




EXHIBIT 3





AIR



New Source Review Workshop Manual



Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Nonattainment Area Permitting



CHAPTER B
BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

I. INTRODUCTION

Any major stationary source or major modification subject to PSD must conduct an analysis to ensure the application of best available control technology (BACT). The requirement to conduct a BACT analysis and determination is set forth in section 165(a)(4) of the Clean Air Act (Act), in federal regulations at 40 CFR 52.21(j), in regulations setting forth the requirements for State implementation plan approval of a State PSD program at 40 CFR 51.166(j), and in the SIP's of the various States at 40 CFR Part 52, Subpart A - Subpart FFF. The BACT requirement is defined as:

"an emissions limitation (including a visible emission standard) based on the maximum degree of reduction for each pollutant subject to regulation under the Clean Air Act which would be emitted from any proposed major stationary source or major modification which the Administrator, on a case-by-case basis, taking into account energy, environmental, and economic impacts and other costs, determines is achievable for such source or modification through application of production processes or available methods, systems, and techniques, including fuel cleaning or treatment or innovative fuel combustion techniques for control of such pollutant. In no event shall application of best available control technology result in emissions of any pollutant which would exceed the emissions allowed by any applicable standard under 40 CFR Parts 60 and 61. If the Administrator determines that technological or economic limitations on the application of measurement methodology to a particular emissions unit would make the imposition of an emissions standard infeasible, a design, equipment, work practice, operational standard, or combination thereof, may be prescribed instead to satisfy the requirement for the application of best available control technology. Such standard shall, to the degree possible, set forth the emissions reduction achievable by implementation of such design, equipment, work practice or operation, and shall provide for compliance by means which achieve equivalent results."

During each BACT analysis, which is done on a case-by-case basis, the reviewing authority evaluates the energy, environmental, economic and other

costs associated with each alternative technology, and the benefit of reduced emissions that the technology would bring. The reviewing authority then specifies an emissions limitation for the source that reflects the maximum degree of reduction achievable for each subject pollutant regulated under the Act. In no event can a technology be recommended which would not meet any applicable standard of performance under 40 CFR Parts 60 (New Source Performance Standards) and 61 (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants).

In addition, if the reviewing authority determines that there is no economically reasonable or technologically feasible way to accurately measure the emissions, and hence to impose an enforceable emissions standard, it may require the source to use design, alternative equipment, work practices or operational standards to reduce emissions of the pollutant to the maximum extent.

On December 1, 1987, the EPA Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation issued a memorandum that implemented certain program initiatives designed to improve the effectiveness of the NSR programs within the confines of existing regulations and state implementation plans. Among these was the "top-down" method for determining best available control technology (BACT).

In brief, the top-down process provides that all available control technologies be ranked in descending order of control effectiveness. The PSD applicant first examines the most stringent--or "top"--alternative. That alternative is established as BACT unless the applicant demonstrates, and the permitting authority in its informed judgment agrees, that technical considerations, or energy, environmental, or economic impacts justify a conclusion that the most stringent technology is not "achievable" in that case. If the most stringent technology is eliminated in this fashion, then the next most stringent alternative is considered, and so on.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a detailed description of the top-down method in order to assist permitting authorities and PSD applicants in conducting BACT analyses.

II. BACT APPLICABILITY

The BACT requirement applies to each individual new or modified affected emissions unit and pollutant emitting activity at which a net emissions increase would occur. Individual BACT determinations are performed for each pollutant subject to a PSD review emitted from the same emission unit. Consequently, the BACT determination must separately address, for each regulated pollutant with a significant emissions increase at the source, air pollution controls for each emissions unit or pollutant emitting activity subject to review.

III. A STEP BY STEP SUMMARY OF THE TOP-DOWN PROCESS

Table B-1 shows the five basic steps of the top-down procedure, including some of the key elements associated with each of the individual steps. A brief description of each step follows.

III.A. STEP 1--IDENTIFY ALL CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES.

