

SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Best Available Control Technology Guidelines

Overview

Part A: Policy and Procedures for Major Polluting Facilities

Part B: LAER/BACT Determinations for Major Polluting Facilities

Part C: Policy and Procedures for Non-Major Polluting Facilities

Part D: BACT Guidelines for Non-Major Polluting Facilities

Part E: Policy and Procedures for Facilities Subject to Prevention of Significant Deterioration for Greenhouse Gases

Part F: BACT Determinations for Facilities Subject to Prevention of Significant Deterioration for Greenhouse Gases

August 17, 2000 (Revised June 6, 2003; December 5, 2003; July 9, 2004; July 14, 2006; December 2, 2016; February 2, 2018; February 1, 2019; February 5, 2021; September 2, 2022; February 2, 2024; xx xx, 2026)

**Deputy Executive Officer
Engineering and Permitting**
Jason Aspell

Authors:

Bahareh Farahani

Bettina Burleigh Sanchez

Ashkan Garshasbi

Tom Lee, P.E.

Alfonso Baez

Martin Kay, P.E.

Howard Lange

Program Supervisor

Senior Air Quality Engineer

Air Quality Engineer II

Program Supervisor

Program Supervisor (Retired)

Program Supervisor (Retired)

Air Quality Engineer II (Retired)

Reviewed By:

Susan Nakamura

Barbara Baird

Jillian Wong

David Ono

Bhaskar Chandan, P.E.

Brian Tomasovic

Chief Operating Officer

Chief Deputy Counsel

Assistant Deputy Executive Officer

Senior Air Quality Engineering Manager

Senior Air Quality Engineering Manager

Assistant Chief Deputy Counsel

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW	1
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	2
<i>BACKGROUND</i>	2
<i>BACT FOR MAJOR VS NON-MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES</i>	4
<i>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</i>	4
CHAPTER 2 – APPLICABILITY DETERMINATION	6
<i>MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITY EMISSION THRESHOLDS</i>	6
<i>POTENTIAL TO EMIT</i>	8
<i>LIMITING POTENTIAL TO EMIT</i>	8
CHAPTER 3 - WHEN IS BACT REQUIRED?.....	9
<i>POLLUTANTS SUBJECT TO NSR, PSD AND BACT</i>	9
<i>PERMIT ACTIONS SUBJECT TO NSR, PSD AND BACT</i>	12
<i>LIMITED BACT EXEMPTION</i>	13
<i>CALCULATION PROCEDURES FOR EMISSION INCREASES</i>	13
CHAPTER 4 - WHAT IS BACT?	15
<i>NSR RULES (REGULATION XIII)</i>	15
<i>PSD RULES (REGULATION XVII)</i>	15
<i>DEFINITION OF BACT</i>	15
<i>REQUIREMENTS OF HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 40440.11</i>	16
<i>CLEAN FUEL GUIDELINES</i>	16
CHAPTER 5 - REVIEW OF STAFF BACT DETERMINATIONS	17
<i>BACT SCIENTIFIC REVIEW COMMITTEE (BACT SRC)</i>	17
<i>MEETING WITH SOUTH COAST AQMD MANAGEMENT</i>	18
<i>THE BACT REVIEW COMMITTEE</i>	18
<i>THE SOUTH COAST AQMD HEARING BOARD</i>	18
<i>THE SOUTH COAST AQMD GOVERNING BOARD</i>	19
PART A - POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES	20
CHAPTER 1 - HOW IS LAER DETERMINED FOR MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES?	21
<i>CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING LAER FOR MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES</i>	21
LAER BASED ON A SIP	21
ACHIEVED IN PRACTICE LAER	22
<i>REGULATORY DOCUMENTS</i>	22
<i>NEW TECHNOLOGIES/EMISSION LEVELS</i>	22
<i>TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER</i>	23
FEDERAL PM _{2.5} NEW SOURCE REVIEW AND SOUTH COAST AQMD RULE 1325	23
LIMITED BACT EXEMPTION.....	23
COST IN LAER DETERMINATIONS	24
SPECIAL PERMITTING CONSIDERATIONS.....	24
<i>CASE-SPECIFIC SITUATIONS</i>	24
<i>EQUIVALENCY</i>	25
<i>SUPER COMPLIANT MATERIALS</i>	25
<i>EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS</i>	25
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	25
<i>POLLUTION PREVENTION</i>	26
<i>MONITORING AND TESTING</i>	26
<i>CAPTURE EFFICIENCY</i>	26
<i>LAER APPLICATION CUT-OFF DATES</i>	27
<i>LAER UPDATE PROCESS</i>	27
<i>CLEAN FUEL GUIDELINES</i>	28

AIR QUALITY-RELATED ENERGY POLICY..... 29

CHAPTER 2 - HOW TO USE PART B OF THE BACT GUIDELINES..... 30

GENERAL..... 30

HOW TO DETERMINE LAER..... 32

PART B - LAER/BACT DETERMINATIONS FOR MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES . 33

PART C - POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR NON-MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES
..... 34

CHAPTER 1 - HOW IS MSBACT DETERMINED FOR MINOR POLLUTING FACILITIES? 35

PART D OF THE MSBACT GUIDELINES..... 35

CRITERIA FOR NEW MSBACT AND UPDATING PART D 35

MSBACT BASED ON A SIP 36

ACHIEVED IN PRACTICE MSBACT..... 36

ACHIEVED IN PRACTICE CRITERIA..... 36

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER..... 37

LIMITED BACT EXEMPTION..... 37

REQUIREMENTS OF HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 40440.11 37

COST EFFECTIVENESS METHODOLOGY 38

DISCOUNTED CASH FLOW METHOD 38

MAXIMUM COST EFFECTIVENESS VALUES..... 38

TOP-DOWN COST METHODOLOGY 39

 1. *IDENTIFY ALL CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES*..... 39

 2. *ELIMINATE TECHNICALLY INFEASIBLE OPTIONS*..... 39

 3. *RANK REMAINING CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES* 39

 4. *EVALUATION*..... 39

 5. *SELECT MSBACT* 39

COSTS TO INCLUDE IN A COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS 40

CLEAN FUEL GUIDELINES..... 41

AIR QUALITY-RELATED ENERGY POLICY..... 41

MSBACT UPDATE PROCESS 42

CHAPTER 2 - HOW TO USE PART D OF THE MSBACT GUIDELINES..... 44

GENERAL 44

SPECIAL PERMITTING CONSIDERATIONS 45

CASE-SPECIFIC SITUATIONS 45

EQUIVALENCY 45

SUPER COMPLIANT MATERIALS 45

EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS..... 46

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS 46

POLLUTION PREVENTION..... 46

MONITORING AND TESTING..... 47

CAPTURE EFFICIENCY..... 47

EQUIPMENT NOT IDENTIFIED IN THE MSBACT GUIDELINES..... 47

MSBACT DETERMINATIONS SHOULD THE GUIDELINES BECOME OUT OF DATE..... 48

MSBACT APPLICATION CUT-OFF DATES..... 48

PART D - BACT DETERMINATIONS FOR NON-MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES... 49

PART E – POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR FACILITIES SUBJECT TO PREVENTION OF SIGNIFICANT DETERIORATION FOR GREENHOUSE GASES ... 50

 CHAPTER 1 - GHG BACT..... 51

BACKGROUND..... 51
PERMITTING GUIDANCE FOR GHG..... 51
FEDERAL PSD APPLICABILITY FOR GHG..... 52
SOUTH COAST AQMD PSD APPLICABILITY FOR GHG 53
TOP-DOWN BACT PROCESS 53
GHG CONTROL MEASURES WHITE PAPERS 56

**PART F - BACT DETERMINATIONS FOR FACILITIES SUBJECT TO PREVENTION
OF SIGNIFICANT DETERIORATION FOR GREENHOUSE GASES..... 57**

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS..... 58

INDEX OF EQUIPMENT CATEGORIES..... 59

Draft

OVERVIEW

Draft

Chapter 1 - Introduction

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) Regulation XIII – New Source Review (NSR) and Regulation XX – RECLAIM, require applicants to use Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for new sources, relocated sources, and modifications to existing sources that may result in an emission increase of any nonattainment air contaminant, any ozone depleting compound (ODC), or ammonia. Regulation XIII, Rule 1303 (a)(2), requires the Executive Officer to periodically publish BACT Guidelines that establish the procedures and the BACT requirements for commonly permitted equipment.

South Coast AQMD Regulation XIV – Toxics and Other Non-Criteria Pollutants, requires applicants to use Best Available Control Technology for Toxics (T-BACT) for new, relocated or modified permit units that result in a cumulative increase in Maximum Individual Cancer Risk (MICR) of greater than one in a million (1.0×10^{-6}) at any receptor location. Additionally, Regulation XVII – Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) also sets forth BACT requirements for new sources, relocated sources and modifications to existing sources that emit attainment air contaminants. PSD BACT is incorporated into these BACT Guidelines. As of the publication date of these guidelines, there is currently no requirement for South Coast AQMD to publish T-BACT guidelines and T-BACT must be established during the permitting process.

BACKGROUND

~~Historically, the BACT Guidelines were first published in May 1983, and later revised in October 1988. The Guidelines consisted of two parts: Part A – Policy and Procedures, and Part B – BACT Determinations. Part A provided an overview and general guidance while Part B contained specific BACT information by source category and pollutant. Since the October 1988 revision, Part A was amended once in 1995, and Part B was updated with six LAER determinations between 1997 and 1998.~~

On December 11, 1998, the Governing Board approved a new format for listing BACT determinations in Part B of the Guidelines. While the previous Part B of the BACT Guidelines specified BACT requirements and set out source category determinations which could be interpreted as definitive, the new format simply provides listings of recent BACT determinations by South Coast AQMD permitting staff and others as well as information on new and emerging technologies. Part B of the South Coast AQMD BACT Guidelines now follows the same outline as the permit listings in the California Air Resources Board State Technology Clearinghouse Database, which is managed under the direction of the Committee California Air Resources Board Technology Assessment Section~~California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's (CAPCOA) Engineering Managers Committee~~. In addition, BACT determinations made by South Coast AQMD are submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse by ARB staff. Further information on the format of the Guidelines, including reasons for the change in direction, may be found in Board Letters presented at the October 1998 Board Meeting, Agenda No. 41, and the December 1998 Board Meeting, Agenda No. 28.

~~The public participation process includes technical review and comments by a focused BACT Scientific Review Committee (BACT SRC) at periodic intervals, prior to the updates of the South Coast AQMD BACT Guidelines. The Board established a 30-day notice period for the BACT SRC and interested persons to review and comment on South Coast AQMD BACT determinations that result in BACT requirements that are more stringent than previously imposed BACT.~~

As a result of amendments to South Coast AQMD's NSR regulations in September 2000, the BACT Guidelines were separated into two sections: one for major polluting facilities and another for non-major (minor) polluting facilities. (See Chapter 2 in the Overview for how to determine if a facility is major or minor).

The BACT Guidelines for major polluting facilities include:

- Part A: Policy and Procedures for Major Polluting facilities; and
- Part B: LAER/BACT Determinations for Major Polluting Facilities.

The BACT Guidelines for non-major polluting facilities include:

- Part C: Policy and Procedures for Non-Major Polluting Facilities; and
- Part D: BACT Guidelines for Non-Major Polluting Facilities.

~~Both the format of the guidelines and the process for determining BACT are significantly different between major and non-major polluting facilities. Major polluting facilities that are subject to NSR are required by the Clean Air Act to have the Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER). LAER is determined at the time the permit is issued, with little regard for cost, and pursuant to U.S. EPA's LAER policy as to what is achieved in practice. The Part B BACT and LAER determinations for major polluting facilities are only examples of past determinations that help in determining LAER for new permit applications.~~

~~For non-major polluting facilities, BACT will be determined in accordance with state law at the time an application is deemed complete unless a more stringent rule requirement becomes applicable prior to permit issuance. For the most part, it will be as specified in Part D of the BACT Guidelines. Changes to Part D for minor source BACT (MSBACT) to make them more stringent will be subject to public review and South Coast AQMD Board approval, for consideration of cost.~~

For the 2016 amendment to the Guidelines, additional parts have been added to address PSD requirements for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions established by U.S. EPA in 40 CFR 52.21 in 2011. The requirements are incorporated by reference in South Coast AQMD Rule 1714. The BACT Guidelines for GHG requirements include:

- Part E: Policy and Procedures for Facilities Subject to Prevention of Significant Deterioration for Greenhouse Gases; and
- Part F: BACT Determinations for Facilities Subject to Prevention of Significant Deterioration for Greenhouse Gases.

~~In order to distinguish between BACT for various sources, this document will use the following nomenclature for BACT:~~

~~LAER for BACT at major polluting facilities~~

~~MSBACT for BACT at non-major polluting facilities~~

~~PSD BACT for BACT at facilities subject to BACT requirements for criteria pollutants~~

BACT FOR MAJOR VS NON-MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES

Both the format of the guidelines and the process for determining BACT are significantly different between major and non-major polluting facilities. Major polluting facilities that are subject to NSR are required by the Clean Air Act to have the Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER). LAER is determined at the time the permit is issued, with little regard for cost, and pursuant to U.S. EPA's LAER policy as to what is achieved in practice. The Part B BACT and LAER determinations for major polluting facilities are only examples of past determinations that help in determining LAER for new permit applications.

For non-major polluting facilities, BACT will be determined in accordance with state law at the time an application is deemed complete unless a more stringent rule requirement becomes applicable prior to permit issuance. For the most part, it will be as specified in Part D of the BACT Guidelines. Changes to Part D for minor source BACT (MSBACT) to make them more stringent will be subject to public review and South Coast AQMD Board approval, for consideration of cost.

In order to distinguish between BACT for various sources, this document will use the following nomenclature for BACT:

LAER for BACT at major polluting facilities

MSBACT for BACT at non-major (minor) polluting facilities

PSD BACT for BACT at facilities subject to BACT requirements for criteria pollutants

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

California Health & Safety Code Section 40440.11 specifies the criteria and process that must be followed by the South Coast AQMD to establish new BACT emission limits and standards. This code includes requirements that ensure cost effectiveness evaluations are subject to South Coast AQMD Governing Board review and to public hearings prior to revising. The public participation process includes technical review and comments by a focused BACT Scientific Review Committee (BACT SRC) at periodic intervals, prior to the updates of the South Coast AQMD BACT Guidelines. The Board established a 30-day notice period for the BACT SRC and interested persons to review and comment on South Coast AQMD BACT determinations that result in BACT requirements that are more stringent than previously imposed BACT.

Written comments about the BACT Guidelines are welcome at any time and will be evaluated by South Coast AQMD staff and included in the BACT Docket at the South Coast AQMD library. These comments should be addressed to:

South Coast Air Quality Management District
BACT Team
Engineering and Permitting
21865 Copley Dr.

Diamond Bar, CA 91765-0934

Comments may also be submitted via email to BACTTeam@aqmd.gov, and should include BACT Docket in the subject line.

