

Meeting Agenda for Coke Ovens RTR Proposed Rule

Coke Oven Environmental Task Force

November 28, 2023

Meeting Agenda

1. Fenceline Monitoring Requirements
2. “Gap-Filling” Standards for Battery Stacks and Pushing Emission Control Devices
3. Standards for Doors/Lids/Offtakes
4. Compliance Schedules

1. Proposed Fenceline Monitoring Requirements

The COETF requests that EPA eliminate the proposed fenceline monitoring requirements.

1. EPA lacks authority to impose fenceline monitoring requirements that include monitoring of emissions from coke byproduct recovery coke plants because byproduct recovery plants are not a source category under CAA § 112.
2. HAP emissions from byproduct recovery plants are separately regulated under CAA § 111 and Part 61 Subpart L.
3. Proposed action level was set by modeling estimates of actual (versus allowable) benzene emissions from byproduct recovery plants, so there is no consideration of emissions variability and no compliance margin built into the action level. If a facility increases production or makes other changes within its permit limits, the facility could still exceed an action that is not based on allowable emissions.
4. Proposed action level was set by modeling a polar grid (i.e., concentric circles) from a central point within a facility, rather than modeling concentrations at the actual fenceline where monitoring would be required.

2. Proposed Limits for Battery Stacks and Pushing Control Devices

The COETF requests that EPA:

- Defer finalizing the new limits until additional test data is available, or add a mechanism in the final rule allowing facilities to request approval for alternative emission limits or alternative operating limitations for the sources with emission limits that the facility believes cannot be achieved using demonstrated control technology (as EPA has done in some other rules); and
- Eliminate the proposed PM limits for battery combustion stacks because the existing opacity standards are a surrogate standard for PM control.
 1. Proposed standards are based on very limited data that do not account for variability in operating conditions (e.g., coking time) and coal characteristics.
 2. Misconception that additional controls will not be needed to achieve compliance – proposed standards are set at levels that likely cannot be achieved without using unidentified/unproven control technologies.
 3. Most of the proposed limits are for HAP that are not controlled at coke plants in the U.S. or globally.
 4. Likely not enough time before rulemaking deadline to collect adequate data in order to set achievable standards.

3. Proposed Limits for Doors Lids/Offtakes

The COETF requests that EPA retain the existing limits for percent leaking doors/lids/offtakes.

1. Proposal to lower existing standards is not based on any identified development in practices, processes, or control technologies. Current leak percentages merely reflect “overcompliance” with existing standards, and EPA lacks authority to lower standards simply because facilities comply with current standards.
2. Proposal arbitrarily subcategorizes standards for doors based on coke production capacity factors that have no demonstrated bearing on door leak rates.
3. Proposal arbitrarily eliminates subcategories for tall and “not tall” batteries despite demonstrated differences that affect leak rates.
4. Final rule should continue to distinguish between tall and “not tall” batteries (maintaining the current higher limits for tall batteries) and should not distinguish between facilities based on coke production capacity (which has no bearing on leak rates).

4. Compliance Schedules

The COETF requests the following compliance schedules:

- 3-year compliance period for any/all new MACT floor emission limits and any other new emission or monitoring requirements, as allowed in the existing MACT rules; and
- 1-year compliance period for all changes to SSM provisions and ERT reporting requirements.
 1. Misconception that the proposed 1-year schedule would be sufficient because additional controls are not needed. Facilities will need a full 3-year compliance period to test and evaluate compliance status and to engineer/install controls and/or seek alternative limits.

Discussion

- Next steps and schedule for rule development