The first step in a "top-down" analysis is to identify, for the emissions unit in question (the term "emissions unit" should be read to mean emissions unit, process or activity), all "available" control options. Available control options are those air pollution control technologies or techniques with a practical potential for application to the emissions unit and the regulated pollutant under evaluation. Air pollution control technologies and techniques include the application of production process or available methods, systems, and techniques, including fuel cleaning or treatment or innovative fuel combustion techniques for control of the affected pollutant. This includes technologies employed outside of the United States. As discussed later, in some circumstances inherently lower-polluting processes are appropriate for consideration as available control alternatives. The control alternatives should include not only existing controls for the source category in question, but also (through technology transfer) controls applied to similar source categories and gas streams, and innovative control technologies. Technologies required under lowest achievable emission rate (LAER) determinations are available for BACT purposes and must also be included as control alternatives and usually represent the top alternative.

In the course of the BACT analysis, one or more of the options may be eliminated from consideration because they are demonstrated to be technically infeasible or have unacceptable energy, economic, or environmental impacts on a case-by-case (or site-specific) basis. However, at the outset, applicants

TABLE B-1. - KEY STEPS IN THE "TOP-DOWN" BACT PROCESS

STEP 1: IDENTIFY ALL CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES.

- LIST is comprehensive (LAER included).

STEP 2: ELIMINATE TECHNICALLY INFEASIBLE OPTIONS.

- A demonstration of technical infeasibility should be clearly documented and should show, based on physical, chemical, and engineering principles, that technical difficulties would preclude the successful use of the control option on the emissions unit under review.

STEP 3: RANK REMAINING CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES BY CONTROL EFFECTIVENESS.

Should include:

- control effectiveness (percent pollutant removed);
- expected emission rate (tons per year);
- expected emission reduction (tons per year);
- energy impacts (BTU, kWh);
- environmental impacts (other media and the emissions of toxic and hazardous air emissions); and
- economic impacts (total cost effectiveness, incremental cost effectiveness).

STEP 4: EVALUATE MOST EFFECTIVE CONTROLS AND DOCUMENT RESULTS.

- Case-by-case consideration of energy, environmental, and economic impacts.
- If top option is not selected as BACT, evaluate next most effective control option.

STEP 5: SELECT BACT

- Most effective option not rejected is BACT.

should initially identify all control options with potential application to the emissions unit under review.

III.B. STEP 2--ELIMINATE TECHNICALLY INFEASIBLE OPTIONS.

In the second step, the technical feasibility of the control options identified in step one is evaluated with respect to the source-specific (or emissions unit-specific) factors. A demonstration of technical infeasibility should be clearly documented and should show, based on physical, chemical, and engineering principles, that technical difficulties would preclude the successful use of the control option on the emissions unit under review. Technically infeasible control options are then eliminated from further consideration in the BACT analysis.

For example, in cases where the level of control in a permit is not expected to be achieved in practice (e.g., a source has received a permit but the project was canceled, or every operating source at that permitted level has been physically unable to achieve compliance with the limit), and supporting documentation showing why such limits are not technically feasible is provided, the level of control (but not necessarily the technology) may be eliminated from further consideration. However, a permit requiring the application of a certain technology or emission limit to be achieved for such technology usually is sufficient justification to assume the technical feasibility of that technology or emission limit.

III.C. STEP 3--RANK REMAINING CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES BY CONTROL EFFECTIVENESS.

In step 3, all remaining control alternatives not eliminated in step 2 are ranked and then listed in order of overall control effectiveness for the pollutant under review, with the most effective control alternative at the top. A list should be prepared for each pollutant and for each emissions unit (or grouping of similar units) subject to a BACT analysis. The list should present the array of control technology alternatives and should include the following types of information:

- control efficiencies (percent pollutant removed);
- expected emission rate (tons per year, pounds per hour);
- expected emissions reduction (tons per year);
- economic impacts (cost effectiveness);
- environmental impacts [includes any significant or unusual other media impacts (e.g., water or solid waste), and, at a minimum, the impact of each control alternative on emissions of toxic or hazardous air contaminants];
- energy impacts.

However, an applicant proposing the top control alternative need not provide cost and other detailed information in regard to other control options. In such cases the applicant should document, to the satisfaction of the review agency and for the public record, that the control option chosen is, indeed, the top, and review for collateral environmental impacts.

III.D. STEP 4--EVALUATE MOST EFFECTIVE CONTROLS AND DOCUMENT RESULTS.

