

**Draft, Do Not Cite or Quote**

# **Five-Factor Analysis of BART- Eligible Sources**

## **Survey of Options for Conducting BART Determinations**

**Prepared by  
NESCAUM  
*for the*  
Mid-Atlantic/Northeast Visibility Union (MANE-VU) Regional Planning  
Organization**



**February 7, 2007**

## **Members of Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management**

Anne Gobin, Acting Bureau Chief  
Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Air Management

James P. Brooks, Bureau Director  
Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Air Quality

Barbara Kwetz, Director  
Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Waste Prevention

Robert Scott, Director  
New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, Air Resources Division

William O'Sullivan, Director  
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Office of Air Quality Management

David Shaw, Director  
New York Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Air Resources

Stephen Majkut, Chief  
Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, Office of Air Resources

Richard A. Valentinetti, Director  
Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation, Air Pollution Control Division

Arthur Marin, Executive Director  
Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management

*- DRAFT -*

**Draft, Do Not Cite or Quote**

# **Five-Factor Analysis of BART- Eligible Sources**

**Survey of Options for Conducting BART  
Determinations**

**Prepared by  
NESCAUM  
*for the*  
Mid-Atlantic/Northeast Visibility Union (MANE-VU) Regional Planning  
Organization**

**February 7, 2007**

*- DRAFT -*

# **FIVE-FACTOR ANALYSIS OF BART- ELIGIBLE SOURCES**

Survey of Options for Conducting BART Determinations

## **Project Manager**

Gary Kleiman, NESCAUM

## **Principal Contributors**

Iyad Kheirbek and Gary Kleiman, NESCAUM

## **Acknowledgements**

NESCAUM acknowledges the support of its member agencies and the staff time that they dedicated in providing survey information on the types and level of control available for various source categories subject to the BART requirements of the Regional Haze Rule. Their insight has allowed NESCAUM to create what it hopes will be a valuable guide for all members of MANE-VU as they proceed to conduct source-specific BART determinations. NESCAUM also acknowledges the funding for this work through U.S. EPA agreement number XA-97318101-0 to the Ozone Transport Commission in support of the MANE-VU Regional Planning Organization. NESCAUM is solely responsible for the content of this report and any errors it may contain.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Acknowledgements..... iv  
Executive Summary ..... vii  
1. Introduction..... 8  
    1.1. The BART Rule ..... 8  
    1.2. Overview of State BART Requirements..... 9  
    1.3. Overview of Report..... 10  
2. Determining BART-Eligible Sources ..... 11  
3. MANE-VU Approach to “Subject to BART” ..... 11  
4. Regional Five Factor Analysis..... 11  
    4.1. The Degree of Visibility Improvement That May Reasonably be Anticipated  
    From the Use of BART ..... 11  
    4.2. Cost and Availability of Controls and Controls Already in Place ..... 15  
        4.2.1. Chemical Manufacturers ..... 19  
        4.2.2. Glass Fiber ..... 19  
        4.2.3. Coal Cleaning..... 19  
        4.2.4. Electric Generation Units..... 19  
            Coal-Fired Units..... 19  
            Oil-Fired Units ..... 20  
        4.2.5. Incinerators ..... 20  
        4.2.6. Metal Production..... 21  
        4.2.7. Paper and Pulp ..... 21  
        4.2.8. Portland Cement Plants..... 21  
        4.2.9. Refineries ..... 22  
    4.3. Energy and Non-Air Quality Environmental Impacts ..... 22  
    4.4. Remaining Useful Life..... 24  
5. Conclusions..... 24  
6. References ..... 26  
Appendix A: List of BART-Eligible Facilities in the MANE-VU Region ..... 27  
Appendix B: Costs of Technologies ..... 32  
Appendix C: BART Workgroup Draft Recommendations..... 34

**FIGURES**

Figure 4-1. Reduction potential of BART control options at EGUs and Paper and Pulp Facilities ..... 23  
Figure 4-2. Reduction potential of BART control options at Cement Plants ..... 24

**TABLES**

Table 4-1. Types of BART-eligible facilities modeled in the region ..... 12  
Table 4-2. Types of facilities in MANE-VU region with greater than 0.1 dv impact at any Class I area (non year-round CAIR states)..... 14  
Table 4-3. Possible range of SO<sub>2</sub> controls and costs based on survey of state staff ..... 16  
Table 4-4. Possible range of NO<sub>x</sub> controls and costs based on survey of state staff..... 17  
Table 4-5. Possible range of PM<sub>10</sub> controls and costs based on survey of state staff ..... 18

## Executive Summary

The 1999 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) “Regional Haze Rule” [64 Fed. Reg. 35714 (July 1, 1999)] requires certain emission sources that “may reasonably be anticipated to cause or contribute” to visibility impairment in downwind Class I areas to install Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART). These requirements are intended to reduce emissions specifically from large sources that, due to age, were exempted from other control requirements of the Clean Air Act.

States are required to undertake three key steps to comply with the BART requirements of the Regional Haze Rule. These steps include:

- Determining if a source is BART-eligible;
- Determining if a source reasonably causes or contributes to visibility impairment in any Class I area (subject to BART);
- Determining if additional controls or emission limits are necessary (BART determination).

This report is intended to summarize one approach to satisfy the BART requirements of the Regional Haze Rule that member states may consider. We also review BART-eligible facilities in the MANE-VU region and provide – on a regional basis – an analysis of the general applicability of the five statutory factors that states must consider in determining BART controls for various source categories subject to BART. This analysis will allow MANE-VU states to place their facility-specific BART determinations into the regional context of similar sources within MANE-VU. This review includes an examination of individual units’ impacts on visibility at Class I areas based on CALPUFF modeling and an evaluation of existing or potential controls and feasibility of these controls relative to the statutory factors identified in the BART rule.

Ultimately, the strength of the MANE-VU BART program, as determined by individual state control decisions and informed by this analysis, will demonstrate MANE-VU’s resolve to tackle visibility and related air quality problems in its region. As MANE-VU enters into consultations with other regional planning organizations (RPOs), its willingness to seek reasonable emission reductions within its own region will help set expectations for the other RPOs, and the BART program represents a cornerstone of this process.



## 1. INTRODUCTION

The 1999 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) “Regional Haze Rule” [64 Fed. Reg. 35714 (July 1, 1999)] requires certain emission sources that “may reasonably be anticipated to cause or contribute” to visibility impairment in downwind Class I areas to install Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART).<sup>1</sup> These requirements are intended to reduce emissions specifically from large sources that, due to age, were exempted from other control requirements of the Clean Air Act.

BART requirements pertain to 26 specified major point source categories, including power plants, industrial boilers, paper and pulp plants, cement kilns, and other large stationary sources. To be considered BART-eligible, sources from these specified categories must have the potential to emit at least 250 tons per year of any haze forming pollutant and must have commenced operation or come into existence in the 15 year period prior to August 7, 1977 (the date of passage of the 1977 Clean Air Act Amendments, which first required new source performance standards).