The BACT Guidelines are available ~~without charge~~ from South Coast AQMD's web site at www.aqmd.gov/home/permits/bact. ~~A hardcopy of the BACT Guidelines may be obtained for a fee by submitting a request to Subscription Services at www.aqmd.gov/contact/subscription-services or by calling (909) 396-3720. Revisions to the Guidelines will be mailed to all persons that have purchased annual updates to the BACT Guidelines.~~

Draft

Chapter 2 – Applicability Determination

This chapter explains how to determine whether a facility is a major or minor polluting facility, and how a facility can become a minor polluting facility.

MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITY EMISSION THRESHOLDS

A facility is a major polluting facility (or a major stationary source as it is called in the federal Clean Air Act [CAA]) if it emits, or has the potential to emit (PTE), a criteria air pollutant at a level that equals or exceeds emission thresholds specified in the CAA¹ based on the attainment or nonattainment status. Table 1 presents those emission thresholds for each criteria air pollutant for each air basin in South Coast AQMD. The map in Figure 1 shows the location of the three air basins in South Coast AQMD. **If a threshold for any one criteria pollutant is equaled or exceeded, the facility is a major polluting facility, and will be subject to LAER for all pollutants subject to NSR.** Table 1 does not include emission thresholds that trigger GHG BACT for South Coast AQMD Rule 1714 and 40 CFR 52.21. Part E of the BACT Guidelines should be referenced for a detailed explanation of how GHG BACT emission thresholds are determined.

A facility includes all sources located within contiguous properties owned or operated by the same person, or persons under common control. Contiguous means in actual contact or separated only by a public roadway or other public right-of-way. However, on-shore crude oil and gas production facilities under the same ownership or use entitlement must be included with offshore crude oil and gas production facilities located in Southern California Coastal or Outer Continental Shelf waters.

The following mobile source emissions are also considered as part of the facility²:

1. Emissions from in-plant vehicles; and
2. All emissions from ships during the loading or unloading of cargo and while at berth where the cargo is loaded or unloaded; and
3. Non-propulsion ship emissions within Coastal Waters under South Coast AQMD jurisdiction.

¹ The major source emission thresholds are higher for air basins that comply with the national ambient air quality standard and lower depending on how far an air basin is from compliance with the standard for a pollutant.


The lowest thresholds apply to extreme non-attainment air basins, the only ones which are the South Coast Air Basin and San Joaquin Valley Air Basin for ozone (VOC and NOx).

² In accordance with Rule 1306(g).

Table 1
Actual or Potential Emission Threshold Levels (Tons per Year)
for Major Polluting Facilities

Pollutant	South Coast Air Basin	Riverside County Portion of Salton Sea Air Basin	Non-Palo Verde, Riverside County Portion of Mojave Desert Air Basin
VO C	10	10	100
NOx	10	10	100
SOx ₃	70	70	100
CO	50	100	100
PM ₁₀	70	70	100
PM _{2.5}	70	---	---

Figure 1: Map of South Coast AQMD



³ The threshold for SOx, as a precursor for PM, is 70 tons per year for serious PM₁₀ areas, which the SCAB previously was, and 70 tons per year for serious PM_{2.5} areas, which the SCAB currently is. Rule 1302 previously specified 100 tons per year, which was in error, and was changed at the November 2016 Board Meeting.

POTENTIAL TO EMIT

Potential to emit is based on permit conditions that limit emissions or throughput. If there are no such permit conditions, PTE is based on:

- the maximum rated capacity; and
- the maximum daily hours of operation; and
- physical characteristics of the materials processed.

The PTE must include fugitive emissions associated with the source. RECLAIM emission allocations are not considered emission limits because RECLAIM facilities may purchase RTCs and increase their emissions without modifying their permit. For PSD purposes, as well as Rule 1325 for PM_{2.5}, which incorporates federal requirements, fugitive emissions are included only for major source categories specifically identified in 40 CFR 52.21.

LIMITING POTENTIAL TO EMIT

A facility's PTE can be capped by an enforceable permit condition that limits emissions. This condition will likely involve monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting to ensure that emissions remain below the permit limit.

Chapter 3 - When is BACT Required?

This chapter explains when BACT is required by identifying the air pollutants subject to BACT, the permit actions that trigger BACT review, and the calculation procedures to determine emission increases.

POLLUTANTS SUBJECT TO NSR, PSD AND BACT

The South Coast AQMD's New Source Review (NSR) programs include *Regulation XIII - New Source Review* and *Rule 2005 - New Source Review for RECLAIM*. Rule 2005 applies only to NO_x and SO_x emissions from RECLAIM facilities, while Regulation XIII applies to other non-attainment air pollutants from RECLAIM facilities, all non-attainment air pollutants from all other facilities, and ammonia and ozone-depleting compound (ODC) emissions from all facilities. ODCs are defined as Class I substances listed in 40 CFR, Part 82, Appendix A, Subpart A, and are listed in Table 2. Rule 1325 specifically applies to PM_{2.5}.

Although the South Coast AQMD is in attainment with the ambient air quality standards for SO₂ and NO₂, NO_x is a precursor to ozone, and both SO_x and NO_x are precursors to PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, which are non-attainment air pollutants. Therefore, SO_x and NO_x are treated as non-attainment air pollutants as well. The net result is that VOC, NO_x, SO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} are subject to NSR in all of South Coast AQMD.

The South Coast Air Basin has historically been designated nonattainment for CO. However, there has been considerable improvement in CO air quality in the Basin from 1976 to 2005. In 2001, the Basin met both the federal and state 8-hour CO standards for the first time at all monitoring stations. The 2003 AQMP revision to the CO plan served a dual purpose; it replaced the 1997 attainment demonstration that lapsed at the end of 2000, and it provided the basis for a CO maintenance plan in the future. The Basin was designated as attainment for CO in 2007.⁴ Therefore, Although, CO is in attainment with state and federal ambient air quality standards, CO is subject to BACT based on South Coast AQMD policy.

The South Coast AQMD's Regulation XVII – Prevention of Significant Deterioration sets forth BACT requirements for stationary sources that emit attainment air contaminants. The BACT requirement applies to any net emission increase of a criteria pollutant from a permit unit at any source. As explained in the South Coast AQMD Staff Report for Regulation XVII dated September 28, 1988 for the October 7, 1988 Board meeting, **the PSD BACT requirement is applicable to all permit units regardless if the source is classified as a minor or major facility.**

Lead (Pb) is a criteria air pollutant and is subject to BACT in areas of non-attainment or is subject to PSD in areas of attainment. Pb can be a component of a source's PM₁₀ emissions and is therefore subject to BACT for PM₁₀. BACT for Pb will be BACT for PM₁₀ or compliance with Rules 1420, 1420.1 or 1420.2, whichever is more stringent.

⁴ CO Attainment Status memo dated August 9th, 2007
<https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/bact/policy-and-guidance-documents/8-9-07-coattainmentstatus2.pdf>

The applicability of the various pollutants to NSR in the various air basins is summarized in Table 3. See Figure 1 in the previous chapter for a map of South Coast AQMD that shows the location of the three air basins in South Coast AQMD.

Draft

Table 2
Class I Substances (ODCs)*

<p>A. Group I: CFCl_3 Trichlorofluoromethane (CFC-11) CF_2Cl_2 Dichlorodifluoromethane (CFC-12) $\text{C}_2\text{F}_3\text{Cl}_3$ Trichlorotrifluoroethane (CFC-113) $\text{C}_2\text{F}_4\text{Cl}_2$ Dichlorotetrafluoroethane (CFC-114) $\text{C}_2\text{F}_5\text{Cl}$ Monochloropentafluoroethane (CFC-115) All isomers of the above chemicals</p> <p>B. Group II: CF_2ClBr Bromochlorodifluoromethane (Halon-1211) CF_3Br Bromotrifluoromethane (Halon-1301) $\text{C}_2\text{F}_4\text{Br}_2$ Dibromotetrafluoroethane (Halon-2402) All isomers of the above chemicals</p> <p>C. Group III: CF_3Cl Chlorotrifluoromethane (CFC-13) C_2FCl_5 Pentachlorofluoroethane (CFC-111) $\text{C}_2\text{F}_2\text{Cl}_4$ Tetrachlorodifluoroethane (CFC-112) C_3FCl_7 Heptachlorofluoropropane (CFC-211) $\text{C}_3\text{F}_2\text{Cl}_6$ Hexachlorodifluoropropane (CFC-212) $\text{C}_3\text{F}_3\text{Cl}_5$ Pentachlorotrifluoropropane (CFC-213) $\text{C}_3\text{F}_4\text{Cl}_4$ Tetrachlorotetrafluoropropane (CFC-214) $\text{C}_3\text{F}_5\text{Cl}_3$ Trichloropentafluoropropane (CFC-215) $\text{C}_3\text{F}_6\text{Cl}_2$ Dichlorohexafluoropropane (CFC-216) $\text{C}_3\text{F}_7\text{Cl}$ Chloroheptafluoropropane (CFC-217) All isomers of the above chemicals</p> <p>D. Group IV: CCl_4 Carbon Tetrachloride</p> <p>E. Group V: $\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{Cl}_3$ 1,1,1 Trichloroethane (Methyl chloroform) All isomers of the above chemical except 1,1,2-trichloroethane</p> <p>F. Group VI: CH_3Br Bromomethane (Methyl Bromide)</p> <p>H. Group VIII: CH_2BrCl (Chlorobromomethane)</p>	<p>G. Group VII: CH_2FBr CHF_2Br (HBFC-2201) CH_2FBr C_2HFBr_4 $\text{C}_2\text{HF}_2\text{Br}_3$ $\text{C}_2\text{HF}_3\text{Br}_2$ $\text{C}_2\text{HF}_4\text{Br}$ $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\text{FBr}_3$ $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\text{F}_2\text{Br}_2$ $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$ $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\text{FBr}_2$ $\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{F}_2\text{Br}$ $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\text{FBr}$ C_3HFBr_6 $\text{C}_3\text{HF}_2\text{Br}_5$ $\text{C}_3\text{HF}_3\text{Br}_4$ $\text{C}_3\text{HF}_4\text{Br}_3$ $\text{C}_3\text{HF}_5\text{Br}_2$ $\text{C}_3\text{HF}_6\text{Br}$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{FBr}_5$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_2\text{Br}_4$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}_3$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_4\text{Br}_2$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_5\text{Br}$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_3\text{FBr}_4$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_3\text{F}_2\text{Br}_3$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_3\text{F}_3\text{Br}_2$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_3\text{F}_4\text{Br}$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_4\text{FBr}_3$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_4\text{F}_2\text{Br}_2$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_4\text{F}_3\text{Br}$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_5\text{FBr}_2$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_5\text{F}_2\text{Br}$ $\text{C}_3\text{H}_6\text{FBr}$</p>
--	--

* 40 CFR, Part 82, Appendix A, Subpart A

Table 3
Applicability of NSR to Various Pollutants in
South Coast Air Basin (SOCAB), Salton Sea Air Basin (SSAB),
and Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB)

<u>Air Basin</u>	<u>VOC</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>SOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>PM₁₀</u>	<u>PM_{2.5}</u>	<u>NH₃</u>	<u>Pb</u>	<u>ODC</u>
SOCAB	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√
SSAB	√	√	√		√		√	√	√
MDAB	√	√	√		√		√	√	√

PERMIT ACTIONS SUBJECT TO NSR, PSD AND BACT

South Coast AQMD's NSR and PSD regulations are preconstruction permit review programs that require the Executive Officer to deny a permit to construct unless the proposed equipment includes BACT when:

- new equipment is installed;
- existing stationary permitted equipment is relocated; or
- existing permitted equipment is modified such that there is an emission increase.

If the new equipment is to replace the same kind of equipment, NSR⁵ still requires BACT unless it is an identical replacement, which does not require a new permit according to *Rule 219 -Equipment Not Requiring a Written Permit Pursuant to Regulation II*.

BACT is not required for a change of operator, provided the facility is a continuing operation at the same location, without modification or change in operating conditions.

In case of relocation of a non-major facility, the facility operator may opt out of installing MSBACT, provided that the owner/operator meets the conditions specified in Rule 1302 (ai) and Rule 1306 (d)(3).⁶

PSD applies to GHG if the source is otherwise subject to PSD for another regulated NSR pollutant and the source is new with a GHG PTE $\geq 75,000$ tons per year CO₂e, or an existing source with a modification resulting in a similar GHG emissions increase.

It is South Coast AQMD policy that BACT is required only for emission increases greater than or equal to one (1.0) pound per day.

In accordance with policy established by South Coast AQMD's Engineering and Permitting division in June 2018, for the purpose of preventing circumvention of triggering a BACT requirement, a period of 5 years prior to the date of application submittal shall be used to accumulate all previous permitting actions allowing emission increases for that specific permit unit to determine if emission increases exceed or

⁵ See Rules 1303(a) and 1304(a).

⁶ U.S. EPA has expressed concerns with this provision of the NSR Rules for minor polluting facilities as of September 2000. Staff will continue to work with U.S. EPA to resolve this issue.

equal 1.0 pound per day for any nonattainment air contaminant, any ozone depleting compound, or ammonia.

LIMITED BACT EXEMPTION

Rule 1304 (Exemptions) was amended in November 2021 to add subdivision (f) to include a limited BACT exemption for RECLAIM and former RECLAIM facilities. This limited BACT exemption is available to new or modified permit units located at a RECLAIM or former RECLAIM facility, for PM₁₀ and SO_x emission increases associated with the installation or modification of add-on air pollution control equipment for controlling NO_x emissions to comply with NO_x Best Available Retrofit Control Technology (BARCT) emission limits. The objective of the proposed narrow BACT exemption is to address the co-pollutant issue associated with the installation or modification of add-on air pollution controls and the replacement of equipment that is combined with an installation or modification of add-on air pollution control required to transition NO_x RECLAIM facilities. This limited BACT exemption is available only to projects at qualified facilities that meet all the requirements listed under Rule 1304 subparagraphs (f)(1)(A) through (E) ⁷.

CALCULATION PROCEDURES FOR EMISSION INCREASES

The calculation procedures for determining whether there is an increase in emissions from an equipment modification that triggers BACT are different for NO_x and SO_x pollutants from RECLAIM facilities than for all other cases. In general, the calculation procedures for RECLAIM facilities are less likely to result in an emission increase that requires BACT.

For NO_x and SO_x emissions from a source at a RECLAIM facility, there is an emission increase if the maximum hourly potential to emit is greater after the modification than it was before the modification. ⁸

For modifications subject to Regulation XIII, there are two possible cases ⁹:

1. If the equipment was previously subject to NSR, an emission increase occurs if the new potential to emit in one day is greater than the previous potential to emit in one day.
2. If the equipment was never previously subject to NSR, an emission increase occurs if the new potential to emit in one day exceeds the actual average daily emissions over the two-year period, or other appropriate period, prior to the permit application date. However, for the installation of air pollution controls on any source constructed prior to the adoption of the NSR on October 8, 1976 for the sole purpose of reducing emissions, Rule 1306(f) allows the emission change to be calculated as the post-modification potential to emit minus the pre-modification potential to emit.

The potential to emit is based on permit conditions that directly limit the emissions, or, if there are none, then the potential to emit is based on:

⁷ See Rule 1304 (f).

⁸ See Rule 2005(d) and [Engineering Policy & Procedures dated 8/7/2019](#).

⁹ See Rule 1306(d)(2).

- maximum rated capacity; and
- the maximum daily hours of operation; and
- the physical characteristics of the materials processed.