After the identification of available and technically feasible control technology options, the energy, environmental, and economic impacts are considered to arrive at the final level of control. At this point the analysis presents the associated impacts of the control option in the listing. For each option the applicant is responsible for presenting an objective evaluation of each impact. Both beneficial and adverse impacts should be discussed and, where possible, quantified. In general, the BACT analysis should focus on the direct impact of the control alternative.

If the applicant accepts the top alternative in the listing as BACT, the applicant proceeds to consider whether impacts of unregulated air pollutants or impacts in other media would justify selection of an alternative control option. If there are no outstanding issues regarding collateral environmental impacts, the analysis is ended and the results proposed as BACT. In the event that the top candidate is shown to be inappropriate, due to energy,

environmental, or economic impacts, the rationale for this finding should be documented for the public record. Then the next most stringent alternative in the listing becomes the new control candidate and is similarly evaluated. This process continues until the technology under consideration cannot be eliminated by any source-specific environmental, energy, or economic impacts which demonstrate that alternative to be inappropriate as BACT.

III.E. STEP 5--SELECT BACT

The most effective control option not eliminated in step 4 is proposed as BACT for the pollutant and emission unit under review.

taken as an indication that unusual and persuasive differences exist with respect to the source under review. In addition, where the cost of a control alternative for the specific source reviewed is within the range of normal costs for that control alternative, the alternative, in certain limited circumstances, may still be eligible for elimination. To justify elimination of an alternative on these grounds, the applicant should demonstrate to the satisfaction of the permitting agency that costs of pollutant removal for the control alternative are disproportionately high when compared to the cost of control for that particular pollutant and source in recent BACT determinations. If the circumstances of the differences are adequately documented and explained in the application and are acceptable to the reviewing agency they may provide a basis for eliminating the control alternative.

In all cases, economic impacts need to be considered in conjunction with energy and environmental impacts (e.g., toxics and hazardous pollutant considerations) in selecting BACT. It is possible that the environmental impacts analysis or other considerations (as described elsewhere) would override the economic elimination criteria as described in this section. However, absent a concern over an overriding environmental impact or other considerations, an acceptable demonstration of an adverse economic impact can be an adequate basis for eliminating the control alternative.

IV.D.2.a. ESTIMATING THE COSTS OF CONTROL

Before costs can be estimated, the control system design parameters must be specified. The most important item here is to ensure that the design parameters used in costing are consistent with emissions estimates used in other portions of the PSD application (e.g., dispersion modeling inputs and permit emission limits). In general, the BACT analysis should present vendor-supplied design parameters. Potential sources of other data on design parameters are BID documents used to support NSPS development, control technique guidelines documents, cost manuals developed by EPA, or control data

cost. However, this type of information can be misleading. If a large emissions reduction is projected, low or reasonable cost effectiveness numbers may validate the option as an appropriate BACT alternative irrespective of the apparent high capital costs. In another example, undue focus on incremental cost effectiveness can give an impression that the cost of a control alternative is unreasonably high, when, in fact, the cost effectiveness, in terms of dollars per total ton removed, is well within the normal range of acceptable BACT costs.

IV.D.3. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ANALYSIS

The environmental impacts analysis is not to be confused with the air quality impact analysis (i.e., ambient concentrations), which is an independent statutory and regulatory requirement and is conducted separately from the BACT analysis. The purpose of the air quality analysis is to demonstrate that the source (using the level of control ultimately determined to be BACT) will not cause or contribute to a violation of any applicable national ambient air quality standard or PSD increment. Thus, regardless of the level of control proposed as BACT, a permit cannot be issued to a source that would cause or contribute to such a violation. In contrast, the environmental impacts portion of the BACT analysis concentrates on impacts other than impacts on air quality standards due to emissions of the regulated pollutant in question, such as solid or hazardous waste generation, discharges of polluted water from a control device, visibility impacts, or emissions of unregulated pollutants.

Thus, the fact that a given control alternative would result in only a slight decrease in ambient concentrations of the pollutant in question when compared to a less stringent control alternative should not be viewed as an adverse *environmental* impact justifying rejection of the more stringent control alternative. However, if the cost effectiveness of the more stringent alternative is exceptionally high, it may (as provided in section V.D.2.) be considered in determining the existence of an adverse *economic* impact that would justify rejection of the more stringent alternative.