Because of the regional focus of the 1999 haze rule, it is likely that BART requirements will be applied to a much larger number of sources across a broader geographic region than has been the case historically (i.e., through reasonably attributable visibility impairment requirements in the 1980 haze regulations). In addition, USEPA has for the first time introduced the possibility that source-by-source, command and control type BART implementation may be replaced by more flexible, market-based approaches, provided such alternatives can be shown to achieve greater progress toward visibility objectives than the standard BART approach.

### 1.1. The BART Rule

In June 2001, EPA released a proposed rule on BART. This rule outlined the method for determining if a facility is eligible for BART, subject to BART provisions, and methods for conducting a BART control review.

In 2002, industry groups challenged the method EPA outlined in the Regional Haze Rule to determine the degree of visibility improvement resulting from application of BART controls. Under EPA’s interpretation of the statute, a state would deem sources subject to BART if they emitted into a geographic area or region from which pollutants are likely transported downwind into a protected area. In May 2002, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals agreed with industry petitioners that this interpretation impermissibly constrained the authority of any state that wanted to provide an exemption mechanism from BART requirements. The Court vacated those portions of the Regional Haze Rule dealing with BART.

---

<sup>1</sup> There are seven designated Class I areas in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic States. They include Acadia National Park and Moosehorn Wilderness Area in Maine; Roosevelt Campobello International Park in New Brunswick and Maine; the Lye Brook Wilderness Area in Vermont; the Great Gulf and Presidential Range-Dry River Wilderness Areas in New Hampshire; and the Brigantine Wilderness Area in New Jersey.

In June 2005, EPA released the final BART rule that also addressed the remanded portions of the Regional Haze Rule dealing with BART. Under the final rule, the BART program requires states to develop an inventory of sources within each state or tribal jurisdiction that could be subject to control. Specifically, the rule:

- Outlined methods to determine if a source is “reasonably anticipated to cause or contribute to haze;”
- Defined the methodology for conducting a BART control analysis;
- Provided presumptive control limits for electricity generating units (EGUs) larger than 750 Megawatts;
- Provided a justification for the use of the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) as BART for CAIR state EGUs.

Beyond the specific elements listed above, EPA provided the states with a great degree of flexibility in how they choose to implement the BART program. The following section summarizes the core requirements for state compliance with BART regulations.

## 1.2. Overview of State BART Requirements

As finally promulgated, States are required to undertake three key steps to comply with the BART requirements of the Regional Haze Rule. These steps include:

- Determining if a source is BART-eligible;
- Determining if a source reasonably causes or contributes to visibility impairment in any Class I area (subject to BART);
- Determining if additional controls or emission limits are necessary (BART determination).

As stated earlier, eligibility is limited to facilities in one of 26 source categories that have units installed and operating between 1962 and 1977 with the potential to emit more than 250 tons per year of a visibility impairing pollutant. Once a facility is found to be “eligible” for the BART program, states must determine if that facility is “subject to BART,” that is, if it causes haze or contributes to the formation of haze at any Class I area. EPA’s 2005 rule outlines three options to determine if a source is subject to BART. These options include:

- **Individual source assessment (Exemption Modeling)** – This assessment uses CALPUFF or other EPA approved modeling methods. Results of modeling would be compared to natural background conditions. EPA defined “cause” as an impact of 1.0 deciview or more and “contribute” as an impact of 0.5 deciview or more.<sup>2</sup> The rule, however, gave states discretion to set lower thresholds for contribution.

---

<sup>2</sup> Impacts are based on the difference in deciviews (delta deciview) calculated between the best twenty percent natural visibility conditions (states have the option to use annual average conditions as an alternative) at a Class I site with and without individual source contributions included.

- **Cumulative assessment of all BART "eligible sources"** – Under this method, a state can choose to find that all eligible sources within a geographic area or region are subject to BART. This method could also be used to analyze an area's contribution to visibility impairment and demonstrate that *no* sources are subject, based on cumulative modeling.
- **Assessment based on model plants** – This method provides a mechanism to exempt sources with common characteristics that are found not to impair visibility at Class I areas.

Once a facility has been identified as BART-eligible and "subject" to BART, it must conduct an engineering review to determine if the installation of new control requirements is appropriate. This review takes into consideration five factors:

- Cost of controls
- Energy and non-air quality environmental impacts
- Existing controls at source
- Remaining useful life of source
- Visibility improvement reasonably expected from application of the controls.

### 1.3. Overview of Report

This report is intended to summarize an approach to satisfy the BART requirements of the Regional Haze Rule based on the "cumulative assessment of contribution" option for determining if eligible sources are subject to BART. We also review BART-eligible facilities in the MANE-VU region and provide – on a regional basis – an analysis of the general applicability of the five factors for various source categories subject to BART. This analysis will allow MANE-VU states to place their facility-specific BART determinations into the regional context of similar sources within MANE-VU. This review includes an examination of individual units' impacts on visibility at Class I areas, based on CALPUFF modeling and an evaluation of existing or potential controls and feasibility of these controls relative to the statutory factors identified in the BART rule.

To that end, Section 2 of this report first develops a list of all BART-eligible sources in the MANE-VU region. Section 3 provides an overview of the region's approach to determining BART eligibility. Finally, Section 4 presents observations on the regional and sectoral differences among control options and the applicability of the five-factor analysis.

## 2. DETERMINING BART-ELIGIBLE SOURCES

To assist MANE-VU states and tribes with BART implementation efforts, MANE-VU developed a list of BART-eligible sources in the region (NESCAUM, 2001; NESCAUM, 2003). Since then, the preliminary list developed in these documents was refined through consultation with state permitting staff to verify completeness and accuracy of the list. Emissions of SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> as well as stack information were compiled through either consultation with state permitting staff or the 2002 MANE-VU emissions inventory. The final list of sources (as well as associated 2002 emissions and stack parameters) was developed in consultation with state staffs (see Appendix A for a complete list of BART-eligible facilities and units in the MANE-VU region).

## 3. MANE-VU APPROACH TO “SUBJECT TO BART”

Based on the MANE-VU contribution assessment (NESCAUM, 2006b), every MANE-VU state with BART-eligible sources contributes to visibility impairment at a Class I area to a significant degree. Therefore, MANE-VU staff continues to support the policy decision made by the MANE-VU Board in June 2004, that *if a source is eligible for BART, it is subject to BART*. (i.e., no exemption test will be used). The reasons why MANE-VU has chosen to pursue this option for demonstrating its sources are reasonably anticipated to cause or contribute to visibility impairment at Class I areas are threefold: (1) the BART program represents an opportunity to achieve greater reasonable progress, (2) additional public health and welfare benefits will accrue from resulting decreases in fine particulate matter, and (3) to demonstrate its commitment to federal land managers (FLMs) and other RPOs as it seeks emissions reductions wherever it is authorized to do so.

This recommendation is not equivalent, however, to the statement that every BART-eligible source must install controls. The approach presented for MANE-VU state consideration – starting with this document and continuing with their own source specific analyses – requires the consideration of each of the five factors required by statute before determining whether or not controls are warranted.