Draft

Chapter 4 - What is BACT?

This chapter explains the definitions of BACT found in South Coast AQMD rules, state law and federal law.

NSR RULES (REGULATION XIII)

New sources, relocations, and modifications of existing sources that increase nonattainment air contaminant emissions are subject to New Source Review (NSR) regulations which require BACT, among other requirements. Both federal and state laws require this strategy. The federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requirement for Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) is implemented through BACT in the South Coast AQMD. Federal LAER applies to major sources only. Although federal LAER applies to any emissions increase at a major stationary source of ozone precursors, South Coast AQMD has interpreted this provision as a 1.0 lb/day increase in emissions from all sources subject to NSR. According to South Coast AQMD's rules, BACT requirements may not be less stringent than federal LAER for major polluting facilities. The California Health & Safety Code (H&SC) Section 40405 defines state BACT similar to federal LAER and requires the application of BACT for all new and modified permitted sources subject to NSR.

PSD RULES (REGULATION XVII)

New sources, relocations, and modifications of existing sources that emit attainment air contaminant emissions and certain other specified pollutants are subject to Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) regulations, which require BACT. Pursuant to Rule 1701, the BACT requirement applies to a net emission increase from a permit unit located at minor and major stationary sources. The intention of the PSD requirement is to implement a similar requirement as Regulation XIII to maintain national ambient air quality standards for attainment air contaminants.

DEFINITION OF BACT

Definitions of BACT are found in: Rule 1302 -*Definitions of Regulation XIII - New Source Review*, which applies to all cases in general, except for Rule 1702 – *Definitions*, which applies only to attainment air contaminants, and Rule 2000 - *General*, which applies to NO_x and SO_x emissions from RECLAIM facilities. While the definitions are not identical, they are essentially the same. Section (h) of Rule 1302 - *Definitions* defines BACT as:

BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY (BACT) means the most stringent emission limitation or control technique which:

- (1) *has been achieved in practice for such category or class of source; or*
- (2) *is contained in any state implementation plan (SIP) approved by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for such category or class of source. A specific limitation or control technique shall not apply if the*

owner or operator of the proposed source demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer or designee that such limitation or control technique is not presently achievable; or

- (3) *is any other emission limitation or control technique, found by the Executive Officer or designee to be technologically feasible for such class or category of sources or for a specific source, and cost-effective as compared to measures as listed in the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) or rules adopted by the South Coast AQMD Governing Board.*

The first two requirements in the BACT definition are required by federal law, as LAER for major sources. The third part of the definition is unique to South Coast AQMD and some other areas in California and allows for more stringent controls than LAER.

Rule 1303(a)(2) requires that economic and technical feasibility be considered in establishing the class or category of sources and the BACT requirements for non-major polluting facilities.

REQUIREMENTS OF HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 40440.11

Senate Bill 456 (Kelley) was chaptered into state law in 1995 and became effective in 1996. H&SC Section 40440.11 specifies the criteria and process that must be followed by the South Coast AQMD to update its BACT Guidelines to establish more stringent BACT limits for listed source categories. After consultation with the affected industry, the CARB, and the U.S. EPA, and considerable legal review and analysis, staff concluded that the process specified in SB 456 to update the BACT Guidelines should be interpreted to apply only if the South Coast AQMD proposes to make BACT more stringent than LAER or to establish BACT for non-major sources. This is because the CAA requires the South Coast AQMD staff to apply current LAER for major polluting facilities, even if the proposed LAER determination has not gone through the SB456 process. Therefore, the SB 456 requirements do apply to BACT requirements for non-major polluting facilities, but do not apply to federal LAER determinations for major polluting facilities.

CLEAN FUEL GUIDELINES

In January 1988, the South Coast AQMD Governing Board adopted a Clean Fuels Policy that included a requirement to use clean fuels as part of BACT. The implementation of this policy is further described in Parts A and C of these guidelines.

Chapter 5 - Review of Staff BACT Determinations

New BACT determinations and guideline updates proposed by South Coast AQMD staff are subject to public notification requirements. In addition to allowing the public to comment on these items, the South Coast AQMD has established a BACT Scientific Review Committee (BACT SRC) to review and comment on technical matters of the proposals.

The South Coast AQMD has included provisions for an applicant to request a review of particular circumstances regarding a permit application and reconsideration of the BACT determination. Additional avenues are available to permit applicants for further review of staff BACT determinations through South Coast AQMD management, BACT Review Committee, Hearing Board, and the Governing Board.

BACT SCIENTIFIC REVIEW COMMITTEE (BACT SRC)

The BACT SRC was established as a standing committee by action of the South Coast AQMD Governing Board on September 8, 1995, to enhance the public participation process and include technical review and comments by a focused committee at periodic intervals, prior to the updates of the South Coast AQMD BACT Guidelines. The BACT SRC Charter details the goals, objectives, composition, qualifications, and operational guidelines of the BACT SRC¹⁰. A 30-day notice period applies for the BACT SRC and interested persons to review and comment on South Coast AQMD BACT determinations that result in BACT requirements that are more stringent than previously imposed. The BACT SRC consist of up to 19 members, including but are not limited to, representatives from CARB, U.S. EPA, neighboring Air Pollution Control Districts (APCD), with the balance of the committee created by invitation of recognized experts from industry, public utilities, suppliers of air pollution control equipment and advocacy groups. Whenever a committee member resigns or is no longer able to serve, South Coast AQMD seeks out an appropriate replacement to join the committee. A list of current BACT SRC members can be accessed at

Scientific Review Committee (aqmd.gov)
<http://www.aqmd.gov/home/permits/bact/scientific-review-committee>.

The overall purpose of the BACT Scientific Review Committee is to:

- Comment on proposed new and more stringent BACT determinations in permit applications under 30-day public review.
- Comment on proposed BACT listings for all parts of the BACT Guidelines.

Except for the above, the BACT SRC's purpose is not to comment on past permitting decisions or change them. Specifically, the role of the BACT SRC is to review and comment in writing on the appropriateness of new BACT determinations under 30-Day public review. During this comment period, South Coast AQMD, State, and

¹⁰ See South Coast Air Quality Management District Best Available Control Technology Scientific Review Committee Charter: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/bact-src/bact-src-charter/amended-bact-src-charter_02012019.pdf

Federal required permit issuance timelines are still in effect. South Coast AQMD BACT staff will ~~commit to sending~~ send the BACT SRC newly proposed BACT listings at least seven days prior to the next scheduled BACT SRC meeting. Meetings will typically consist of a presentation by BACT Team (BACTTeam@aqmd.gov) staff of new BACT ~~forms~~ determinations and technical data and a general discussion of the proposed BACT listings, ~~as well as addressing any preliminary written comments received from the public and BACT SRC prior to the meeting.~~ South Coast AQMD staff will respond in writing to ~~preliminary~~ comments about new BACT proposals within thirty days of the subject BACT SRC meeting. New issues raised during the BACT SRC meetings regarding newly proposed BACT listings will be addressed at the subsequent BACT SRC meeting to allow time for South Coast AQMD staff to research the comments. South Coast AQMD Engineering staff may also respond to specific issues raised at the following BACT SRC meeting.

In addition to newly proposed BACT listings, the BACT SRC will be tasked with reviewing and commenting on updates to the policy and procedure sections of the BACT Guidelines prior to the guidelines being presented to the South Coast AQMD Governing Board for approval.

MEETING WITH SOUTH COAST AQMD MANAGEMENT

South Coast AQMD management, starting with the Senior Engineering Manager of the permitting team, can consider unique and site-specific characteristics of an individual permit. The allowance for site-specific characteristics has been designed into the guidelines and can be reviewed with the manager of the section processing the permit. It is also possible to request review at the next level, with the Assistant Deputy Executive Officer of Engineering and Permitting. The Senior Engineering Managers and the Assistant Deputy Executive Officers are empowered to make case-by-case decisions on an individual permit. Further review can be obtained through a meeting with the Deputy Executive Officer (DEO) of Engineering and Permitting. Ultimately, all permitting decisions are the responsibility of the Executive Officer.

THE BACT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Beyond meetings with South Coast AQMD management, an applicant may also request, prior to permit issuance or denial, that the proposed BACT for an individual permit be reviewed by the BACT Review Committee (BRC). The BRC is composed of five senior-level South Coast AQMD officials - the DEO of Legislative, Public Affairs/Media Office; the DEO of Science and Technology Advancement; the DEO of Engineering and Permitting; the DEO of Planning, Rule Development and Implementation; and General Counsel. This committee can review pending individual applications and decide if the BACT determination is appropriate. The BRC can be accessed without any fee or legal representation, and will meet upon demand.

THE SOUTH COAST AQMD HEARING BOARD

After the permit is issued or denied, the applicant can seek further independent review of an individual Minor Source BACT determination through the South Coast AQMD Hearing Board. In order to access this venue, the permit applicant would need to submit a petition and fee to appeal the final Minor Source BACT determination by

South Coast AQMD (once the permit is denied or issued)¹¹. The Hearing Board is an independent, quasi-judicial body composed of five members, who can review a permitting decision by the Executive Officer. In this venue, legal counsel represents the South Coast AQMD. Although not required, many petitioners choose to have legal counsel to represent their position.

THE SOUTH COAST AQMD GOVERNING BOARD

Any applicant may petition the South Coast AQMD Governing Board to review a pending application pursuant to South Coast AQMD Regulation XII and Health and Safety Code Section 40509. While the Governing Board has the authority to hear and consider any pending permit application, it has rarely done so. It is important to note that this action must be taken while the permit application is pending with staff. Once staff reaches its decision, the only avenue of appeal is through the Hearing Board and ultimately to court.

Draft

¹¹ Applicants must file an appeal petition with the Hearing Board within thirty days of the receipt of the permit or the notification of permit denial. See Rule 216 - *Appeals*, Regulation V - *Procedure Before the Hearing Board*, and Rule 303 - *Hearing Board Fees* for more information.

PART A - POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES

Draft

Chapter 1 - How is LAER Determined for Major Polluting Facilities?

This chapter explains the criteria used for determining LAER¹ and the process for updating Part B of the BACT Guidelines for major polluting facilities.

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING LAER FOR MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES

South Coast AQMD staff determines LAER requirements on a permit-by-permit basis based on the definition of LAER. In essence, LAER is the most stringent emission limit or control technology for a class or category of source that is:

- found in a state implementation plan (SIP) pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 40405(a)(1), or
- achieved in practice (AIP), or
- is technologically feasible and cost effective.

For practical purposes, at this time, nearly all South Coast AQMD LAER determinations will be based on AIP LAER because it is generally more stringent than LAER based on SIP, ~~and because state law constrains South Coast AQMD in using the third approach, as such a determination must go through the SB456 process, which may take more time than allowed for the permit decision.~~

Based on Governing Board policy, LAER also includes a requirement for the use of clean fuels. Terms such as “achieved in practice” and “technologically feasible” have not been defined in the rule, so the purpose of this section is to explain the criteria South Coast AQMD permitting staff uses to make a LAER determination.

LAER Based on a SIP

The most stringent emission limit found in an approved state implementation plan (SIP) might be the basis for LAER. This means that the most stringent emission limit adopted by any state as a rule, regulation or permit², and approved by U.S. EPA, is eligible as a LAER requirement. No other parameters are required to be evaluated when this category is chosen. This does not include future emission limits that have not yet been implemented.

¹ In order to distinguish between BACT for major polluting facilities and BACT for minor polluting facilities, this document uses the term LAER when referring to BACT for major polluting facilities.

² Some states incorporate individual permits into their SIP as case-by-case Reasonably Available Control Technology requirements.

Achieved in Practice LAER

Regulatory Documents

An emission limit or control technology may be considered achieved in practice (AIP) for a category or class of source if it exists in any of the following regulatory documents or programs:

- South Coast AQMD BACT Guidelines
- CAPCOA BACT Clearinghouse
- U.S. EPA RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse
- Other districts' and states' BACT Guidelines
- BACT/LAER requirements in New Source Review permits issued by South Coast AQMD or other agencies

However, staff will check with the permitting authority (other than South Coast AQMD) on the status of the BACT or LAER requirement. If it is found that an emission limit is not being achieved or a control technology is not performing as expected in the equipment referenced in any of the above sources or in other equipment used as the basis for the BACT or LAER determination, then it will not be considered as AIP.

New Technologies/Emission Levels

New technologies and innovations of existing technologies occasionally evolve without a regulatory requirement, but still deserve consideration. They may have been voluntarily installed to reduce emissions, and may or may not be subject to an air quality permit or an emission limit. Therefore, in addition to the above means of being determined as AIP, a control technology or emission limit may also be considered as AIP if it meets all the following criteria:

Commercial Availability

At least one vendor must offer this equipment for regular or full-scale operation in the United States. A performance warranty or guaranty must be available with the purchase of the control technology, as well as parts and service.

Reliability

All control technologies must have been installed and operated reliably for at least six months. If the operator did not require the basic equipment to operate daily, then the equipment must have at least 183 cumulative days of operation. During this period, the basic and/or control equipment must have operated: 1) at a minimum of 50% design capacity; or 2) in a manner that is typical of the equipment in order to provide an expectation of continued reliability of the control technology.

Effectiveness

The control technology must be verified to perform effectively over the range of operation expected for that type of equipment. If the control technology will be allowed to operate at lesser effectiveness during certain modes of operation, then those modes of operation must be identified. The verification shall be based on a performance test or tests deemed to be acceptable by South Coast AQMD, when possible, or other performance data.

Technology Transfer

LAER is based on what is AIP for a category or class of source. However, U.S. EPA guidelines require that technology that is determined to be AIP for one category of source be considered for transfer to other source categories. There are two types of potentially transferable control technologies: 1) exhaust stream controls, and 2) process controls and modifications. For the first type, technology transfer must be considered between source categories that produce similar exhaust streams. For the second type, technology transfer must be considered between source categories with similar processes.

Federal PM_{2.5} New Source Review and South Coast AQMD Rule 1325

PM_{2.5} NSR applies to a new major polluting facility, major modifications to a major polluting facility, and any modification to an existing facility that would constitute a major polluting facility. A major polluting facility would be a facility located in areas federally designated pursuant to 40 CFR 81.305 as non-attainment for PM_{2.5} for the South Coast Air Basin (SOCAB) which has actual emissions of, or the potential to emit, 70 tons or more per year of PM_{2.5}, or its precursors for serious areas. For major modifications, LAER applies on a pollutant-specific basis to emissions of PM_{2.5} and its precursors, for which (1) the source is major, (2) the modification results in a significant increase, and (3) the modification results in a significant net emissions increase.

Significant means in reference to a net emissions increase or the potential of a source to emit any of the following pollutants, a rate of emissions that would equal or exceed any of the following rates³:

Nitrogen oxides:	40 tons per year
Sulfur dioxide:	40 tons per year
Volatile organic compound (VOC):	40 tons per year ⁴
PM _{2.5} :	10 tons per year
Ammonia:	40 tons per year ⁵

A facility subject to the Federal PM_{2.5} NSR will be required to comply with the following:

- Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER)
- Emission increases offset
- Certification of compliance with Clean Air Act; and
- Analysis conducted of benefits of the proposed project outweigh the environmental and social costs associated with that project.

