 and 11949 and OMB Circular A-107.

Dated: April 4, 1978.

DOUGLAS M. COSTLE,
Administrator.

Part 60 of Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

Subpart N—Standards of Performance for Iron and Steel Plants

1. Section 60.141 is amended by adding paragraph (c) as follows:

§ 60.141 Definitions.

* * * * *

(c) "Startup means the setting into operation for the first steel production cycle of a relined BOPF or a BOPF which has been out of production for a minimum continuous time period of eight hours.

2. Section 60.142 is amended by adding paragraph (a)(2) as follows:

§ 60.142 Standard for particulate matter.

(a) * * *

(2) Exit from a control device and exhibit 10 percent opacity or greater, except that an opacity of greater than 10 percent but less than 20 percent may occur once per steel production cycle.

(Secs. 111, 301(a), Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7411, 7601).)

3. A new § 60.143 is added as follows:

§ 60.143 Monitoring of operations.

(a) The owner or operator of an affected facility shall maintain a single time-measuring instrument which shall be used in recording daily the time and duration of each steel production cycle, and the time and duration of any diversion of exhaust gases from the main stack servicing the BOPF.

(b) The owner or operator of any affected facility that uses venturi scrubber emission control equipment shall install, calibrate, maintain, and continuously operate monitoring devices as follows:

(1) A monitoring device for the continuous measurement of the pressure loss through the venturi constriction of the control equipment. The monitoring device is to be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within ±250 Pa (±1 inch water).

(2) A monitoring device for the continous measurement of the water supply pressure to the control equipment. The monitoring device is to be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within ±5 percent of the design water supply pressure. The monitoring device's pressure sensor or pressure tap must be located close to the water discharge point. The Administrator may be consulted for approval of alternative locations for the pressure sensor or tap.

(3) All monitoring devices shall be synchronized each day with the time-measuring instrument used under paragraph (a) of this section. The chart recorder error directly after synchronization shall not exceed 0.08 cm (1/32 inch).

(4) All monitoring devices shall use chart recorders which are operated at a minimum chart speed of 3.8 cm/hr (1.5 in/hr).

(5) All monitoring devices are to be recalibreated annually, and at other times as the Administrator may require, in accordance with the proceduces under § 60.13(b)(3).

(c) Any owner or operator subject to requirements under paragraph (b) of this section shall report for each calendar quarter all measurements over any three-hour period that average more than 10 percent below the average levels maintained during the most recent performance test conducted under § 60.8 in which the affected facility demonstrated compliance with the standard under § 60.142(a)(1). The accuracy of the respective measurements, not to exceed the values specified in paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section, may be taken into consideration when determining the measurement results that must be reported.

4. Section 60.144 is amended by adding paragraphs (a)(5) and (c) as follows:

§ 60.144 Test methods and procedures.

(a) * * *

(5) Method 9 for visible emissions. For the purpose of this subpart, opacity observations taken at 15-second intervals immediately before and after a diversion of exhaust gases from the stack may be considered to be consecutive for the purpose of computing an average opacity for a six-minute period. Observations taken during a diversion shall not be used in determining compliance with the opacity standard.

* * * * *

(c) Sampling of flue gases during each steel production cycle shall be discontinued whenever all flue gases are diverted from the stack and shall be resumed after each diversion period.

(Secs. 111, 114, 301(a), Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7411, 7414, 7601).)

[FR Doc. 78-9879 Filed 4-12-78; 8:45 am]