## 4. REGIONAL FIVE FACTOR ANALYSIS

### 4.1. The Degree of Visibility Improvement That May Reasonably be Anticipated from the Use of BART

BART emission limits and compliance schedules must be determined subject to an evaluation of the five statutory factors. These factors include:

- (a) the costs of compliance,
- (b) the energy and non-air quality environmental impacts of compliance,
- (c) any existing pollution control technology in use at the source,
- (d) the remaining useful life of the source, and

(e) the degree of visibility improvement which may reasonably be anticipated from the use of BART.

To begin its regional analysis of these factors, MANE-VU staff first considered the degree of visibility improvement that could result from the installation of BART controls. This is slightly different than the statutory language and is meant to reflect our first-order approach to estimating the maximum visibility benefit that could be achieved by eliminating all emissions from the facility. While this is not a realistic approach to fully satisfying the intent of factor (e) above, it does provide the states a useful metric for determining which facilities are unlikely to warrant BART controls based on consideration of this factor.

This analysis was achieved by first modeling 2002 emissions of SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> from all BART-eligible units in the region.<sup>3</sup> A total of 136 BART-eligible facilities were identified in the MANE-VU region and modeled on the two CALPUFF platforms. Table 4-1 displays the types and numbers of facilities modeled in the region.

**Table 4-1. Types of BART-eligible facilities modeled in the region**

Facility Type	Number of Facilities	Number of Units/MM5*	Number of Units/NWS
Chemical Manufacturer	12	48	107
Chemical Plant	1	4	18
Coal Cleaning	1	1	1
EGU	59	139	296
Glass Fiber	3	14	33
Incinerator	1	2	2
Industrial Boilers	2	6	8
Lime Plant	2	4	14
Metal Production	13	64	140
Mineral Products	1	4	13
Paper and Pulp	14	39	63
Petroleum Storage	4	6	10
Portland Cement	13	49	228
Refinery	9	70	497
<b>Total</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>1449</b>

\* Units with very small emissions were grouped together and modeled as one stack for the MM5-based CALPUFF runs.

The two CALPUFF modeling platforms are described in greater detail elsewhere (NESCAUM, 2006b) and are driven by two respective meteorological datasets: 1) a wind field based on National Weather Service (NWS) observations and 2) a wind field based on output from the MM5 meteorological model (MM5, 2006). Environmental Resources Management (ERM) developed CALMET-processed meteorology on a large domain (extending from Oklahoma City, OK up to Prince Edward Island, Canada). The CALMET meteorology was processed directly from the MM5 model output developed

<sup>3</sup> Emissions information was gathered from the MANE-VU 2002 Version 2 (Base A) emissions inventory. Since then, the MANE-VU 2002 Version 3 (Base B) emissions inventory has been developed which includes several changes made by the OTC modeling committee.

on a 12-km horizontal grid by the University of Maryland for the OTC modeling committee and MANE-VU. The Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation (VT DEC) developed CALMET meteorology (for the identical domain) driven by the NWS's surface observation network, rawinsonde network, and supplemented by the Airport Surface Observation System (ASOS) network. This observation-based dataset provides an alternative to the gridded wind fields generated by the diagnostic model MM5.

Modeling results from both NWS and MM5 platforms have been made available to the states involved in this process. Results include each BART-eligible unit's maximum 24-hr, 8<sup>th</sup> highest 24-hr, and annual average impact at the Class I area most heavily impacted, as well as the total impact from all BART sources on each Class I area. These visibility impacts were modeled relative to 20 percent best, 20 percent worst, and annual average natural background conditions. For the purposes of this analysis, we examined the 24-hr maximum visibility impact relative to the 20 percent best days. On July 19, 2006, EPA provided clarification to guidance that states may use either estimates of 20 percent best or annual average natural background visibility conditions as the basis for calculating the deciview difference that individual sources would contribute for BART exemption modeling purposes. MANE-VU has opted to use the best conditions estimates for their consideration of the "degree of visibility improvement" modeling because it is more protective to the region.

Given that no modeling of 2018 "post-BART" emission levels has been conducted yet, the 2002 modeling, in essence, provides MANE-VU with an estimate of the maximum improvement in visibility that could result from installation of BART controls at Class I areas in the region (i.e., if the facility was zeroed out). In virtually all instances, the installation of BART controls would result in less visibility improvement than what is represented by a facility's 2002 impact, but this does provide a consistent means of identifying those sources whose emissions represent a more significant contribution to visibility impairment than others.

In July of 2004, MANE-VU submitted comments to EPA that included visibility impact analysis of a representative sample of EGUs across the country. Based on that representative sample, MANE-VU determined that the value of the maximum 24-hour impact relative to natural conditions that would include 98 percent of the cumulative visibility impact on MANE-VU sites was likely between 0.1 and 0.2 dv. However, this dataset was limited in that it only explored the relationship of EGUs and did not provide an indication of how the total frequency impact might change with numerous smaller, non-EGU, BART-eligible sources. With this new CALPUFF modeling data, we were able to repeat this analysis for the dataset that included all BART-eligible units in the region. This analysis remains limited in that it includes only MANE-VU sources. It is likely that the additional sources from VISTAS and MWRPO would add to the total visibility impairment experienced at MANE-VU class I areas and, to some extent, to the top 98 percent of the visibility impacts. Without knowing the exact contribution of extra-regional BART sources to impairment at our Class I sites, it is impossible to determine the cumulative 98<sup>th</sup> percentile frequency precisely.

Notwithstanding this limitation, the results of this new analysis showed that 98 percent of the cumulative frequency visibility impact from all MANE-VU BART-eligible

sources corresponds to a maximum 24-hr impact of 0.22 dv from the NWS-driven data and 0.29 dv from the MM5 data. We therefore concluded that a range of 0.2 to 0.3 dv would represent a “significant” impact at MANE-VU Class I areas on an average basis. Given the analysis and the limitation due to exclusion of sources outside of MANE-VU, we decided to place increased weight on facilities with an individual visibility impact greater than 0.1 dv for this 1<sup>st</sup> order regional 5-factor analysis. This threshold is overly inclusive relative to exemption processes being conducted by other RPOs, but still provides MANE-VU states flexibility in choosing the weight to be given to the first of the five factors considered (i.e., the degree of visibility improvement that could result from BART).

As an additional demonstration that sources whose impact were below the 0.1 dv level were too small to warrant BART controls, the entire MANE-VU population of these units was modeled together to examine their cumulative impacts on each Class I site. The result of this simulation showed that the maximum 24-hr impact at any Class I area of *all* modeled facilities with individual impacts below 0.1 dv was only a 0.35 dv change relative to the estimated best days natural conditions at Acadia National Park. This value is below the 0.5 dv impact recommended by EPA for exemption modeling and we can be fairly certain that facilities below the 0.1 dv level have very small individual impacts on visibility at Class I areas.