Please refer to South Coast AQMD Rule 1325 for specific requirements.

Limited BACT Exemption

Rule 1304 - Exemptions was amended in November 2021 to add subdivision (f) to include a limited BACT exemption for RECLAIM and former RECLAIM facilities. This

³ South Coast AQMD Rule 1325(b)(4213), as amended on January 4, 2019

⁴ VOC was added to Rule 1325 as a precursor to PM_{2.5} pursuant to EPA's 2016 PM_{2.5} SIP implementation Rule

⁵ Ammonia was added to Rule 1325 as a precursor to PM_{2.5} pursuant to EPA's 2016 PM_{2.5} SIP implementation Rule.

limited BACT exemption is available to new or modified permit unit located at a RECLAIM or former RECLAIM facilities, for PM₁₀ and SO_x emission increases associated with the installation or modification of add-on air pollution control equipment for controlling NO_x emissions to comply with NO_x Best Available Retrofit Control Technology (BARCT) emission limits. The objective of the proposed narrow BACT exemption is to address the co-pollutant issue associated with the installation or modification of add-on air pollution controls and the replacement of equipment that is combined with an installation or modification of add-on air pollution control required to transition NO_x RECLAIM facilities. This limited BACT exemption is available only to projects at qualified facilities that meet all the requirements listed under Rule 1304 subparagraphs (f)(1)(A) through (E) ⁶.

Cost in LAER Determinations

U.S. EPA guidelines do not allow for routine consideration of the cost of control in LAER determinations. However, U.S. EPA guidelines say that LAER is not considered achievable if the cost of control is so great that a new source could not be built or operated with a particular control technology. If a facility in the same or comparable industry already uses the control technology, then such use constitutes evidence that the cost to the industry is not prohibitive.

State law (H&SC 40405) also defines BACT as the lowest achievable emission rate, which is the more stringent of either (i) the most stringent emission limitation contained in the SIP, or (ii) the most stringent emission limitation that is achieved in practice. There is no explicit reference or prohibition to cost considerations, and the applicability extends to all permitted sources. South Coast AQMD rules implement both state BACT and federal LAER requirements simultaneously, and furthermore specify that South Coast AQMD BACT must meet federal LAER requirements for major polluting facilities.

If a proposed LAER determination results in extraordinary costs to a facility, the applicant may bring the matter to South Coast AQMD management for consideration as described in Overview, Chapter 65.

Special Permitting Considerations

Although the most stringent AIP LAER for a source category will most likely be the required LAER, South Coast AQMD staff may consider special technical circumstances that apply to the proposed equipment which may allow deviation from that LAER. The permit applicant should bring any pertinent facts to the attention of the South Coast AQMD permitting engineer for consideration.

Case-Specific Situations

South Coast AQMD staff may consider unusual equipment-specific and site-specific characteristics of the proposed project that would warrant a reconsideration of the LAER requirement for new equipment. Here are some examples of what may be considered.

Technical infeasibility of the control technology

⁶ See Rule 1304 (f).

A particular control technology may not be required as LAER if the applicant demonstrates that it is not technically feasible to install and operate it to meet a specific LAER emission limitation in a specific permitting situation.

Operating schedule and project length

If the equipment will operate much fewer hours per year than what is typical, or for a much shorter project length, it can affect what is considered AIP.

Availability of fuel or electricity

Some LAER determinations may not be feasible if a project will be located in an area where natural gas or electricity is not available.

Process requirements

Some LAER determinations specify a particular type of process equipment. South Coast AQMD staff may consider requirements of the proposed process equipment that would make the LAER determination not technically feasible.

Equivalency

The permit applicant may propose alternative means to achieve the same emission reduction as required by LAER. For example, if LAER requires a certain emission limit or control efficiency to be achieved, the applicant may choose any control technology, process modification, or combination thereof that can meet the same emission limit or control efficiency.

Super Compliant Materials

South Coast AQMD will accept the use of super compliant materials in lieu of an add-on control device controlling VOC emissions from coating operations. For example, if a permit applicant uses only surface coatings that meet the super compliant material definition in South Coast AQMD Rule 109, an add-on control device would not be required for VOC LAER. This policy does not preclude any other LAER requirements for other contaminants.

Equipment Modifications

As a general rule, it is more difficult to retrofit existing equipment with LAER as a result of NSR modification when compared to a new source. The equipment being modified may not be compatible with some past LAER determinations that specify a particular process type. There may also be space restrictions that prevent installation of some add-on control technology.

Other Considerations

Although multiple process and control options may be available during the LAER determination process, considerations should be made for options that reduce the formation of air contaminants from the process, as well as ensuring that emissions are properly handled. In addition to evaluating the efficiency of the control stage, these additional considerations are needed to ensure that the system is capable of reducing or eliminating emissions from the facility on a consistent basis during the operational life of the equipment.

Pollution Prevention

The Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §§13101-13109) established a national policy that pollution should be prevented or reduced at the source whenever feasible. In many cases, air pollution control is a process that evaluates contaminants at the exhaust of the system. Pollution prevention is the reduction or elimination of waste at the source by the modification of the production process. Pollution prevention measures may consist of the use of alternate or reformulated materials, a modification of technology or equipment, or improvement of energy efficiency changes that result in an emissions reduction. These measures should be considered as part of the LAER determination process if the measures will result in the elimination or reduction of emissions, but are not required to include projects which are considered to fundamentally redefine the source. New and different emissions created by a process or material change will also need to be considered as part of the LAER determination process, in contrast to the overall emissions reductions from the implementation of pollution prevention measures. U.S. EPA policy defined pollution prevention as source reduction and other practices that reduce or eliminate the creation of pollutants through increased efficiency in the use of raw materials, energy, water, or other resources, and protection of natural resources by conservation⁷. U.S. EPA further specifies that pollution prevention does not include recycling (except in-process recycling), energy recovery, treatment or disposal. For purposes of these BACT Guidelines, and to be consistent with federal definitions, source reduction and pollution prevention may include, but not be limited to, a consideration of the feasibility of:

- equipment or technology modifications,
- process or procedure modifications,
- reformulation or redesign of products,
- substitution of raw materials, or
- improvements in housekeeping, maintenance or inventory control,

that reduce the amount of air contaminants entering any waste stream or otherwise released into the environment, including fugitive emissions.

Monitoring and Testing

In order to ensure that LAER determinations continue to meet their initial emission and efficiency standards, periodic or continuous parameter monitoring and testing requirements may be required during the permitting process. Equipment and processes may experience some change over time, due to aging or operational methods of the equipment, which may affect emission rates or control efficiencies. In addition to other rule requirements, additional monitoring and testing requirements may need to focus on aspects directly related to the BACT determination, and may be made enforceable by permit conditions. Monitoring and testing requirements should be specific to characterize operating conditions (e.g. temperatures, pressures, flows, production rates) and measurement techniques when LAER is established to ensure clarity and consistency with the standard.

Capture Efficiency

An integral part of controlling air pollutants emitted from a process with add-on air pollution control equipment is capturing those emissions and directing them to the air pollution control device. Emissions which are designed to be collected by an exhaust

⁷ U.S. EPA Pollution Prevention Law and Policies (www.epa.gov/p2/pollution-prevention-law-and-policies#define)

system but are vented uncontrolled into the atmosphere can have a much greater impact than controlled emissions. When applicable, the evaluation of a process and its associated control equipment should address the qualification and quantification of capture efficiency. By addressing capture efficiency during LAER determinations, a standard can be established to evaluate the capture efficiency of other systems, as well as ensure that the capture efficiency is maintained consistently over time.

If applicable, LAER determinations may include the percentage capture efficiency and the methods and measurements (e.g. EPA Method 204, capture velocity measurements, design using ACGIH’s Industrial Ventilation, static pressures) used to determine and verify it. For various circumstances, several South Coast AQMD rules (Table 4) already require an assessment of collection efficiency of an emission control system following EPA Method 204, EPA’s “Guidelines for Determining Capture Efficiency”, South Coast AQMD’s [“Protocol for Determination of Volatile Organic Compounds \(VOC\) Capture Efficiency”](#), or other methods approved by the Executive Officer, and are appropriate to include as LAER requirements. The capture efficiency for any LAER Determination shall be no less stringent than any applicable rule requirement. Other considerations that may affect capture, such as cross-drafts, thermal drafts and the volume of combustion products, should also be addressed during this process.

Table 4
South Coast AQMD Regulation XI and XIV Rules with Capture Efficiency Requirements or Considerations

- | | | | | |
|--------|----------|----------|--------|----------|
| • 1103 | • 1125 | • 1136 | • 1162 | • 1420.1 |
| • 1104 | • 1126 | • 1141 | • 1164 | • 1420.2 |
| • 1106 | • 1128 | • 1141.2 | • 1171 | • 1425 |
| • 1107 | • 1130 | • 1144 | • 1175 | • 1469 |
| • 1115 | • 1130.1 | • 1145 | • 1178 | • 1469.1 |
| • 1122 | • 1131 | • 1155 | • 1407 | |
| • 1124 | • 1132 | • 1156 | • 1420 | |

LAER APPLICATION CUT-OFF DATES

For applications submitted by major polluting facilities, LAER requirements will be determined based on information available up to the date the permit to construct is issued. This requirement allows interested parties to comment on possible technologies that could provide lower emissions.

Applications for a Registration Permit for equipment issued a valid Certified Equipment Permit (CEP), which is valid for one year, will only be required to comply with LAER as determined at the time the CEP was issued. However, South Coast AQMD staff will reevaluate the LAER requirements for the CEP upon renewal of the Title V permit.

LAER UPDATE PROCESS

South Coast AQMD will update Section I – South Coast AQMD LAER/BACT Determinations of Part B of the BACT Guidelines on an ongoing basis with actual LAER determinations for South Coast AQMD permits issued to major polluting facilities. The process will depend on whether or not the LAER requirement is more

stringent than previous South Coast AQMD LAER determinations for the same equipment category.

When South Coast AQMD permitting staff makes a LAER determination that is no more stringent than previous South Coast AQMD LAER determinations, the permitting team will issue the permit and forward information regarding this LAER determination to the BACT Team.⁸ The BACT Team will review this LAER determination with the BACT SRC prior to listing in the BACT Guidelines.

Whenever permitting staff makes a LAER determination that is more stringent than what South Coast AQMD has previously required as LAER, the permit to construct may be subject to a public review. In any event depending on Rule 212, the permitting team will forward the preliminary LAER determination to the BACT Team, who will prepare and send a public notice of the preliminary determination to the BACT SRC, potentially interested persons, and anyone else requesting the information. Staff will consider all comments filed during the 30-day review period before making a permit decision. Staff will make every effort to conduct the public review consistent with the requirements of state law. However, if the 30-day review period conflicts with the deadline of the Permit Streamlining Act⁹ for issuing the permit, the permit will be issued in accordance with state law. The 30-day public review may also be done in parallel with other public reviews mandated by *Rule 212 - Standards for Approving Permits and Issuing Public Notice* or *Regulation XXX - Title V Permits* in applicable cases.

On a periodic basis, the South Coast AQMD BACT Team will provide standing status reports to the South Coast AQMD Governing Board's Stationary Source Committee and to the Governing Board.

In summary, as technology advances, many categories in the South Coast AQMD's BACT Guidelines will be updated with new listings. This on-going process will reflect new lower emitting technologies not previously identified in the Guidelines.

CLEAN FUEL GUIDELINES

In January 1988, the South Coast AQMD Governing Board adopted a Clean Fuels Policy that included a requirement to use clean fuels as part of BACT/LAER. A clean fuel is one that produces air emissions equivalent to or lower than natural gas for NO_x, SO_x, ROG, and fine respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀). Besides natural gas, other clean fuels are liquid petroleum gas (LPG), hydrogen and electricity. Utilization of zero and near-zero emission technologies are also integrated into the Clean Fuels Policy. The burning of landfill, digester, refinery and other by-product gases is not subject to the clean fuels requirement. However, the combustion of these fuels must comply with other South Coast AQMD rules, including the sulfur content of the fuel.

The requirement of a clean fuel is based on engineering feasibility. Engineering feasibility considers the availability of a clean fuel and safety concerns associated with that fuel. Some state and local safety requirements limit the types of fuel, which can be used for emergency standby purposes. Some fire departments or fire marshals do not allow the storage of LPG near occupied buildings. Fire officials have, in some cases, vetoed the use of methanol in hospitals. If special handling or safety considerations preclude the use of the clean fuel, the South Coast AQMD has allowed

⁸ To reduce the burden on South Coast AQMD of preparing hundreds of LAER Determination Forms each month, forms will not be prepared for routine LAER determinations after Part B, Section I of the guidelines has sufficient entries to demonstrate typical LAER requirements.

⁹ The requirements of the Permit Streamlining Act are also found in South Coast AQMD's Rule 210.

the use of fuel oil as a standby fuel in boilers and heaters, fire suppressant pump engines and for emergency standby generators. The use of these fuels must meet the requirements of South Coast AQMD rules limiting NO_x and sulfur emissions.

AIR QUALITY-RELATED ENERGY POLICY

In September 2011, the South Coast AQMD Governing Board adopted an air quality-related energy policy to help guide a unified approach to reducing air pollution while addressing other key environmental concerns including environmental justice, climate change and energy independence. The air quality-related energy policy outlines 10 policies and 10 action steps to help meet federal health-based standards for air quality in the South Coast Air Basin while also promoting the development of zero- and near-zero emission technologies.

Policy 7 is to require any new/repowered in-Basin fossil-fueled generation power plant to incorporate BACT/LAER as required by South Coast AQMD rules, considering energy efficiency for the application. These power plants will need to comply with any requirements adopted by the California Air Resources Board, California Energy Commission, Public Utilities Commission, California Independent System Operator, or the governing board of a publicly-owned electric utility, as well as state law under the California Environmental Quality Act. In recognizing that fossil fuel electric generation will still be needed in the Basin to complement projected increased use of renewable energy sources, this policy ensures that all fossil-fueled plants will meet existing BACT/LAER requirements and South Coast AQMD's BACT/LAER determinations will also take into consideration generating efficiency in setting the emission limits. Parts E and F of the BACT Guidelines complement and support this policy.

Chapter 2 - How to Use Part B of the BACT Guidelines

This chapter explains the LAER information found in Part B - LAER/BACT Determinations for Major Polluting Facilities. Part B is a listing of LAER/BACT determinations for major polluting facilities contained in South Coast AQMD and other air pollution control agencies' permits, and data on new and emerging technologies. These LAER/BACT determinations and data are guides and will be used, along with other information, to determine LAER as outlined in Chapter 1. For a listing of equipment types, refer to the List of Equipment Categories. LAER determination for equipment not found in Part B of the BACT Guidelines is done according to the process outlined in Chapter 1.

GENERAL

Part B is divided into three sections. Section I – South Coast AQMD LAER/BACT Determinations, includes information on LAER/BACT determinations contained in permits issued by South Coast AQMD, with permit limits based on achieved in practice technology. Section II – Non-AQMD LAER/BACT Determinations, lists LAER/BACT determinations contained in other air pollution control agencies' permits or BACT Guidelines, with permit limits based on achieved in practice technology. Section III – Other Technologies, consists of information on technologies which have been achieved in practice but are not reflected in a permit limit, information on emerging technologies or emission limits which have not yet been achieved in practice. All three sections are subdivided based on the attached List of Equipment Categories. Within each category, the LAER/BACT determinations will be listed in order of stringency.

