

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

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 [SCAQMD 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and emission levels identified applied to any non-major source subject to NSR until the Guideline was updated or became out of date.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 determination¹⁷.

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 that is:

- found in a state implementation plan (SIP), or
- achieved in practice (AIP), or
- is technologically feasible and cost effective.

For practical purposes, nearly all [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD 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

¹⁷ [SCAQMD South Coast AQMD](#) Rule 1303(a)(3)

section is to explain the criteria ~~SCAQMD~~South Coast AQMD permitting staff uses to make a MSBACT determination.

MSBACT Based on a SIP

The most stringent emission limit found in an approved state implementation plan (SIP) might be the basis for MSBACT. This means that the most stringent emission limit adopted by any state as a rule, regulation or permit¹⁸ and approved by USEPA 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 also be based on 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. ~~SCAQMD~~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
- USEPA RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse
- Other districts' and states' BACT Guidelines
- Permits to operate issued by ~~SCAQMD~~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 ~~District~~South Coast AQMD-approved performance test or tests, when possible, or other performance data.

¹⁸ Some states incorporate individual permits into their SIP as case-by-case Reasonably Available Control Technology requirements.

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.

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.

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 [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD South Coast AQMD](#)'s established cost-effectiveness criteria;
- Putting BACT Guideline revisions on a regular meeting agenda of the [SCAQMD 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)

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 [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD 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 rate¹⁹ 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 ~~2018~~2020)

Pollutant	Average (Maximum \$ per Ton)	Incremental (Maximum \$ per Ton)
ROG	30,765 <u>31,245</u>	92,296 <u>93,735</u>
NOx	29,090 <u>29,543</u>	87,117 <u>88,476</u>
SOx	15,383 <u>15,622</u>	46,148 <u>46,867</u>
PM ₁₀	6,854 <u>6,960</u>	20,409 <u>20,727</u>
CO	609 <u>619</u>	1,751 <u>1779</u>

The cost criteria are based on those adopted by the [SCAQMD South Coast AQMD](#) Governing Board in the 1995 BACT Guidelines, adjusted to ~~second~~first quarter ~~2016~~2020 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.

¹⁹ The real interest rate is the difference between market interest rates and inflation, which typically remains constant at four percent.

Top-Down Cost Methodology

The [SCAQMD South Coast AQMD](#) uses the top-down approach for evaluating BACT 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 BACT 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 BACT 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 BACT

The most effective control option not eliminated in Step 4 is proposed as BACT for the pollutant and permit unit and presented to the [District-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 USEPA 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 Investment</u>	
<u>Purchased Equipment Cost</u>	<u>Indirect Installation Costs</u>
Control Device	Engineering
Ancillary (including duct work)	Construction and Field Expenses
Instrumentation	Start-Up
Taxes	Performance Tests
Freight	Contingencies
<u>Direct Installation Cost</u>	
Foundations and Supports	
Handling and Erection	
Electrical	
Piping	
Insulation	
Painting	
<u>Total Annual Cost</u>	
<u>Direct Costs</u>	<u>Indirect Costs</u>
Raw Materials	Overhead
Utilities	Property Taxes
- Electricity	Insurance
- Fuel	Administrative Charges
- Steam	<u>Recovery Credits</u>
- Water	Materials
- Compressed Air	Energy
Waste Treatment/Disposal	
Labor	
- Operating	
- Supervisory	
- Maintenance	
Maintenance Materials	
Replacement Parts	

CLEAN FUEL GUIDELINES

In January 1988, the ~~SCAQMD~~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 ~~SCAQMD~~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 [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD 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.

BACT UPDATE PROCESS

As technology advances, the [SCAQMD 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.

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 [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD 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, [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD South Coast AQMD](#) permitting engineer for consideration.

Case-Specific Situations

[SCAQMD 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. [SCAQMD 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

[SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD 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 conservation²⁰. 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 may 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.

²⁰ 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 [SCAQMD 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", [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD 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 [SCAQMD 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.

BACT APPLICATION CUT-OFF DATES

These guidelines apply to all non-major polluting facility applications deemed complete subsequent to [SCAQMD 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, [SCAQMD South Coast AQMD](#) staff will reevaluate the MSBACT requirements for the CEP upon annual renewal of the CEP by the equipment manufacturer.