Among the sources with a greater than 0.1 dv total impact at any Class I area were 29 EGUs with 95 BART-eligible units that are located in states subject to CAIR. These CAIR-eligible EGU units may use the CAIR program to satisfy BART for SO<sub>2</sub> and in most cases NO<sub>x</sub> BART. We did not consider these facilities further with the exception of the three EGU facilities (eight units) that had greater than 0.1 dv contribution for PM alone. These three EGU facilities, along with 14 additional EGU facilities in states that are not subject to CAIR (17 EGUs total), and 36 additional non-EGU facilities with visibility impacts that may warrant BART controls are listed in Table 4-2 by type.

**Table 4-2. Types of facilities in MANE-VU region with greater than 0.1 dv impact at any Class I area (non year-round CAIR states).**

Facility Type	Number of Facilities	Number of Units/MM5*
Chemical Manufacturer	1	3
Coal Cleaning	1	1
EGU	17	30
Glass Fiber	1	6
Incinerator	1	2
Metal Production	2	7
Paper and Pulp	12	30
Portland Cement	12	25
Refinery	5	37
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>142</b>

\*Only MM5 Data were used for this analysis.

## 4.2. Cost and Availability of Controls and Controls Already in Place

The second and third steps of the MANE-VU five-factor analysis involved evaluating current controls at sources and costs of additional controls at these facilities – factors (a) and (c) above. To address these factors, the list of these 53 highest impacting facilities, including all the BART-eligible units at these facilities (142 units), was sent out to state permitting staff for feedback on possible controls recommendations for these types of units and cost information for typical installation of these controls. Several states informed us that some of the eligible facilities are subject to future controls under existing state regulations that will achieve “BART-like” levels of control at no additional cost. In these cases, we have listed the control level where applicable, or designated the control as “Currently Controlled” if the controls are already in place. Other states are considering a cost threshold to determine whether controls are feasible. If potential additional controls are above any known cost thresholds, then it is likely that a state would not feel that additional controls beyond those currently in place are warranted and we have therefore designated such units as “currently controlled.” In situations where we did not have sufficient information to assess current or potential future controls, the unit has been designated as “No Known Further Controls.” Finally, many units already have controls in place. When no indication was given by the states that further controls were being considered for a unit, it was designated as “Currently Controlled.”

NESCAUM compiled the available survey results provided by state staffs on expected or potential controls on these units and projected 2018 emissions from these units. Summaries of these results are found in Table 4-3 to Table 4-5. Cost information for various control options was obtained from a variety of sources including individual states, previous NESCAUM reports (NESCAUM, 2005), and other RPO analyses. Cost estimates from NESCAUM (2005) are summarized in Appendix B. Obviously, more detailed analysis of the cost of various control options will have to be conducted at the facility-specific level by the states as they conduct facility-specific BART determinations.



**Table 4-3. Possible range of SO<sub>2</sub> controls and costs based on survey of state staff**

Type of Unit	Counts By Type	Control Strategies	Number of Units where this option might apply	Total 2002 SO <sub>2</sub> Emissions	Total Estimated Decrease in SO <sub>2</sub> (tons/yr)	Estimated Cost (\$/Ton SO <sub>2</sub> )	Notes
Chemical Manufacturer	3	Currently Controlled	3	24000	NA	0	
Glass Fiber	6	Currently Controlled	6	17	0	0	
Coal Cleaning	1	No Known Further Controls	1	68	0	0	
EGU/Coal	5	Dry Scrubber	4	64000	NA	200-500	Mid Range
		0.33 lb/MMBtu	1	4000	1200	0	
EGU/Oil (Resid and Dist)	17	0.3% fuel sulfur limit	3	1400		NA	
		0.56 lb/MMBtu	1	85	NA		
		1.5% Fuel Sulfur Limit	1	5200	1300	NA	
		0.33 lb/MMBtu	1	4000	3100	0	
		3.0 lb/MWh	5	31000	NA	0	
		1.1-1.2 lb/MMBtu	2	480	NA		
		BART WG Reco?	2	1800			
Incinerator	2	Currently Controlled	2	84	0		
Metal Production	7	Currently Controlled	5	2200	0	0	
		Increased efficiency of the facility's wet scrubber	2	3000	300	Limited Cost	Low Range
Paper and Pulp	30	FGD (SO <sub>2</sub> Scrubber)	3	13000	20000	400-8000	Mid Range (1)
		No Known further controls	9	10000	0	0	
		Currently Controlled	8	4400	0	0	
		BART WG Rec?	10	8500	7600		
Portland Cement	25	Fuel switching: CE of SO <sub>x</sub> 10%	3	2300	230	NA	
		Currently Controlled	4	3400	0	0	
		No Known Further Controls	7	300	0	0	
		SO <sub>2</sub> Scrubber	10	26000	19000	400-8000	Mid Range (1)
		BART WG Reco?	1	300	NA		
Refinery	37	Refinery RACT	9	5400	NA	0	
		No Known Controls	25	NA	NA	0	

(1) Cost estimate from NESCAUM 2005 for Industrial Boilers

**Table 4-4. Possible range of NO<sub>x</sub> controls and costs based on survey of state staff**

Type of Unit	Counts By Type	Control Strategies	Number of Units where this option might apply	Total 2002 NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	Total Estimated Decrease in NO <sub>x</sub> (tons/yr)	Estimated Cost (\$/Ton NO <sub>x</sub> )	Notes
Chemical Manufacturer	3	Currently Controlled	3	5000	0	0	
Glass Fiber	6	Currently Controlled	6	180	0	0	
Coal Cleaning	1	Low NO <sub>x</sub> burners, CE of 15%	1	160	25	1-2 Million (capital cost)	Low Range
EGU/Coal	5	Currently Controlled	2	2900	820	0	
		SCR and 1.5 lb/MWh	2	9800	NA	1000-1500	Mid Range (1)
		NO <sub>x</sub> Budget & 1.5 lb/MWh	1	2300	NA	NA	
EGU/Oil	17	Currently Controlled	4	4300	360	0	
		No Known Controls	3	390	0	0	
		NO <sub>x</sub> Budget	1	400	NA	NA	
		NO <sub>x</sub> Budget and 1.5 lb/MWh	4	5300	NA	NA	
		SNCR, 1.5 lb/MWh	1	2400	NA	500-700	Mid Range (1)
		NO <sub>x</sub> Budget	2	280	NA	NA	
		BART WG Reco?	2	440	NA	NA	
Incinerator	1	Currently Controlled	2	720	NA	NA	
Metal Production	7	Currently Controlled	7	110	0	0	
Paper and Pulp	30	SCR or SNCR	2	710	430	1300-10000	Mid to High Range (2)
		No Known Controls	13	4500	0	0	
		BART WG Reco?	7	1800	NA	NA	
		Currently Controlled	8	2800	0	0	
Portland Cement	25	Low NO <sub>x</sub> burners	3	2800	430	200-3000	Mid Range (3)
		LNB and Mid Kiln Firing, 40% Reduction	2	8500	3400	1200-10000	Mid Range (2)
		SCR, 65% Red.	1	740	480	1300-10000	(2)
		No Known Controls	9	2000	0	0	
		Currently Controlled	1	1700	0	0	
		SNCR	9	7100	2900	900-1200	Mid Range (3)
Refinery	37	Refinery RACT	9	2300	NA	NA	
		No Known Controls	25	0	0	0	
		SCR	2	NA		1300-10000	(2)
		SNCR	1	NA		1300-10000	(2)