Each listing includes the following information, in addition to other information detailing the description and operation of the equipment:

- Equipment Information

This provides information on the manufacturer, model, description, function, size/dimensions/capacity, combustion sources, and cost of the equipment. Cost data are generally obtained from the South Coast AQMD application forms, manufacturer or owner/operator, and are not verified. It also provides additional information such as fuel type for combustion equipment and equipment information comments that can provide weight of parts cleaned per load for degreasers and the number and size of blowers for spray booths.

- Company Information

This identifies the contact person and owner/operator of the equipment, along with telephone numbers.

- Permit Information

This identifies the permitting agency and the name and telephone number of the agency's contact person. It also provides information on Permits to Construct/Operate. The South Coast AQMD is always the issuing agency for LAER determinations listed in Section I.

- Emission Information

This identifies the actual permit limits and LAER/BACT requirements set forth by the issuing agency for the equipment being evaluated, concise description of the

BACT requirements for each regulated contaminant, and basis of the BACT/LAER determination.

- Control Technology

This provides information on the manufacturer, model, description, size/dimensions/capacity, permit information and required control efficiencies on the control technology used to achieve the permit limit and the LAER/BACT requirements.

- Demonstration of Compliance

This provides information such as source test or other method that was used to demonstrate compliance and any monitoring or testing requirements.

- Additional South Coast AQMD Reference Data

This identifies the BCAT (for basic equipment¹⁰), CCAT (for control equipment), RECLAIM and Title V facilities, and source test ID. It also lists applicable South Coast AQMD Regulation XI rules. Additionally, it provides health risk data for the permit unit.

The above information will enable permit applicants to assess the applicability of each LAER/BACT determination to their particular equipment.

The LAER requirements usually found in the LAER Determination listings are in the form of:

- an emission limit;
- a control technology;
- equipment requirements; or
- a combination of the last two

If the requirement is an emission limit, the applicant may choose any control technology to achieve the emission limit. The South Coast AQMD prefers to set an emission limit as LAER because it allows an applicant the most flexibility in reducing emissions. If control technology and/or equipment requirements are the only specified LAER, then either emissions from the equipment are difficult to measure or it was not possible to specify an emission limit that applies to all equipment within the category. Where possible, an emission limit or control efficiency condition will be specified on the permit along with the control technology or equipment requirements to ensure that the equipment is properly operated with the lowest emissions achievable.

¹⁰ Basic equipment is the process or equipment, which emits the air contaminant for which BACT is being determined.

HOW TO DETERMINE LAER

The Part B LAER determinations are only examples of LAER determinations for equipment that have been issued permits or that have been demonstrated in practice. As described in Chapter 1, LAER is determined on a case-by-case basis. To find out what LAER is likely to be for a particular equipment, the applicant should review the Part B LAER determinations found at the South Coast AQMD website www.aqmd.gov/home/permits/bact. The CAPCOA Clearinghouse maintained by the California Air Resources Board and the U.S. EPA RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse should also be reviewed. These compendiums contain information from other districts, local agencies, and states that may not be included in the South Coast AQMD BACT Guidelines. Finally, the South Coast AQMD permitting staff may be contacted to discuss LAER prior to submitting a permit application.

As described in Chapter 1, the permit applicant should bring to the attention of the South Coast AQMD permitting engineer any special permitting considerations that may affect the LAER determination.

Draft

PART B - LAER/BACT DETERMINATIONS FOR MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES

Draft

PART C - POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR NON-MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES

Draft

Chapter 1 - How Is MSBACT Determined for Minor Polluting Facilities?

This chapter explains the definitions of BACT for non-major polluting facilities (minor source BACT or MSBACT) found in South Coast AQMD rules and state law and how they are interpreted. It also explains the criteria used for initializing the Part D MSBACT Guidelines and the process for updating the MSBACT Guidelines.

PART D OF THE MSBACT GUIDELINES

Part D of the MSBACT Guidelines specifies the MSBACT requirements for all of the commonly permitted categories of equipment (See Chapter 2 for a full explanation of Part D).

The initial listings in Part D of the MSBACT Guidelines reflected the current BACT determinations at the time for sources at non-major polluting facilities as of April 2000. These did not represent new requirements but rather memorialized BACT determinations and emission levels at that time. This initialization was necessary to benchmark the transition from federal LAER to MSBACT for non-major polluting facilities. The control technologies and emission levels identified applied to any non-major source subject to NSR until the Guideline was updated or became out of date. The dates listed on the BACT determinations in Part D refer to the date of adoption of the determination. The dates listed do not grandfather the equipment from complying with any new requirements or limits that are implemented after the approval of a BACT determination¹.

CRITERIA FOR NEW MSBACT AND UPDATING PART D

MSBACT requirements are determined for each source category based on the definition of MSBACT. In essence, MSBACT is the most stringent emission limit or control technology for a class or category of source that is:

- found in a state implementation plan (SIP) pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 40405(a)(1), or
- achieved in practice (AIP), or
- is technologically feasible and cost effective.

For practical purposes, nearly all South Coast AQMD MSBACT determinations will be based on AIP BACT because it is generally more stringent than MSBACT based on SIP, and because state law contains some constraints on South Coast AQMD from using the third approach. For minor polluting facilities, MSBACT will also take economic feasibility into account.

Based on Governing Board policy, MSBACT also includes a requirement for the use of clean fuels.

Terms such as “achieved in practice” and “technologically feasible” (including technology transfer) have not been defined in the rule, so one of the purposes of this section is to explain the criteria South Coast AQMD permitting staff uses to make a MSBACT determination.

¹ South Coast AQMD Rule 1303(a)(3)

MSBACT Based on a SIP

The most stringent emission limit found in an approved state implementation plan (SIP) may be an option for establishing MSBACT. This means that the most stringent emission limit adopted by any state as a rule, regulation or permit² and approved by U.S. EPA is eligible as a MSBACT requirement. This does not include future emission limits that have not yet been implemented.

Achieved in Practice MSBACT

MSBACT may be an option for establishing the most stringent control technology or emission limit that has been achieved in practice (AIP) for a category or class of source. AIP control technology may be in operation in the United States or any other part of the world. South Coast AQMD permitting engineers will review the following sources to determine the most stringent AIP MSBACT:

- LAER/BACT determinations in Part B of the BACT Guidelines
- CAPCOA BACT Clearinghouse
- U.S. EPA RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse
- Other districts' and states' BACT Guidelines
- Permits to operate issued by South Coast AQMD or other agencies
- Any other source for which the requirements of AIP can be demonstrated

Achieved in Practice Criteria

A control technology or emission limit found in any of the references above may be considered as AIP if it meets all of the following criteria:

Commercial Availability

At least one vendor must offer this equipment for regular or full-scale operation in the United States. A performance warranty or guaranty must be available with the purchase of the control technology, as well as parts and service.

Reliability

The control technology must have been installed and operated reliably for at least twelve months on a comparable commercial operation. If the operator did not require the basic equipment to operate continuously, such as only eight hours per day and 5 days per week, then the control technology must have operated whenever the basic equipment was in operation during the twelve months.

Effectiveness

The control technology must be verified to perform effectively over the range of operation expected for that type of equipment. If the control technology will be allowed to operate at lesser effectiveness during certain modes of operation, then those modes must be identified. The verification shall be based on a South Coast AQMD-approved performance test or tests, when possible, or other performance data.

Cost Effectiveness

The control technology or emission rate must be cost effective for a substantial number of sources within the class or category. Cost effectiveness criteria are described in detail in a later section. Cost criteria are not applicable to an individual permit but rather to a class or category of source.

² Some states incorporate individual permits into their SIP as case-by-case Reasonably Available Control Technology requirements.

Technology Transfer

MSBACT is based on what is AIP for a category or class of source. However, technology transfer must also be considered across source categories, in view of the other AIP criteria. There are two types of potentially transferable control technologies:

1) exhaust stream controls, and 2) process controls and modifications. For the first type, technology transfer must be considered between source categories that produce similar exhaust streams. For the second type, process similarity governs the technology.

Limited BACT Exemption

Rule 1304 - Exemptions was amended in November 2021 to add subdivision (f) to include a limited BACT exemption for RECLAIM and former RECLAIM facilities. This limited BACT exemption is available to new or modified permit unit located at a RECLAIM or former RECLAIM facilities, for PM₁₀ and SO_x emission increases associated with the installation or modification of add-on air pollution control equipment for controlling NO_x emissions to comply with NO_x Best Available Retrofit Control Technology (BARCT) emission limits. The objective of the proposed narrow BACT exemption is to address the co-pollutant issue associated with the installation or modification of add-on air pollution controls and the replacement of equipment that is combined with an installation or modification of add-on air pollution control required to transition NO_x RECLAIM facilities. This limited BACT exemption is available only to project at qualified facilities that meet all the requirements listed under Rule 1304 subparagraphs (f)(1)(A) through (E)³.

Requirements of Health & Safety Code Section 40440.11

Senate Bill 456 (Kelley) was chartered into state law in 1995 and became effective in 1996. H&SC Section 40440.11 specifies the criteria and process that must be followed by the South Coast AQMD to establish new MSBACT limits for source categories listed in the MSBACT Guidelines. In general, the provisions require:

- Considering only control options or emission limits to be applied to the basic production or process equipment;
- Evaluating cost to control secondary pollutants;
- Determining the control technology is commercially available;
- Determining the control technology has been demonstrated for at least one year on a comparable commercial operation;
- Calculating total and incremental cost-effectiveness;
- Determining that the incremental cost-effectiveness is less than South Coast AQMD's established cost-effectiveness criteria;
- Putting BACT Guideline revisions on a regular meeting agenda of the South Coast AQMD Governing Board;
- Holding a Board public hearing prior to revising maximum incremental cost-effectiveness values;
- Keeping a BACT determination made for a particular application unchanged for at least one year from the application deemed complete date; and
- Considering a longer period for a major capital project (> \$10,000,000)

³ See Rule 1304 (f).

After consultation with the affected industry, the CARB, and the U.S. EPA, and considerable legal review and analysis, staff concluded that the process specified in SB 456 to update the BACT Guidelines should be interpreted to apply only if the South Coast AQMD proposes to make BACT more stringent than LAER or where LAER is inapplicable (e.g. in establishing minor source BACT). Staff intends to incorporate the spirit and intent of the SB 456 provisions into the MSBACT update process, as explained below, because non-major polluting facilities are no longer subject to federal LAER, according to Regulation XIII. Therefore, MSBACT may consider cost as specified herein.

COST EFFECTIVENESS METHODOLOGY

Cost effectiveness is measured in terms of control costs (dollars) per air emissions reduced (tons). If the cost per ton of emissions reduced is less than the maximum required cost effectiveness, then the control method is considered to be cost effective. This section also discusses the updated maximum cost effectiveness values, and those costs, which can be included in the cost effectiveness evaluation.

There are two types of cost effectiveness: average and incremental. Average cost effectiveness considers the difference in cost and emissions between a proposed MSBACT and an uncontrolled case. On the other hand, incremental cost effectiveness looks at the difference in cost and emissions between the proposed MSBACT and alternative control options.

Applicants may also conduct a cost effectiveness evaluation to support their case for the special permit considerations discussed in Chapter 2.

Discounted Cash Flow Method

The discounted cash flow method (DCF) is used in the MSBACT Guidelines. This is also the method used in South Coast AQMD Air Quality Management Plan. The DCF method calculates the present value of the control costs over the life of the equipment by adding the capital cost to the present value of all annual costs and other periodic costs over the life of the equipment. A real interest rate⁴ of four percent, and a 10-year equipment life is used. The cost effectiveness is determined by dividing the total present value of the control costs by the total emission reductions in tons over the same 10-year equipment life.

Maximum Cost Effectiveness Values

The MSBACT maximum cost effectiveness values, shown in Table 5, are based on a DCF analysis with a 4% real interest rate.

Table 5: Maximum Cost Effectiveness Criteria (3rd-1st Quarter 2023-2026)

Pollutant	Average (Maximum \$ per Ton)	Incremental (Maximum \$ per Ton)
ROG	40,854 <u>45,173</u>	122,563 <u>135,520</u>
NOx	38,630 <u>42,713</u>	115,687 <u>127,916</u>
SOx	20,427 <u>22,587</u>	61,282 <u>67,760</u>
PM10	9,104 <u>10,063</u>	27,104 <u>29,966</u>
CO	809 <u>895</u>	-2,326 <u>2,572</u>

⁴ The real interest rate is the difference between market interest rates and inflation, which typically remains constant at four percent.

The cost criteria are based on those adopted by the South Coast AQMD Governing Board in the 1995 BACT Guidelines, adjusted to ~~third-first~~ quarter ~~2023-2026~~ dollars using the Marshall and Swift Equipment Cost Index. Cost effectiveness analyses should use these figures adjusted to the latest Marshall and Swift Equipment Cost Index. Contact the BACT Team for current figures.

Top-Down Cost Methodology

The South Coast AQMD uses the top-down approach for evaluating MSBACT and cost effectiveness. This means that the best control method, with the highest emission reduction, is first analyzed. If it is not cost effective, then the second-best control method is evaluated for cost effectiveness. The process continues until a control method is found to be cost-effective. This process provides a mechanism for all practical and potential control technologies to be evaluated. As part of the permitting process, the applicant is responsible for preparing the MSBACT analysis, and submitting it to the District for review and approval.

The top-down process consists of five steps:

1. Identify all control technologies

Identify all possible air pollution control options for the emissions unit. In addition to add-on control, control options may include production process methods and techniques. Innovative, transferable technologies, and LAER technologies should also be identified.

2. Eliminate technically infeasible options

The technologies identified in Step 1 should be evaluated for technical feasibility. Elimination of any of the technologies identified in Step 1 should be well-documented and based on physical, chemical and engineering principles.

3. Rank remaining control technologies

Based on overall control effectiveness, all remaining technically feasible control options should be ranked for the pollutants under review. A list should be generated for each pollutant subject to the MSBACT analysis. This list should include control efficiencies, emission rates, emission reductions, environmental impacts and energy impacts. Environmental impacts may include multimedia impacts and the impacts of the control option on toxic emissions.

4. Evaluation

Evaluate the most effective controls and document the results. For each option, the applicant is responsible for objectively discussing each of the beneficial and adverse impacts. Typically, the analysis should focus on the direct impacts. Calculations for both incremental and average cost effectiveness should be completed during this step. The MSBACT option must be cost effective for both analyses. In the event that the top option from Step 4 is ruled out after the impacts and cost effectiveness are evaluated, the decision and reasoning should be fully documented. The next most stringent alternative from Step 4, should then be evaluated.

5. Select MSBACT

The most effective control option not eliminated in Step 4 is proposed as MSBACT for the pollutant and permit unit and presented to the South Coast AQMD for review and approval.

Costs to Include in a Cost Effectiveness Analysis

Cost effectiveness evaluations consider both capital and operating costs. Capital cost includes not only the price of the equipment, but the cost for shipping, engineering and installation. Operating or annual costs include expenditures associated with utilities, labor and replacement costs. Finally, costs are reduced if any of the materials or energy created by the process result in cost savings. These cost items are shown in Table 6. Methodologies for determining these values are given in documents prepared by U.S. EPA through their Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (EPA Air Pollution Control Cost Manual, Sixth Edition, 2002, EPA 452/B-02-001).