The applicant should identify any significant or unusual environmental impacts associated with a control alternative that have the potential to affect the selection or elimination of a control alternative. Some control technologies may have potentially significant secondary (i.e., collateral) environmental impacts. Scrubber effluent, for example, may affect water quality and land use. Similarly, emissions of water vapor from technologies using cooling towers may affect local visibility. Other examples of secondary environmental impacts could include hazardous waste discharges, such as spent catalysts or contaminated carbon. Generally, these types of environmental concerns become important when sensitive site-specific receptors exist or when the incremental emissions reduction potential of the top control is only marginally greater than the next most effective option. However, the fact that a control device creates liquid and solid waste that must be disposed of does not necessarily argue against selection of that technology as BACT, particularly if the control device has been applied to similar facilities elsewhere and the solid or liquid waste problem under review is similar to those other applications. On the other hand, where the applicant can show that unusual circumstances at the proposed facility create greater problems than experienced elsewhere, this may provide a basis for the elimination of that control alternative as BACT.

The procedure for conducting an analysis of environmental impacts should be made based on a consideration of site-specific circumstances. In general, however, the analysis of environmental impacts starts with the identification and quantification of the solid, liquid, and gaseous discharges from the control device or devices under review. This analysis of environmental impacts should be performed for the entire hierarchy of technologies (even if the applicant proposes to adopt the "top", or most stringent, alternative). However, the analysis need only address those control alternatives with any significant or unusual environmental impacts that have the potential to affect the selection or elimination of a control alternative. Thus, the relative environmental impacts (both positive and negative) of the various alternatives can be compared with each other and the "top" alternative.

Initially, a qualitative or semi-quantitative screening is performed to narrow the analysis to discharges with potential for causing adverse environmental effects. Next, the mass and composition of any such discharges should be assessed and quantified to the extent possible, based on readily available information. Pertinent information about the public or environmental consequences of releasing these materials should also be assembled.

IV.D.3.a. EXAMPLES (Environmental Impacts)

The following paragraphs discuss some possible factors for consideration in evaluating the potential for an adverse other media impact.

- *Water Impact*

Relative quantities of water used and water pollutants produced and discharged as a result of use of each alternative emission control system relative to the "top" alternative would be identified. Where possible, the analysis would assess the effect on ground water and such local surface water quality parameters as ph, turbidity, dissolved oxygen, salinity, toxic chemical levels, temperature, and any other important considerations. The analysis should consider whether applicable water quality standards will be met and the availability and effectiveness of various techniques to reduce potential adverse effects.

- *Solid Waste Disposal Impact*

The quality and quantity of solid waste (e.g., sludges, solids) that must be stored and disposed of or recycled as a result of the application of each alternative emission control system would be compared with the quality and quantity of wastes created with the "top" emission control system. The composition and various other characteristics of the solid waste (such as permeability, water retention, rewatering of dried material, compression strength, leachability of dissolved ions, bulk density, ability to support

vegetation growth and hazardous characteristics) which are significant with regard to potential surface water pollution or transport into and contamination of subsurface waters or aquifers would be appropriate for consideration.

• *Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources*

The BACT decision may consider the extent to which the alternative emission control systems may involve a trade-off between short-term environmental gains at the expense of long-term environmental losses and the extent to which the alternative systems may result in irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources (for example, use of scarce water resources).

• *Other Environmental Impacts*

Significant differences in noise levels, radiant heat, or dissipated static electrical energy, or greenhouse gas emissions may be considered.

One environmental impact that could be examined is the trade-off between emissions of the various pollutants resulting from the application of a specific control technology. The use of certain control technologies may lead to increases in emissions of pollutants other than those the technology was designed to control. For example, the use of certain volatile organic compound (VOC) control technologies can increase nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions. In this instance, the reviewing authority may want to give consideration to any relevant local air quality concern relative to the secondary pollutant (in this case NO_x) in the region of the proposed source. For example, if the region in the example were nonattainment for NO_x, a premium could be placed on the potential NO_x impact. This could lead to elimination of the most stringent VOC technology (assuming it generated high quantities of NO_x) in favor of one having less of an impact on ambient NO_x concentrations. Another example is the potential for higher emissions of toxic and hazardous pollutants from a municipal waste combustor operating at a