(1) Cost estimate from NESCAUM 2005, EGU controls

(2) Cost estimate from NESCAUM 2005, Industrial Boiler controls

(3) Cost estimate from NESCAUM 2005, Portland Cement Kilns

**Table 4-5. Possible range of PM<sub>10</sub> controls and costs based on survey of state staff**

Type of Unit	Counts By Type	Control Strategies	Number of Units where this option might apply	Total 2002 PM <sub>10</sub> Emissions	Total Estimated Decrease in PM <sub>10</sub> (tons/yr)	Estimated Cost	Notes
Chemical Manufacturer	3	Currently Controlled	3	200	0	0	
Coal Cleaning	1	No Known Controls	1	46	0	0	
EGU/Coal	10	Currently Controlled ESP	6	3300	1400	0	
		PM co-benefit reductions expected due to FGD-25-50% reduction	2	1500	370	0	
		Baghouse	1	1500		\$50 M	Capital Cost, NJ estimate
EGU/Natural Gas	2	Controls information included with oil/coal boilers	2	13	NA	NA	
EGU/Oil	18	Currently Controlled Mech Collector	1	9	0	0	
		Currently Controlled	12	400	42	0	
		No Known Controls	5	52	0	0	
Incinerator	2	Currently Controlled Fabric Filter	2	0	0	0	
Glass Fiber	6	Currently Controlled	6	190	0	0	
Metal Production	7	Currently Controlled	7	41	0	0	
Paper and Pulp	30	Upgrade from ESP to baghouse, CE of 4% estimate	2	180	7	\$15 M	Capital Cost
		No Known Controls	7	280	0	0	
		Currently Controlled (ESP, Venturi Scrubbers, Demister, or MultiCyclones)	9	690	0	0	
		BART WG Reco?	7	670	NA	NA	
Portland Cement	25	Upgrade on current ESP, CE of 5%	3	210	11	Limited Cost	
		No Known Controls	15	300	0	0	
		Currently Controlled	6	370	0	0	
		Baghouse or electric precipitator	1	4	NA	NA	
Refinery	37	No Known Controls	28	NA	0	0	
		Refinery RACT	9	270	NA	NA	

Table 4-3 through Table 4-5 display general summary information from state surveys on possible BART control efforts as well as cost information gathered from several sources. The sections below will describe the contents of these tables in further detail.

#### **4.2.1. Chemical Manufacturers**

In the MANE-VU region, two chemical manufacturing facilities showed visibility impacts greater than 0.1 dv at a Class I area. Based on our state survey of control options for SO<sub>2</sub>, it seems that some states may consider installation of a scrubber as a reasonable alternative with another state feeling that installation of a scrubber is likely to exceed a reasonable cost threshold for this type of facility.

For NO<sub>x</sub> and PM controls at the chemical manufacturers in the region, states felt that current controls in place at these units are likely to serve as BART and that no additional control would be warranted for these pollutants.

#### **4.2.2. Glass Fiber**

There is one glass fiber facility in the region with a significant visibility impact on a Class I area in MANE-VU. Recent controls installed at this plant are likely to satisfy BART requirements.

#### **4.2.3. Coal Cleaning**

One coal cleaning facility in the region showed a significant visibility impact at Class I areas. Low NO<sub>x</sub> burners for NO<sub>x</sub> control are considered a low-cost option at this facility. Additional control options for SO<sub>2</sub> and PM may not be warranted based on a survey of state staff. Low NO<sub>x</sub> burners could result in approximately 24 tons of NO<sub>x</sub> reduced annually.

#### **4.2.4. Electric Generation Units**

Of the 58 EGUs modeled in the region, 40 facilities are located in states implementing a year-round CAIR program, while 15 facilities are located in states implementing an ozone season CAIR program. Units covered in a year-round CAIR program were removed from further SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> analysis because BART would likely be satisfied through CAIR requirements. Visibility modeling was conducted for all EGUs in the region and of the 18 EGU facilities in MANE-VU states without a year-round CAIR program under development, 13 showed a significant impact at Class I areas in the region. In addition, three facilities in states with a year-round CAIR program showed a significant PM impact, and were included in the PM control and cost analysis.

#### ***Coal-Fired Units***

States with coal-fired EGU units are considering two options for SO<sub>2</sub> control; dry scrubber installation (a mid level cost option) and a 0.33 lb/mmBTU capacity limit. A dry scrubber could result in over 90 percent SO<sub>2</sub> decrease while a capacity limit of 0.33

lb/mmBTU could result in a decrease of 1200 tons SO<sub>2</sub> at one unit considering this option.

In terms of NO<sub>x</sub> control, two units in the region have current controls that are being considered sufficient for BART. Two units are looking at SCR controls to achieve a 1.5 lb/MWh emission rate, a mid level cost option for this facility. One unit's control level under the NO<sub>x</sub> Budget Program will simultaneously control for BART.

The majority of coal-fired units at EGUs in the region are currently fit with ESPs and further PM control recommendations are not warranted. For the units without ESPs, one state was looking at baghouse installation as a possible option and another expects sufficient reductions due to a PM co-benefit from the installation of an FGD scrubber for SO<sub>2</sub> control.

### ***Oil-Fired Units***

The majority of BART-eligible oil-fired EGU boilers in the region were found in one state. For these units, input- and output-based capacity limits established under other programs for which the BART-eligible units were covered may satisfy SO<sub>2</sub> BART control requirements. The levels of those programs are 0.56 and 1.1 lb/MMBtu for two different EGUs respectively, and 3.0 lb/MWh output-based limit for several other EGUs.

Another control option being considered by other states is a fuel sulfur limit (0.3 percent) or an equivalent 0.33 lb/MMBtu emissions rate. Four BART-eligible units in the region have been controlled at this level since 2002 and would consider this level of control appropriate for BART. This BART control option has reduced total SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 3100 tons annually at the one controlled facilities, but is not anticipated to achieve as great a reduction at the other three BART-eligible facilities, which are smaller. One unit is considering a 1.5 percent fuel sulfur limit that could result in approximately 1300 tons (or approximately 25 percent reduction) of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the one candidate for this option. We have no information on potential controls for two other BART-eligible units in the region.

Regarding NO<sub>x</sub> controls on oil-fired boilers, possible technologies being considered for BART include SNCR installation. Several units in the region are either currently controlled, with further controls considered unwarranted, or are under a NO<sub>x</sub> budget program that would serve as BART. For several of these units, information on BART recommendations was unavailable.

As with the coal-fired units, the majority of oil-fired boilers in the region have existing PM control technologies like ESPs, multicyclones, and mechanical collectors.

### **4.2.5. Incinerators**

The lone BART-eligible incinerator facility in the region has already achieved an approximately 75 percent reduction in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions through the installation of a dry scrubber. This facility already has SNCR NO<sub>x</sub> controls and continues participation in the NO<sub>x</sub> Budget Program. The unit has existing PM controls and may not warrant further controls.