The cost of land will not be considered because 1) add-on control equipment usually takes up very little space, 2) add-on control equipment does not usually require the purchase of additional land, and 3) land is non-depreciable and has value at the end of the project. In addition, the cost of controlling secondary emissions and cross-media pollutants caused by the primary MSBACT requirement should be included in any required cost effectiveness evaluation of the primary MSBACT requirement.

Table 6: Cost Factors

<u>Total Capital</u>	
<u>Purchased Equipment Cost</u> Control Device Ancillary (including duct work) Instrumentation Taxes Freight	<u>Indirect Installation Costs</u> Engineering Construction and Field Expenses Start-Up Performance Tests Contingencies
<u>Direct Installation Cost</u> Foundations and Supports Handling and Erection Electrical Piping Insulation Painting	
<u>Total</u>	
<u>Direct Costs</u> Raw Materials Utilities - Electricity - Fuel - Steam - Water - Compressed Air Waste Treatment/Disposal Labor - Operating - Supervisory - Maintenance Maintenance Materials Replacement Parts	<u>Indirect Costs</u> Overhead Property Taxes Insurance Administrative Charges <u>Recovery Credits</u> Materials Energy

CLEAN FUEL GUIDELINES

In January 1988, the South Coast AQMD Governing Board adopted a Clean Fuels Policy that included a requirement to use clean fuels as part of BACT. A clean fuel is one that produces air emissions equivalent to or lower than natural gas for NO_x, SO_x, ROG, and fine respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀). Besides natural gas, other clean fuels are liquid petroleum gas (LPG), hydrogen and electricity. Utilization of zero and near-zero emission technologies are also integrated into the Clean Fuels Policy. The burning of landfill, digester, refinery and other by-product gases is not subject to the clean fuels requirement. However, the combustion of these fuels must comply with other South Coast AQMD rules, including the sulfur content of the fuel.

The requirement of a clean fuel is based on engineering feasibility. Engineering feasibility considers the availability of a clean fuel and safety concerns associated with that fuel. Some state and local safety requirements limit the types of fuel, which can be used for emergency standby purposes. Some fire departments or fire marshals do not allow the storage of LPG near occupied buildings. Fire officials have, in some cases, vetoed the use of methanol in hospitals. If special handling or safety considerations preclude the use of the clean fuel, the South Coast AQMD has allowed the use of fuel oil as a standby fuel in boilers and heaters, fire suppressant pump engines and for emergency standby generators. The use of these fuels must meet the requirements of South Coast AQMD rules limiting NO_x and sulfur emissions. In addition, the Clean Fuel requirements for MSBACT are subject to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 40440.11.

AIR QUALITY-RELATED ENERGY POLICY

In September 2011, the South Coast AQMD Governing Board adopted an air quality-related energy policy to help guide a unified approach to reducing air pollution while addressing other key environmental concerns including environmental justice, climate change and energy independence. The air quality-related energy policy outlines 10 policies and 10 action steps to help meet federal health-based standards for air quality in the South Coast Air Basin while also promoting the development of zero- and near-zero emission technologies.

Policy 7 is to require any new/repowered in-Basin fossil-fueled generation power plant to incorporate BACT/LAER as required by District rules, considering energy efficiency for the application. These power plants will need to comply with any requirements adopted by the California Air Resources Board, California Energy Commission, Public Utilities Commission, California Independent System Operator, or the governing board of a publicly-owned electric utility, as well as state law under the California Environmental Quality Act. In recognizing that fossil fuel electric generation will still be needed in the Basin to complement projected increased use of renewable energy sources, this policy ensures that all fossil-fueled plants will meet existing BACT/LAER requirements and South Coast AQMD's BACT/LAER determinations will also take into consideration generating efficiency in setting the emission limits. Parts E and F of the BACT Guidelines complement and support this policy.


MSBACT UPDATE PROCESS

As technology advances, the South Coast AQMD's MSBACT Part D Guidelines will be updated. Updates will include revisions to the guidelines for existing equipment categories, as well as new guidelines for new categories.

The MSBACT Guidelines will be revised based on the criteria outlined in the previous sections. Once a more stringent emission limit or control technology has been reviewed by staff and is determined to meet the criteria for MSBACT, it will be reviewed through a public process. The process is shown schematically in Figure 2. The public will be notified and the BACT Scientific Review Committee will have an opportunity to comment. Following the public process and comment period, the guidelines will be presented to the Governing Board for approval at a public hearing, prior to updates of the MSBACT Guidelines, Part D.

Draft

Figure 2: The Ongoing BACT Update Process



Chapter 2 - How to Use Part D of the MSBACT Guidelines

This chapter explains the MSBACT information found in Part D - MSBACT Guidelines. The Guidelines in Part D should be used to determine MSBACT for non-major polluting facilities. For a listing of equipment, refer to the Part D Table of Contents. Determination of MSBACT for equipment not found in Part D of the MSBACT Guidelines is also explained.

GENERAL

Part D includes MSBACT Guidelines for more than 100 categories of equipment commonly processed by South Coast AQMD. Some guidelines are further subdivided by equipment size, rating, type or the material used, as appropriate.

The MSBACT requirements are in the form of:

- 1) an emission limit;
- 2) a control technology;
- 3) equipment requirements; or
- 4) a combination of the last two.

If the requirement is an emission limit, the applicant may choose any control technology to achieve the emission limit. The South Coast AQMD prefers to set an emission limit as MSBACT because it allows an applicant the most flexibility in reducing emissions.

If a control technology and/or equipment requirements are the only specified MSBACT, then either emissions from the equipment are difficult to measure or it was not possible to specify an emission limit that applies to all equipment within the category. Where possible, an emission limit or control efficiency condition will be specified in the permit along with the control technology or equipment requirements to ensure that the equipment is properly operated with the lowest emissions achievable. An applicant may still propose to use other ways to achieve the same or better emission reduction than the specified MSBACT.

MSBACT is the control technology or emission limit given in Part D for the basic equipment or process being evaluated, unless the guideline is out of date, or there are special permitting conditions, or the equipment is not identified in Part D. In those cases, the procedures described in the following sections will be used to determine MSBACT. Applicants or other interested parties are encouraged to contact the South Coast AQMD permitting staff if there are any questions about MSBACT.

SPECIAL PERMITTING CONSIDERATIONS

Although the most stringent, AIP BACT for a source category will most likely be the required MSBACT, South Coast AQMD staff may consider special technical circumstances that apply to the proposed equipment which may allow deviation from that MSBACT. The permit applicant should bring any pertinent facts to the attention of the South Coast AQMD permitting engineer for consideration.

Case-Specific Situations

South Coast AQMD staff may consider unusual equipment-specific and site-specific characteristics of the proposed project that would warrant a reconsideration of the MSBACT requirement for new equipment.

Technical infeasibility of the control technology

A particular control technology may not be required as MSBACT if the applicant demonstrates that it is not technically feasible to install and operate it to meet a specific MSBACT emission limitation in a specific permitting situation.

Operating schedule and project length

If the equipment will operate much fewer hours per year than what is typical, or for a much shorter project length, it can affect what is considered AIP.

Availability of fuel or electricity

Some MSBACT determinations may not be feasible if a project will be located in an area where natural gas or electricity is not available.

Process requirements

Some MSBACT determinations specify a particular type of process equipment. South Coast AQMD staff may consider requirements of the proposed process equipment that would make the MSBACT determination not technically feasible.

Equivalency

The permit applicant may propose alternative means to achieve the same emission reduction as required by BACT. For example, if BACT requires a certain emission limit or control efficiency to be achieved, the applicant may choose any control technology, process modification, or combination thereof that can meet the same emission limit or control efficiency.

Super Compliant Materials

South Coast AQMD will accept the use of super compliant materials in lieu of an add-on control device controlling volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from coating operations. For example, if a permit applicant uses only surface coatings that meet the super compliant material definition in South Coast AQMD Rule 109, it may qualify as VOC MSBACT. This policy does not preclude any other MSBACT requirement for other contaminants.

Equipment Modifications

As a general rule, it is more difficult to retrofit existing equipment with MSBACT as a result of NSR modification when compared to a new source. The equipment being modified may not be compatible with some past MSBACT determinations that specify a particular process type. There may also be space restrictions that prevent installation of some add-on control technology.

Other Considerations

Although multiple process and control options may be available during the MSBACT determination process, considerations should be made for options that reduce the formation of air contaminants from the process, as well as ensuring that emissions are properly handled. In addition to evaluating the efficiency of the control stage, these additional considerations are needed to ensure that the system is capable of reducing or eliminating emissions from the facility on a consistent basis during the operational life of the equipment. Measures listed in this section for MSBACT are subject to the requirements of California Health and Safety Code Section 40440.11.

Pollution Prevention

The Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §§13101-13109) established a national policy that pollution should be prevented or reduced at the source whenever feasible. In many cases, air pollution control is a process that evaluates contaminants at the exhaust of the system. Pollution prevention is the reduction or elimination of waste at the source by the modification of the production process. Pollution prevention measures may consist of the use of alternate or reformulated materials, a modification of technology or equipment, or improvement of energy efficiency changes that result in an emissions reduction. These measures should be considered as part of the MSBACT determination process if the measures will result in the elimination or reduction of emissions, but are not required to include projects which are considered to fundamentally redefine the source. New and different emissions created by a process or material change will also need to be considered as part of the MSBACT determination process, in contrast to the overall emissions reductions from the implementation of pollution prevention measures.

U.S. EPA policy defined pollution prevention as source reduction and other practices that reduce or eliminate the creation of pollutants through increased efficiency in the use of raw materials, energy, water, or other resources, and protection of natural resources by conservation¹. U.S. EPA further specifies that pollution prevention does not include recycling (except in-process recycling), energy recovery, treatment or disposal. For purposes of these BACT Guidelines, and to be consistent with federal definitions, source reduction and pollution prevention shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of the feasibility of:

- equipment or technology modifications,
- process or procedure modifications,
- reformulation or redesign of products,
- substitution of raw materials, or
- improvements in housekeeping, maintenance or inventory control,

that reduce the amount of air contaminants entering any waste stream or otherwise released into the environment, including fugitive emissions.

¹ U.S. EPA Pollution Prevention Law and Policies (www.epa.gov/p2/pollution-prevention-law-and-policies#define)

Monitoring and Testing

In order to ensure that MSBACT determinations continue to meet their initial emission and efficiency standards, periodic or continuous parameter monitoring and testing requirements may be required during the permitting process. Equipment and processes may experience some change over time, due to aging or operational methods of the equipment, which may affect emission rates or control efficiencies. In addition to other rule requirements, additional monitoring and testing requirements may need to focus on aspects directly related to the MSBACT determination, and may be made enforceable by permit conditions. Monitoring and testing requirements should be specific to characterize operating conditions (e.g. temperatures, pressures, flows, production rates) and measurement techniques when MSBACT is established to ensure clarity and consistency with the standard.

Capture Efficiency

An integral part of controlling air pollutants emitted from a process with add-on air pollution control equipment is capturing those emissions and directing them to the air pollution control device. Emissions which are designed to be collected by an exhaust system but are vented uncontrolled into the atmosphere can have a much greater impact than controlled emissions. When applicable, the evaluation of a process and its associated control equipment should address the qualification and quantification of capture efficiency. By addressing capture efficiency during MSBACT determinations, a standard can be established to evaluate the capture efficiency of other systems, as well as ensure that the capture efficiency is maintained consistently over time.

If applicable, MSBACT determinations may include the percentage capture efficiency and the methods and measurements (e.g. EPA Method 204, capture velocity measurements, design using ACGIH's Industrial Ventilation, static pressures) used to determine and verify it. For various circumstances, several South Coast AQMD rules (see Table 5, Part A, Chapter 1) already require an assessment of collection efficiency of an emission control system following EPA Method 204, EPA's "Guidelines for Determining Capture Efficiency", South Coast AQMD's "Protocol for Determination of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) Capture Efficiency," or other methods approved by the Executive Officer, and are appropriate to include as BACT requirements. The capture efficiency for any MSBACT Determination shall be no less stringent than any applicable rule requirement. Other considerations that may affect capture, such as cross-drafts, thermal drafts and the volume of combustion products, should also be addressed during this process.

Equipment Not Identified in the MSBACT Guidelines

Although the BACT Guidelines contains an extensive listing of practically everything the South Coast AQMD permits, occasionally applications will be received for equipment not identified in the Guidelines. As required by Rule 1303, MSBACT for equipment category not listed in the MSBACT Guidelines must be determined on a case-by-case basis using the definition of BACT in Rule 1302 and the general procedures in these MSBACT Guidelines, as shown in Chapter 1 and the previous sections of this chapter.

Applicants whose equipment is not listed in Part D of the MSBACT Guidelines should contact the South Coast AQMD and arrange a pre-application conference.

MSBACT issues can be discussed in the conference for leading to a MSBACT determination. Applicants are not required to conduct the MSBACT evaluation but the application may be processed more quickly if the applicant provides a MSBACT evaluation with the application for a permit to construct.

MSBACT Determinations Should the Guidelines Become Out of Date

Should the MSBACT Guideline Part D become out of date with state BACT requirements or permits issued for similar equipment in other parts of the state, staff will evaluate permits consistent with the definition of BACT considering technical and economic criteria as required by Rule 1303 (a) and Health & Safety Code Section 40405. The technical and economic factors to be considered are those identified in Chapter 1.

MSBACT APPLICATION CUT-OFF DATES

These guidelines apply to all non-major polluting facility applications deemed complete subsequent to South Coast AQMD Governing Board adoption of the Regulation XIII amendments in 2000.

Applications for a Registration Permit for equipment issued a valid Certified Equipment Permit (CEP), which is valid for one year, will only be required to comply with MSBACT as determined at the time the CEP was issued. However, South Coast AQMD staff will reevaluate the MSBACT requirements for the CEP upon annual renewal of the CEP by the equipment manufacturer.

PART D - BACT DETERMINATIONS FOR NON-MAJOR POLLUTING FACILITIES

Draft

**PART E – POLICY AND
PROCEDURES FOR FACILITIES
SUBJECT TO PREVENTION OF
SIGNIFICANT DETERIORATION FOR
GREENHOUSE GASES**

Draft

Chapter 1 - GHG BACT

This chapter explains the requirements of greenhouse gases (GHG) BACT regulations according to U.S. EPA, describes the Top-Down Process, shows how to calculate GHG emissions and explains the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Applicability for GHGs for new sources as well as modified sources. The guidance in this chapter is applicable to the U.S. EPA requirements in place as of the date of these guidelines, and takes into consideration the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 134 S. Ct. 2427 (2014)¹.

BACKGROUND

U.S. EPA has found that GHG, made up of six combined compounds, constitute air pollution that endanger public health and welfare. U.S. EPA's adopted requirements for GHG under 40 CFR 52.21 in May 2010, which were revised in October 2015, to establish a way to permit GHG emissions under PSD and Title V. Through this rule, permitting focused on the major industrial sources, which emit nearly 70 percent of the greenhouse gas pollution from stationary sources. At this time, smaller businesses and sources are not be subject to these requirements.