#### **4.2.6. Metal Production**

All metal production units in the region have existing controls and states indicated that current controls would likely satisfy BART requirements. For one facility, the state was looking at low cost, better efficiency measures for the SO<sub>2</sub> scrubber that would result in an increase of SO<sub>2</sub> control efficiency by 10 percent.

#### **4.2.7. Paper and Pulp**

There are 30 eligible units at paper and pulp facilities with significant visibility impact in the region. While the majority of these units are industrial boilers, this category also contains lime kilns, smelt tanks, and other process units. States are contemplating FGD scrubber installations for SO<sub>2</sub> control for at least three industrial boiler units as possible BART control options. This is a mid-range cost technology for typical installations that could result in an estimated 20,000 fewer tons of SO<sub>2</sub> for these three units alone. Eight other units are currently controlled at a level such that existing controls are likely to satisfy BART (i.e., the cost of additional controls for some of these units would exceed a reasonable cost threshold). Ten of the 30 units exist in a state that is currently weighing the BART Workgroup's recommendations as a possible control option. These recommendations can be found in Appendix C. For paper and pulp facilities, the recommendation is to consider technologies that would achieve 90 percent control. This option, if implemented, would result in 7,600 fewer tons of SO<sub>2</sub> emitted from these units. We currently do not have SO<sub>2</sub> control information for the remaining nine units in this category.

For the majority of paper and pulp units, either the existing NO<sub>x</sub> controls may satisfy BART or we did not have information about possible controls for units. Possible control options being considered for uncontrolled sources include SCR or SNCR technologies on boilers that could achieve 60 to 80 percent NO<sub>x</sub> control. This is a mid to high cost control option, depending on the facility. Installation of these technologies is estimated to result in a decrease of 430 tons of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions at two units considering this option. Of the 30 units considered in this step of the analysis, seven units are being evaluated for controls based on the BART Workgroup recommendations found in Appendix C.

Most of the units at paper and pulp facilities with significant visibility impacts in the region have existing PM controls and were not viewed as candidates for further controls. One state is considering the BART Workgroup recommendations in Appendix C for seven of its units. Finally, one state is considering upgrading ESPs on two units to baghouses that would result in a decrease of 7 tons of PM emitted per year.

#### **4.2.8. Portland Cement Plants**

Twenty-five Portland cement units in MANE-VU are located at BART-eligible facilities with significant visibility impacts on Class I areas in the region. At these facilities, states are considering installation of SO<sub>2</sub> scrubbers at 10 of these units, which would significantly reduce the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> emitted from this sector. If installed, scrubbers at these units would result in a decrease in emissions of 19,000 tons of SO<sub>2</sub> annually.

Another BART control option being considered in the region is fuel switching. Units considering this option could decrease annual SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 230 tons. Eleven units in this sector either have existing controls that will likely satisfy BART, or control information for SO<sub>2</sub> is currently unknown.

Control technologies under consideration for NO<sub>x</sub> at cement plants were varied according to our survey information. Low NO<sub>x</sub> burners are a possible control option for uncontrolled units. This is a mid range cost option that could result in an annual decrease of 430 tons of NO<sub>x</sub> emitted from three units. Another possible control option is Low NO<sub>x</sub> burners with mid-kiln firing. At a mid level cost, this technology could result in a decrease of 3400 annual tons of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions at units where this option is applicable. SCR installation is being considered at one unit, also a mid level cost option that could decrease emissions from unit by 480 tons annually. SNCR control technology is a mid level cost option, which if in place at units considering this option, could result in a decrease of 2900 tons of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. Ten of the 25 units in this category either have existing controls that will likely satisfy BART or controls for NO<sub>x</sub> are currently unknown.

Most of the units at these Portland cement plants either have existing PM controls or potential control information is unknown. Where no controls exist, possible control options include installation of a baghouse or an ESP. One state is considering a recommendation of upgrading ESPs at three units, a low cost option that would reduce annual emissions of PM by 11 tons.

#### **4.2.9. Refineries**

At this time, for the majority of the units in this category, control information is unknown. One possible control option for SO<sub>2</sub> is installation of a scrubber, a mid range cost option being considered for three units in the region. Nine of these units are currently subject to refinery RACT controls for 8-hour ozone and these control levels for SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM are likely to satisfy BART requirements. States are also considering SCR or SNCR controls for three units in the region for possible NO<sub>x</sub> control, also a mid level cost option.


### **4.3. Energy and Non-Air Quality Environmental Impacts**

While there are certain to be several issues that arise on a facility-specific basis with respect to individual control technologies (e.g., water quality impacts or solid waste disposal issues), we are unable to address these issues in a regional analysis. One environmental benefit that should be considered in weighing control options for BART is the regional impact on acid deposition in MANE-VU.

An analysis of combined SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> reduction potential of BART control options by sector showed similar results for EGUs and paper and pulp facilities. Figure 4-1 shows the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> that could be reduced if BART control options were implemented at the units for which likely control options are known. Figure 4-1 shows that generally, when emission reduction options are known, the emissions reduction potential is evenly distributed across the range of sources in the region. This is important as states are weighing whether controls are warranted or not for EGUs or paper and pulp boilers. However, for the majority of units with significant visibility impact in

these sectors, the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> reduction potential is currently unknown, limiting the power of this analysis.


**Figure 4-1. Reduction potential of BART control options at EGUs and Paper and Pulp Facilities**



For Portland cement plants, possible emissions reduction data were more complete and allowed for a clearer analysis of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> control. Figure 4-2 shows the emissions reduction potential that would be achieved by BART if the survey control options were implemented for units in this sector. While several units would benefit from BART control options with emissions being reduced by greater than 3,000 tons of combined SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>, the majority of the cement plant units would reduce emissions by less than 1,000 tons. As states weigh whether additional controls are warranted for cement plants, this non air-quality environmental factor may play less of a role for these sources.

For other source categories, the statistics are generally too small to make an analysis meaningful, but as a general rule, the remaining source categories tend to have lower overall emissions and lower overall reduction potential, which may factor into control decisions accordingly.



**Figure 4-2. Reduction potential of BART control options at Cement Plants**

#### 4.4. Remaining Useful Life

The MANE-VU BART Workgroup has considered what weight to give to this factor in conducting BART determinations and has recommended that remaining useful life of a source will be addressed in the following way. A BART-eligible facility that is found to have reasonable control options available to it should either control emissions from that BART-eligible facility prior to 2013 or accept a federally enforceable permit limitation or retirement date prior to each state's public notice and hearing processes and FLM review of BART SIP elements.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

As MANE-VU states prepare to conduct source-specific BART determinations for the eligible units in their jurisdictions, this report provides a regional assessment of the five factors that must be considered in determining whether additional controls are warranted for an individual BART source. This information is intended to lay out a regional approach and provide regional context for individual control decisions that will be made by the MANE-VU member states. This information may also serve as an important regional basis for dialogue and internal MANE-VU consultations as states consider what level of stringency is justified and reasonable based on consideration of the five factors.

Important findings of this analysis include the identification of BART-eligible sources in the region, the numbers of units in various categories subject to BART consideration, BART control technology options being considered in the region, and

estimates of the total emissions and reduction potential from units contributing to potentially significant visibility impacts at Class I areas.

Table 4-1 and Table 4-2 indicate that 136 BART-eligible facilities exist in the region with 53 contributing to potentially significant visibility impairment at a Class I area. The majority of BART-eligible facilities in the region are EGUs, however, most of these facilities fall under a year-round CAIR program that will satisfy BART.

Of the BART-eligible source categories with potentially significant visibility impacts, the non-CAIR EGU sector was the largest emitter of SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> in 2002. BART-eligible EGUs with significant visibility impacts included 17 facilities with 30 units emitting 110,000 tons SO<sub>2</sub>, 28,000 tons NO<sub>x</sub>, and 7,000 tons PM<sub>10</sub> in 2002. The majority of these units are anticipating controls for SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> to satisfy BART requirements. Although the amount of expected reductions is currently unknown, we can expect significant reductions in emissions from this sector given widely available control technologies for SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> with proven cost-effectiveness. Most of these units are currently controlled for particulate matter and further controls are not expected.

Portland cement plants and paper and pulp facilities are sectors with many BART-eligible units that made significant contributions to visibility impairment and total pollutant emissions in the region. Paper and pulp facilities with significant visibility impacts emitted 36,000 tons SO<sub>2</sub>, 10,000 tons NO<sub>x</sub>, and 2,000 ton PM<sub>10</sub> at 30 units in 2002. Although information on controls is currently unknown for many of these units, information from units considering controls indicates that significant reductions can be achieved from this sector (19,000 tons SO<sub>2</sub> reduced if scrubbers are installed at 13 units and 400 tons NO<sub>x</sub> reduced if SCR controls are introduced to two units). Portland cement facilities with significant visibility impacts emitted 32,000 tons SO<sub>2</sub>, 23,000 tons NO<sub>x</sub>, and 850 tons PM<sub>10</sub> at 25 units in the region. With more complete information for cement plants, we estimated a reduction of 19,000 tons SO<sub>2</sub> at 13 units and 7,000 tons NO<sub>x</sub> at 15 units when considering controls that would satisfy BART.

Ultimately, the strength of the MANE-VU BART program, as determined by individual state control decisions and informed by this analysis, will demonstrate MANE-VU's resolve to tackle visibility and related air quality problems in its region. As MANE-VU enters into inter-RPO consultations, its willingness to seek reasonable emission reductions within its own region will help set expectations for the other RPOs, and the BART program represents a cornerstone of this process.

## 6. REFERENCES

MM5 website <http://www.mmm.ucar.edu/mm5/>

NESCAUM. 2005. Assessment of Control Technology Options for BART-Eligible Sources. Available at: <http://www.nescaum.org/documents/bart-control-assessment.pdf/>

NESCAUM. 2006a. BART Resource Guide. Available at: <http://www.nescaum.org/documents/bart-resource-guide/bart-resource-guide-08-23-06-final.pdf/>

NESCAUM. 2003. Technical Memorandum #6. Development of a List of BART-Eligible Sources in the MANE-VU Region: Interim Report. Available at: <http://www.nescaum.org/documents/memo6-bart.pdf/>

NESCAUM. 2006b. Contributions to Regional Haze in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic United States. Appendix D: Development of Parallel CALPUFF Dispersion Modeling Platforms for Sulfate Source Attribution Studies in the Northeast U.S. Available at: <http://www.nescaum.org/documents/contributions-to-regional-haze-in-the-northeast-and-mid-atlantic--united-states/appendixd--2006-0831.pdf/>

NESCAUM. 2001. A Basis for Control of BART-Eligible Sources. Available at: <http://www.nescaum.org/documents/a-basis-for-control-of-bart-eligible-sources/basis.pdf/>

## Appendix A: List of BART-Eligible Facilities in the MANE-VU Region

State	Plant	Type	Number of Units
CT	Middletown Power LLC (NRG)	EGU	2
CT	Montville Power LLC (NRG)	EGU	1
CT	Norwalk Power LLC (NRG)	EGU	1
CT	PSEG Power CT Bridgeport Harbor Station	EGU	1
CT	PSEG Power CT New Haven Harbor Station	EGU	1
CT	Sprague Paperboard Carastar	Fossil Fuel Boiler (>250 MMBtu)	1
DC	Benning (PEPCO -15)	EGU	1
DC	Benning (PEPCO -16)	EGU	1
DE	City of Dover - Mckee Run	EGU	1
DE	Connectiv Edgemore	EGU	2
DE	NRG- Indian River	EGU	1
MA	Exxon Mobil Everett	Petroleum Storage	1
MA	Global Petroleum Revere	Petroleum Storage	1
MA	Gulf Oil Chelsea	Petroleum Storage	1
MA	Solutia	Chemical Process Plant	3
MA	Braintree Electric	EGU	1
MA	Brayton Point	EGU	4
MA	Eastman Gelatin (boilers only)	Chemical Process Plant/Industrial Boilers	4
MA	General Electric Lynn	EGU	1
MA	Harvard U (Blackstone)	EGU	2
MA	Mirant Kendall LLC	EGU	3
MA	Mirant-Canal Electric	EGU	2
MA	Mystic	EGU	1
MA	New Boston	EGU	1
MA	Salem Harbor	EGU	1
MA	TMLP - Cleary Flood	EGU	3
MA	Trigen - Kneeland St	EGU	1
MA	Wheelabrator -Saugus	Municipal Incinerator	2
MD	CONSTELLATION POWER SOURCE GENERATION CP CRANE	EGU	7
MD	CONSTELLATION POWER SOURCE GENERATION HERBERT WAGNER	EGU	2
MD	EASTALCO ALUMINUM	Primary Aluminum Ore Reduction Plant	2
MD	INDEPENDENT CEMENT ST LAWERENCE	Portland Cement	1
MD	LEHIGH PORTLAND CEMENT	Portland Cement	3