The requirements of this rule apply only to GHG as defined by U.S. EPA as a total group of six GHG which are: carbon dioxide (CO₂), nitrous oxide (N₂O), methane (CH₄), hydrofluorocarbons (HFC), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). All other attainment air contaminants, as defined in South Coast AQMD Rule 1702 subdivision (a), shall be regulated for the purpose of PSD.

PERMITTING GUIDANCE FOR GHG

U.S. EPA's "PSD and Title V Permitting Guidance for Greenhouse Gases" provides the basic information that permit writers and applicants need to address GHG emissions in permits². Although this guidance was issued prior to the revision of 40 CFR 52.21 in 2015, there are parts still applicable to the current requirements. The applicable parts of the guidance document are summarized in these Guidelines. The guidance:

- applies long-standing PSD and Title V permitting requirements and processes to GHG;
- reiterates that BACT determinations will continue to be a state, and project specific decision;
- does not prescribe GHG BACT for any source type;
- emphasizes the importance of BACT options that improve energy efficiency;

¹ The UARG v. EPA decision limited the scope originally envisioned by the Tailoring Rule, and now only "anyway sources" are subject to GHG BACT. On October 3, 2016, EPA proposed revising 40 CFR 52.21 to establish a Significant Emissions Rate for GHGs at the same threshold of 75,000 ton per year CO₂e as Step 1 of the Tailoring Rule for "anyway" sources.

² <https://www.epa.gov/nsr/clean-air-act-permitting-greenhouse-gases>

- points out that Carbon Capture and Sequestration (CCS) is a promising technology in the early stage of demonstration and commercialization (it should be identified as an available control measure in the first step of BACT, it is currently an expensive technology and unlikely to be selected as BACT in most cases);
- notes that biomass could be considered BACT after taking into account environmental, energy, and economic considerations and state and federal policies that promote biomass for energy-independence and environmental reasons. In its memorandum³ dated November 19, 2014, U.S. EPA states that it is still assessing and monitoring biogenic feedstocks and will provide further guidance. Further updates can be found at U.S. EPA’s webpage “CO2 Emissions Associated with Biomass Use at Stationary Sources.”
- provides flow charts and examples that illustrate the key points of the traditional five-step process for determining BACT for GHG; and
- identifies technical resources related to GHG emissions and controls.

FEDERAL PSD APPLICABILITY FOR GHG

Beginning January 2, 2011, GHG BACT applies when a new or modified facility is subject to PSD requirements for GHG. The first step for PSD applicability determination for new or modified sources is listed in the Tables 7 and 8 below that address the requirements in 40 CFR 52.21. A second step for PSD applicability is contemporaneous netting. For detailed guidance on this topic, U.S. EPA’s “PSD and Title V Permitting Guidance for Greenhouse Gases” (March 2011) should be referenced, but should be used in accordance with U.S. EPA’s clarifying documents regarding the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. Environmental Protection Agency*⁴ and the current requirements under 40 CFR 52.21.

In determining PSD applicability, a differentiation between GHG CO₂e and mass basis must be made. GHG mass basis is simply the sum of all six GHG compound mass emissions. However, to obtain GHG CO₂e, the mass emissions of each individual GHG compound must be multiplied by its 100-year Global Warming Potential (GWP). The individual GHG CO₂e are then summed to obtain the total CO₂e for the source. Current GWP factors should be obtained from U.S. EPA’s website when performing these calculations.

Table 7
GHG PSD Applicability for New Sources

PSD applies to GHG if:
1. The source is otherwise subject to PSD for another regulated NSR pollutant, AND
2. The source has a GHG PTE ≥ 75,000 tons per year (TPY) CO ₂ e;

³ EPA Memo: “Addressing Biogenic Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Stationary Sources, (2014 November 19)”

⁴ EPA Memo: Next Steps and Preliminary Views on the Application of Clean Air Act Permitting Programs to Greenhouse Gases Following the Supreme Court’s Decision, (2014, July 24)

Table 8

GHG PSD Applicability for Modified Sources

PSD applies to GHG if:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The modification is otherwise subject to PSD for another regulated NSR pollutant, AND 2. The modification results in a GHG emissions increase and net emissions increase: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. $\geq 75,000$ TPY CO₂e, AND b. $>$ zero TPY mass basis

Contemporaneous Netting

Contemporaneous netting is the process of considering all of the creditable emission increases and decreases that have occurred during the period beginning five years before the proposed construction of the modification through the date that the emission increase from the modification occurs. When calculating the net emissions increase in Table 8 above for PSD applicability, it must include all emission increases and decreases during this period.

SOUTH COAST AQMD PSD APPLICABILITY FOR GHG

South Coast AQMD adopted Rule 1714 in 2010 to implement the PSD GHG requirements set forth by 40 CFR 52.21. South Coast AQMD Rule 1714 incorporates the provisions of 40 CFR 52.21 by reference, excluding the sections listed under South Coast AQMD Rule 1714 (c)(1). South Coast AQMD PSD applicability should be determined following the applicable sections of the Code of Federal Regulation identified in the rule.

TOP-DOWN BACT PROCESS

U.S. EPA recommends that permitting authorities continue to use the U.S. EPA's five-step "Top-Down" BACT process to determine BACT for GHG (U.S. EPA, 2011)⁵. While this section summarizes the steps in the process, further details for each of the steps can be referenced in U.S. EPA's guidance document.

BACT Step 1 – Identify All Available Control Options

The first step in the top-down BACT process is to identify all "available" control options. Available control options are those air pollution control technologies or techniques (including lower-emitting processes and practices) that have the potential for practical application to the emissions unit and the regulated pollutant under evaluation.

⁵ U.S. EPA (2011). PSD and Title V Permitting Guidance for Greenhouse Gases

Permit applicants and permitting authorities should identify all “available” GHG control options that have the potential for practical application to the source under consideration.

The application of BACT to GHG does not affect the discretion of a permitting authority to exclude options that would fundamentally redefine a proposed source. GHG control technologies are likely to vary based on the type of facility, processes involved, and GHG being addressed. U.S. EPA has emphasized the importance of energy efficiency improvements.

For the purposes of a BACT analysis for GHG, U.S. EPA classifies CCS as an add-on pollution control technology that is “available” for large CO₂-emitting facilities including fossil fuel-fired power plants and industrial facilities with high-purity CO₂ streams (e.g., hydrogen production, ammonia production, natural gas processing, ethanol production, ethylene oxide production, cement production, and iron and steel manufacturing).

BACT Step 2 – Eliminate Technically Infeasible Options

Under the second step of the top-down BACT analysis, a potentially applicable control technique listed in Step 1 may be eliminated from further consideration if it is not technically feasible for the specific source under review. U.S. EPA generally considers a technology to be technically feasible if it has been successfully operated on the same type of source under review or is available and applicable to the source under review.

Assuming CCS has been included in Step 1 of the top-down BACT process for such sources, it now must be evaluated for technical feasibility in Step 2. CCS is composed of three main components: CO₂ capture and/or compression, transport, and storage. CCS may be eliminated from a BACT analysis in Step 2 if it can be shown that there are significant differences pertinent to the successful operation for any of these three main components from what has already been applied to a differing source type. For example, the temperature, pressure, pollutant concentration, or volume of the gas stream to be controlled, may differ so significantly from previous applications that it is uncertain the control device will work in the situation currently undergoing review. CCS may be eliminated from a BACT analysis in Step 2 if the three components working together are deemed technically infeasible for the proposed source, taking into account the integration of the CCS components with the base facility and site-specific considerations (e.g., space for CO₂ capture equipment at an existing facility, right-of-ways to build a pipeline or access to an existing pipeline, access to suitable geologic reservoirs for sequestration, or other storage options).

BACT Step 3 – Ranking of Controls

After the list of all available controls is winnowed down to a list of the technically feasible control technologies in Step 2, Step 3 of the top-down BACT process calls for the remaining control technologies to be listed in order of overall control effectiveness for the regulated NSR pollutant under review. The most effective control alternative (i.e., the option that achieves the lowest emissions level) should be listed at the top and the remaining technologies ranked in descending order of control effectiveness. The ranking of control options in Step 3 determines where to start the top-down BACT selection process in Step 4.

The options considered in a BACT analysis for GHG emissions will likely include, but not necessarily be limited to, control options that result in energy efficiency measures to achieve the lowest possible emission level. Where plant-wide measures to reduce

emissions are being considered as GHG control techniques, the concept of overall control effectiveness will need to be refined to ensure the suite of measures with the lowest net emissions from the facility is the top-ranked measure. Ranking control options based on their net output-based emissions ensures that the thermal efficiency of the control option, as well as the power demand of that control measure, is fully considered when comparing options in Step 3 of the BACT analysis. Finally, to best reflect the impact on the environment, the ranking of control options should be based on the total CO_{2e} rather than total mass or, mass for the individual GHG.

BACT Step 4 – Economic, Energy, and Environmental Impacts

Under Step 4 of the top-down BACT analysis, permitting authorities must consider the economic, energy, and environmental impacts arising from each option remaining under consideration. Accordingly, after all available and technically feasible control options have been ranked in terms of control effectiveness (BACT Step 3), the permitting authority should consider any specific energy, environmental, and economic impacts identified with those technologies to either confirm that the top control alternative is appropriate or determine it to be inappropriate.

There are compelling public health and welfare reasons for BACT to require all GHG reductions that are achievable, considering economic impacts and the other listed statutory factors. As a key step in the process of making GHG a regulated pollutant, U.S. EPA has considered scientific literature on impacts of GHG emissions and has made a final determination that emissions of six GHG endanger both the public health and the public welfare of current and future generations. Potential impacts that may be considered in this step based on the U.S. EPA's January 2010 Endangerment Finding⁶ are detailed in U.S. EPA's guidance document.

When conducting a BACT analysis for GHG, the environmental impact analysis should continue to concentrate on impacts other than the direct impacts due to emissions of the regulated pollutant in question. Where GHG control strategies affect emissions of other regulated pollutants, applicants and permitting authorities should consider the potential trade-offs of selecting particular GHG control strategies.

BACT Step 5 – Selecting BACT

In Step 5 of the BACT determination process, the most effective control option not eliminated in Step 4 should be selected as BACT for the pollutant and emissions unit under review and included in the permit. For energy-producing sources, one way to incorporate the energy efficiency of a process unit into the BACT analysis is to compare control effectiveness in BACT Step 3 based on output-based emissions of each of the control options. Establishing an output-based BACT emissions limit, or a combination of output- and input-based limits, wherever feasible and appropriate to ensure that BACT is complied with at all levels of operation should be considered.

⁶ <https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment/>

GHG CONTROL MEASURES WHITE PAPERS

U.S. EPA has a series of technical “white papers” that summarize readily available information on control techniques and measures to reduce GHG emissions from specific industrial sectors. These papers provide basic technical information which may be useful in a BACT analysis, but they do not define BACT for each sector. The industrial sectors covered include:

- Electric Generating Units (PDF) (48pp, 805k)
U.S. EPA Contact: Christian Fellner (919-541-4003 or fellner.christian@epa.gov)
- Large Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Boilers (PDF) (39pp, 337k)
U.S. EPA Contact: Jim Eddinger (919-541-5426 or edding.jim@epa.gov)
- Pulp and Paper (PDF) (62pp, 421k)
U.S. EPA Contact: Bill Schrock (919-541-5032 or schrock.bill@epa.gov)
- Cement (PDF) (48pp, 220k)
U.S. EPA Contact: Keith Barnett (919-541-5605 or barnett.keith@epa.gov)
- Iron and Steel Industry (PDF) (78pp, 620k)
U.S. EPA Contact: Donna Lee Jones (919-541-5251 or jones.donnalee@epa.gov)
- Refineries (PDF) (42pp, 707k)
U.S. EPA Contact: Brenda Shine (919-541-3608 or shine.brenda@epa.gov)
- Nitric Acid Plants (PDF) (31pp, 544k)
U.S. EPA Contact: Nathan Topham (919-541-0483 or topham.nathan@epa.gov)
- Landfills (PDF) (28pp, 250k)
U.S. EPA Contact: Hillary Ward (919-541-3154 or ward.hillary@epa.gov)

**PART F - BACT DETERMINATIONS
FOR FACILITIES SUBJECT TO
PREVENTION OF SIGNIFICANT
DETERIORATION FOR GREENHOUSE
GASES**

(This section is currently under development)

Draft

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIP	Achieved in Practice
APCD	Air Pollution Control District
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
BACT	Best available control technology
BRC	BACT Review Committee, South Coast AQMD
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CEP	Certified Equipment Permit
CFC	Chlorofluorocarbons
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon monoxide
DEO	Deputy Executive Officer
H&SC	Health and Safety Code, California State
LAER	Lowest achievable emission rate
LPG	Liquefied petroleum gas
MDAB	Mojave Desert Air Basin
MSBACT	Minor Source BACT
NO₂	Nitrogen dioxide
NO_x	Oxides of nitrogen
NSR	New Source Review
ODC	Ozone depleting compounds
PM₁₀	Particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
RACT	Reasonably available control technology
RECLAIM	Regional Clean Air Incentives Market
ROG	Reactive organic gas
South Coast AQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SOCAB	South Coast Air Basin
Sox	Oxides of sulfur
SRC	Scientific Review Committee
SSAB	Salton Sea Air Basin
U.S. EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
VOC	Volatile organic compound

INDEX OF EQUIPMENT CATEGORIES

A

Abrasive Blasting
Absorption Chiller
Air Start Unit
Air Stripper - Ground Water Treatment
Aluminum Melting Furnace - Crucible or Pot (All Charge)
Aluminum Melting Furnace - Crucible or Pot, Ingot and/or Clean Scrap Charge Only
Aluminum Melting Furnace - Reverberatory, Non-Sweating, Ingot or Contaminated Scrap Charge
Aluminum Melting Furnace - Reverberatory, Non-Sweating, Ingot or non-Contaminated Scrap Charge
Aluminum Melting Furnace - Reverberatory, Sweating, Ingot or Contaminated Scrap Charge
Aluminum Melting Furnace - Rotary, Sweating, Ingot or Contaminated Scrap Charge
Ammonium Bisulfate and Thiosulfate Production
Animal Feed Manufacturing - Dry Material Handling (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
Asbestos Machining Equipment
Asphalt Batch Plant Asphalt Roofing Line
Asphalt Storage Tank (see Storage Tank – Liquid - Asphalt)
Asphalt Day Tanker
Auto Body Shredder

B

Ball Mill
Beryllium Machining Equipment Blender (see Mixer)
Boiler
Boiler - Refinery Gas Fired
Boiler, CO - Refinery
Boiler - Agricultural Waste (Biomass) Fired
Boiler - Landfill or Digester Gas fired
Boiler - Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Fired
Boiler – Natural Gas Fired, > 20 MM Btu/hr
Boiler – Fire-Tube, Natural Gas Fired, < 20 MM Btu/hr
Boiler - Wood Fired
Brake Pad Grinder
Brakeshoe Debonder
Brass Melting Furnace - Crucible
Brass Melting Furnace - Cupola
Brass Melting Furnace – Reverberatory, Non-Sweating
Brass Melting Furnace – Reverberatory, Sweating
Brass Melting Furnace - Rotary, Non-Sweating
Brass Melting Furnace - Rotary, Sweating
Brass Melting Furnace - Tilting Induction

Bulk Cement - Ship Unloading
 Bulk Solid Material Handling
 Bulk Solid Material - Ship Loading - Non-White Commodities
 Bulk Solid Material - Ship Loading - White Commodities
 Bulk Solid Material Ship Unloading - Except Cement
 Bulk Solid Material Storage – Non-White Commodities
 Bulk Solid Material Storage - White Commodities
 Burnoff or Burnout Furnace (Excluding Wax Burnoff)

C

Calcined Petroleum Coke Handling
 Calcined Petroleum Coke Truck Loading and Unloading Calciner
 Calciner - Petroleum Coke
 Calciner - Portland Cement
 Carpet Beating and Shearing
 Carpet Oven (see Dryer or Oven)
 Catalyst Manufacturing - Reactor
 Catalyst Manufacturing - Rotary Dryer
 Catalyst Manufacturing - Spray Dryer
 Catalyst Regeneration - Fluidized Catalyst Cracking Unit Catalyst Regeneration - Hydrocarbon Removal
 Catalyst Regeneration and Manufacturing Calcining Cement Handling (see Bulk Cement – Ship Unloading) Charbroiler, Chain-driven (Conveyorized)
 Chemical Milling Tank - Aluminum and Magnesium
 Chemical Milling Tank - Nickel Alloys, Stainless Steel and Titanium Chip Dryer
 Chrome Plating - Decorative Chrome Chrome Plating - Hard Chrome
 Circuit Board Etcher - Batch Immersion Type, Subtractive Process Circuit Board Etcher - Conveyorized Spray Type, Subtractive Process Circuit Board Photoresist Developer
 Clay, Ceramic, and Refractories Handling (Except Mixing) (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Cleaning Compound Blender CO2 Plant
 Coal, Coke and Sulfur Handling and Storage (see Bulk Solid Material Handling and Bulk Solid Material Storage)
 Coffee Roasting
 Coffee Roasting – Handling Equipment
 Commodities Handling and Storage (see Bulk Solid Material Handling and Bulk Solid Material Storage)
 Composting
 Compressors (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
 Connectors - Gas/Vapor and Light Liquid (see Fugitive Emission Sources) Concrete Batch Plant - Central Mixed

 Concrete Batch Plant - Transit-Mixed Concrete Blocks and Forms Manufacturing Cotton Gin
 Crematory
 Crumb Rubber/Asphalt Oil Blending – Carbon Adsorber

D

Degreaser - Batch-Loaded or Conveyorized Cold Cleaners
 Degreaser - Conveyorized Vapor, Volatile Organic Compounds
 Degreaser - Vapor Cleaning, Volatile Organic Compounds

Degreaser - Other
 Detergent Manufacturing - Solids Handling
 Detergent Manufacturing - Spray Dryer
 Diaphragm (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
 Diesel Engine (see I.C. Engine – Compression Ignition)
 Drum Reclamation Furnace
 Dry Cleaning - Perchloroethylene
 Dry Cleaning - Petroleum Solvent
 Dry Material Handling (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Dryer - Kiln
 Dryer - Rotary, Spray and Flash Dryer – Tenter Frame, Fabric
 Dryer - Tray, Agitated Pan, and Rotary Vacuum
 Dryer or Oven - Direct and Indirect Fired
 Duct Burner - Refinery Fuel Gas

E

Electric Furnace - Pyrolyzing, Carbonizing and Graphitizing
 Electrical Wire Reclamation - Insulation Burn-off Furnace
 Ethylene Oxide Sterilization - Quarantine Storage
 Ethylene Oxide Sterilization/Aeration
 Expanded Polystyrene Manufacturing, Using Blowing Agent (see Polymeric Cellular [Foam] Product Manufacturing)
 Extrusion (see Plastic or Resin Extrusion)

F

Fatty Acid - Fat Hydrolyzing and Fractionation
 Fatty Alcohol
 Feed and Grain Handling (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Fermentation - Beer and Wine
 Fertilizer Handling (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Fiber Impregnation
 Fiberglass Fabrication (see Polyester Resin Operations)
 Film Cleaning Machine (see Degreaser)
 Fish Cooker - Edible
 Fish Reduction - Cooker
 Fish Reduction - Digester, Evaporator and Acidulation Tank
 Fish Reduction - Dryer
 Fish Reduction - Meal Handling
 Fish Rendering - Presses, Centrifuges, Separators, Tank, etc.
 Fittings (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
 Flare - Digester Gas or Landfill Gas from Non-Hazardous Waste Landfill
 Flare - Landfill Gas from Hazardous Waste Landfill
 Flare - Refinery, Non-Emergency
 Flexographic Printing (see Printing)
 Flow Coater, Dip Tank and Roller Coater
 Fluidized Catalytic Cracking Unit
 Foundry Sand Mold - Cold Cure Process
 Fryer - Deep Fat
 Fuel Cell Electricity Generation, Digester Gas Fueled
 Fugitive Emission Sources at Natural Gas Plants and Oil and Gas Production Fields
 Fugitive Emission Sources at Organic Liquid Bulk Loading Facilities
 Fugitive Emission Sources at Petroleum Refineries

Fugitive Emission Sources, Other facilities
 Fumigation Chamber - Methyl Bromide
 Fuming Sulfuric Acid Storage Tank (see Storage Tank – Fuming Sulfuric Acid)

G

Galvanizing Furnace - Batch Operations
 Galvanizing Furnace - Continuous Sheet Metal Operations
 Galvanizing Furnace - Continuous Wire Operations
 Garnetting Equipment
 Gas Turbine – Combined Cycle/Cogeneration Gas Turbine - Emergency
 Gas Turbine - Landfill or Digester Gas Fired
 Gas Turbine – Simple Cycle
 Gas Turbine – Simple Cycle, Natural Gas
 Glass Melting Furnace - Container Manufacturing
 Glass Melting Furnace - Decorator Glass
 Glass Melting Furnace - Flat Glass
 Graphic Arts (see Printing)
 Greenhouse Gas
 Green Petroleum Coke Handling (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Green Petroleum Coke Truck Loading or Unloading (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)

H

Hatches (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
 Hazardous Waste Incineration (see Incinerator – Hazardous Waste)
 Heater (see Process Heater)
 Heater – Other Process, Natural Draft Operation

I

I.C. Engine - Emergency, Compression Ignition
 I.C. Engine - Emergency, Spark Ignition
 I.C. Engine - Fire Pump
 I.C. Engine - Portable, Compression Ignition
 I.C. Engine - Portable, Spark Ignition
 I.C. Engine - Stationary, Emergency
 I.C. Engine - Stationary, Non-Emergency
 I.C. Engine - Stationary, Non-Emergency, Electrical with SCR, NG Fired
 I.C. Engine - Stationary, Non-Emergency with SCR, NG Fired
 I.C. Engine - Landfill or Digester Gas Fired
 Incinerator - Hazardous Waste
 Incinerator - Infectious Waste
 Incinerator - Non-Infectious, Non-Hazardous Waste
 Ink Jet Printing
 Iron Melting Furnace - Cupola
 Iron Melting Furnace - Induction
 Iron Melting Furnace - Reverberatory

J

Jet Engine Test Facility - Experimental Jet Engine, High Altitude Testing
 Jet Engine Test Facility - Experimental Jet Engine, Sea Level (Low Altitude) Testing
 Jet Engine Test Facility - Jet engine Performance Testing

L

Laminator with Corona Transfer
Landfill Gas Gathering System
Landfill Gas Sulfur Control System
Latex Manufacturing - Reaction
Lead Melting Furnace - Cupola, Secondary Melting Operations
Lead Melting Furnace - Pot or Crucible, Non-Refining Operations
Lead Melting Furnace - Pot or Crucible, Refining Operations
Lead Melting Furnace - Reverberatory, Secondary Melting Operations
Lead Oxide Manufacturing - Reaction Pot Barton Process
Letterpress Printing (see Printing)
Liquid Transfer and Handling - Container Filling
Liquid Transfer and Handling - Marine, Loading
Liquid Transfer and Handling - Marine, Unloading
Liquid Transfer and Handling - Tank Truck and Rail Car Bulk Loading, Class A (South Coast AQMD's Rule 462)
Liquid Transfer and Handling - Tank Truck and Rail Car Bulk Loading, Class B (South Coast AQMD's Rule 462)
Liquid Transfer and Handling - Tank Truck and Rail Car Bulk Loading, Class C (South Coast AQMD's Rule 462)
Linear Generator - Non-Emergency Electrical Generator, Natural Gas Fired
Lithographic Printing Heatset (see Printing)
Lithographic Printing - Non-Heatset (see Printing)

M

Meat Broiler and Barbecue Oven
Metal Forging Furnace
Metal Heating Furnace
Metallizing Spray Gun
Meters (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
Mixer or Blender - Wet
Mixer, Blender, or Mill - Dry

N

Natural Fertilizer Handling (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
Natural Gas Plants (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
Nitric Acid Manufacturing
Non-Metallic Mineral Processing - Except Rock and Aggregate
Nut Roasting - Handling Equipment
Nut Roasting

O

Offset Printing (see Lithographic Printing)
 Oil and Gas Production - Combined Tankage
 Oil and Gas Production – Wellhead
 Oil and Gas Production Fields (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
 Oil/Water Separator (see Wastewater System)
 Open Process Tanks: Chemical Milling (Etching) and Plating
 Open Spraying - Spray Gun
 Open-ended Valves or Lines (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
 Organic Liquid Bulk Loading Facilities (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
 Oven (see Dryer or Oven)

P

Paper and Fiber Handling (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Perlite Manufacturing System
 Petroleum Coke Calciner (see Calciner – Petroleum Coke) Pharmaceutical
 Manufacturing
 Pharmaceutical - Operations Involving Solvents
 Phosphoric Acid - Thermal Process
 Phthalic Anhydride
 Pipe – Open Ended (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
 Plasma Arc Metal Cutting Torch, Electrical Input Rating
 Plastic or Resin Extrusion
 Pneumatic Conveying - Except Paper and Fibers (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Polyester Resin Operations - Molding and Casting
 Polyester Resin Operations – Fiberglass Fabrication, Hand and Spray Layup
 Polyester Resin Operations – Fiberglass Fabrication, Panel Manufacturing
 Polyester Resin Operations – Fiberglass Fabrication, Pultrusion
 Polyethylene Manufacturing (see Resin Manufacturing)
 Polymeric Cellular (Foam) Product Manufacturing
 Polypropylene Manufacturing (see Resin Manufacturing)
 Polystyrene Extrusion (see Plastic or Resin Extrusion)
 Polystyrene Foam Product Manufacturing (see Polymeric Cellular [Foam] Product
 Manufacturing)
 Polystyrene Foam Product Manufacturing, Using Blowing Agent (see Polymeric Cellular
 [Foam] Product Manufacturing)
 Polystyrene Manufacturing (see Resin Manufacturing)
 Polyurethane Tube Manufacturing
 Powder Coating Booth
 Precious Metal Reclamation - Incineration
 Precious Metals Recovery - Chemical Recovery and Chemical Reactions Pressure
 Relief Valve (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
 Printing (Graphic Arts) – Flexographic
 Printing (Graphic Arts) – Letterpress
 Printing (Graphic Arts) – Lithographic, Heatset
 Printing (Graphic Arts) – Lithographic, Non-Heatset
 Printing (Graphic Arts) – Rotogravure or Gravure – Publication and Packaging Printing
 (Graphic Arts) – Screen Printing and Drying
 Process Drains (see Wastewater System)
 Process Heater – Non-Refinery
 Process Heater - Refinery
 Process Valves (see Fugitive Emission Sources)

Pultrusion (see Polyester Resin Operations)
 Pumps (see Fugitive Emission Sources)

R

Railcar Dumper (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Railcar Loading/Unloading, Liquid (see Liquid Transfer and Handling)
 Reactor with Atmospheric Vent
 Rendering - Crax Pressing, filtering and Centrifuging Operations
 Rendering - Evaporators, Cookers and Dryers
 Rendering - Grease and Blood Processing
 Rendering - Metal Grinding and Handling System
 Rendering - Tanks and Miscellaneous Equipment
 Resin Manufacturing
 Rock - Aggregate Processing
 Rocket Engine Test Cell
 Roller Coater – Paper and Film, with Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer
 Rolling Mill
 Rotary Dryer - Aggregate Facility, Natural Gas Fired
 Rotogravure Printing - Publication and Packaging (see Printing)
 Rubber Compounding - Banbury Type Mixer
 Rubber Compounding – Roll Mill

S

Sampling Connections (see Fugitive Emission Sources)
 Sand Handling System with Shakeout and/or Muller in System
 Screen Printing and Drying (see Printing)
 Sewage Treatment Plants
 Sight Glass (see Fugitive Emission Sources) Silo (see Bulk Solid Material Storage)
 Smokehouse
 Solder Leveling - Hot Oil or Hot Air
 Solid Material Handling – (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Solid Material Storage – (see Bulk Solid Material Storage)
 Solid Material Unloading - Railcar Dumper (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Solids Handling Catalyst (see Catalyst Manufacturing and Regeneration)
 Solids Handling Pharmaceutical (see Pharmaceutical Manufacturing)
 Solvent Reclamation
 Spray Booth
 Steam Generator - Oil field
 Steel Melting Furnace - Basic Oxygen Process
 Steel Melting Furnace - Electric Arc
 Steel Melting Furnace - Induction
 Steel Melting Furnace - Open Hearth
 Storage Tank (see also Bulk Solid Material Storage)
 Storage Tank - External Floating Roof, and VP <= 11 psia
 Storage Tank - Fixed Roof
 Storage Tank - Fuming Sulfuric Acid
 Storage Tank - Grease or Tallow
 Storage Tank - Internal Floating Roof
 Storage Tank – Liquid
 Storage Tank - Spent Sulfuric Acid Storage Tank - Underground
 Sulfur Handling and Storage (see Bulk Solid Material Handling and Bulk Solid Material Storage)
 Sulfur Pelletizing and Prilling

Sulfur Recovery Plant
 Sulfur Recovery Unit and Tail Gas Treatment Unit followed by a Tail Gas Incinerator
 and Caustic Scrubber
 Sulfuric Acid Storage (see Storage Tank – Liquid)
 Surfactant Manufacturing

T

Tank Degassing
 Tank - Grease or Tallow Processing
 Tank Truck Loading/Unloading (see Liquid Transfer and Handling)
 Tank Truck Loading/Unloading Racks
 Tire Buffer
 Tunnel Washer

V

Vegetable Oil Purification
 Vinegar Manufacturing

W

Wastewater System
 Wastewater System – Air Stripper
 Wastewater System – Oil/Water Separator
 Wastewater System - Sour Water Stripping
 Wax Burnoff Furnace
 Wet Material Handling (see Bulk Solid Material Handling)
 Wood Processing Equipment
 Woodworking

Z

Zinc Melting Furnace - Crucible or Pot
 Zinc Melting Furnace - Reverberatory, Non-Sweating Operations
 Zinc Melting Furnace - Reverberatory, Sweating Operations
 Zinc Melting Furnace - Rotary, Sweating Operations