MD	METTIKI COAL CORPORATION	Coal Cleaning	1
MD	MILLENIUUM INORGANIC CHEMICALS	Chemical Process Plants	5
MD	MIRANT MID ATLANTIC LLC MORGANTOWN	EGU	2
MD	MIRANT MID ATLANTIC DICKERSON	EGU	1
MD	PEPCO CHALK POINT	EGU	3
MD	TRIGEN LEADENHALL STREET	Fossil Fuel Boiler (>250 MMBtu)	4
MD	VIENNA GENERATING STATION	EGU	1
MD	WESTVACO FINE PAPERS	Kraft Pulp Mill/Fossil Fuel Boiler (>250 MMBtu)	3
ME	Domtar Ind	Industrial Boiler/Kraft Pulp Mill	2
ME	Dragon Products	Portland Cement	1
ME	Georgia Pacific Old Town	Industrial Boiler/Kraft Pulp Mill	2
ME	IP Bucksport	Fossil Fuel Boiler (>250 MMBtu)	1
ME	IP Jay	Industrial Boiler/Kraft Pulp Mill	9
ME	Katahdin Paper Millinocket	Fossil Fuel Boiler (>250 MMBtu)	1
ME	Lincoln Paper and Tissue	Industrial Boiler/Kraft Pulp Mill	2
ME	Rumford Paper	Industrial Boiler	1
ME	SAPPI Somerset	Industrial Boiler/Kraft Pulp Mill	4
ME	Wyman Station	EGU	2
NH	PSNH Merrimack Station	EGU	1
NH	PSNH Newington Station	EGU	1
NJ	Amerada Hess Corporation-Port Reading Re	Petroleum Refinery	13
NJ	Bayway Refinery	Petroleum Refinery	257
NJ	Chevron Products Company	Petroleum Refinery	22
NJ	COASTAL EAGLE POINT OIL COMPANY	Petroleum Refinery	145
NJ	Hudson Generation Station	EGU	4
PA	ALLEGHENY_LUDLUM_CORP_BRACKENRIDGE	EGU	8
PA	EASTMAN_CHEMICAL_RESINS_INC	Chemical Process Plants/Industrial Boilers	2
PA	ESSROC/BESSEMER	Portland Cement	14
PA	NEVILLE_CHEMICAL_COMPANY	Chemical Process Plants	5
PA	ORION_POWER_MIDWEST_CHESWICK_STATION	EGU	2
PA	USS_CLAIRTON_WORKS	Metal Production/Industrial Boilers	4
PA	AK STEEL CORP BUTLER WORKS	Iron and Steel Mill Plants	16

PA	ALLEGHENY ENERGY SUPPLY CO HATFIELDS FER	EGU	5
PA	ALLEGHENY ENERGY SUPPLY CO MITCHELL POWE	EGU	19
PA	AMER REF GROUP BRADFORD	Petroleum Refinery	4
PA	APPLETON PAPERS SPRING MILL	Kraft Pulp Mill/Industrial Boilers	9
PA	CARMEUSE LIME INC MILLARD LIME PLT	Lime Plant	8
PA	CEMEX INC WAMPUM CEMENT PLT	Portland Cement	9
PA	CONOCOPHILLIPS CO TRAINER REF	Petroleum Refinery	10
PA	DUFERCO FARRELL CORP FARRELL PLT	Iron and Steel Mill Plants	1
PA	DYNO NOBEL INC DONORA	Chemical Process Plants	9
PA	ESSROC NAZARETH LOWER CEMENT PLT 1	Portland Cement	1
PA	EXELON GENERATION CO EDDYSTONE	EGU	6
PA	EXIDE TECH READING SMELTER	Secondary Metal Production	9
PA	HOMER CITY OL HOMER CITY GEN STA	EGU	6
PA	HORSEHEAD CORP MONACA SMELTER	Primary Zinc Smelter	25
PA	INDSPEC CHEM CORP PETROLIA	Chemical Process Plants	17
PA	INMETCO ELLWOOD CITY	Iron and Steel Mill Plants	6
PA	ISG PLATE LLC COATESVILLE	Iron and Steel Mill Plants	20
PA	KEYSTONE PORTLAND CEMENT EAST ALLEN	Portland Cement	4
PA	LAFARGE CORP WHITEHALL PLT	Portland Cement	28
PA	LEHIGH CEMENT CO EVANSVILLE CEMENT PLT	Portland Cement	42
PA	LEHIGH CEMENT CO YORK OPERATIONS	Portland Cement	11
PA	LWB REFRACTORIES CO W MANCHESTER	Mineral Products	13
PA	MERCER LIME & STONE BRANCHTON	Lime Plant	6
PA	NEW CASTLE POWER PLT	EGU	2
PA	PA POWER CO BRUCE MANSFIELD PLT	EGU	18
PA	PH GLATFELTER CO SPRING GROVE	Paper and Pulp/Industrial Boilers	8
PA	PPL BRUNNER ISLAND L BRUNNER ISLAND	EGU	4
PA	PPL MARTINS CREEK LLC MARTINS CREEK	EGU	2
PA	PPL MONTOUR LLC MONTOUR SES	EGU	4
PA	RELIANT ENERGY NORTHEAST CONEMAUGH PLT	EGU	6
PA	RELIANT ENERGY NORTHEAST MGMT KEYSTONE POWER PLT	EGU	2
PA	RELIANT ENERGY PORTLAND GENERATING STATION	EGU	2
PA	SUNOCO CHEMICALS (FORMER ALLIED SIGNAL)	Chemical Process Plants	17
PA	SUNOCO INC (R&M) MARCUS HOOK REFINERY	Refinery	10
PA	SUNOCO INC (R&M)	Refinery	26
PA	TRIGEN - EDISON	EGU	4
PA	TRIGEN - SCHUYLKILL	EGU	1
PA	UNITED REFINING CO WARREN PLT	Refinery	10

PA	VICTAULIC CO AMER FORKS FACILITY	Secondary Metal Production	12
NY	3M TONAWANDA	Chemical Process Plants/Industrial Boilers	4
NY	ALCAN ALUMINUM CORPORATION	Primary and Secondary Aluminum Production	9
NY	ALCOA MASSENA OPERATIONS (WEST PLANT)	Primary and Secondary Aluminum Production	25
NY	ARTHUR KILL GENERATING STATION	EGU	2
NY	ASTORIA GENERATING STATION	EGU	2
NY	BOWLINE POINT GENERATING STATION	EGU	5
NY	BUFFALO COLOR CORP - LEE ST PLANT	Chemical Process Plants/Industrial Boilers	5
NY	CON ED-59TH ST STA	EGU	4
NY	DANSKAMMER GENERATING STATION	EGU	2
NY	EF BARRETT POWER STATION	EGU	44
NY	ERWIN MANUFACTURING COMPLEX	Glass Fiber Processing Plants	3
NY	GENERAL ELECTRIC SELKIRK PLASTICS PLT	Chemical Process Plants/Industrial Boilers	16
NY	GLENS FALLS LEHIGH CEMENT COMPANY	Portland Cement	46
NY	INTERFACE SOLUTIONS INC	Kraft Pulp Mill/Industrial Boilers	9
NY	INTERNATIONAL PAPER TICONDEROGA MILL	Kraft Pulp Mill/Industrial Boilers	11
NY	KODAK PARK DIVISION	Chemical Process Plants/Industrial Boilers	20
NY	LACKAWANNA PLANT- REPUBLIC ENG PROD INC	Primary Metal Production/Industrial Boilers	3
NY	LAFARGE BUILDING MATERIALS INC	Portland Cement	31
NY	LOVETT GENERATING STATION	EGU	4
NY	NORTHPORT POWER STATION	EGU	17
NY	OSWEGO HARBOR POWER	EGU	3
NY	OWENS-CORNING DELMAR PLANT	Glass Fiber Processing Plants	27
NY	RAVENSWOOD GENERATING STATION	EGU	60
NY	REVERE SMELTING & REFINING CORP	Primary Metal Production/Industrial Boilers	8
NY	RIVERBAY CORP-CO-OP CITY	Industrial Boilers	4

NY	RIVERHEAD TERMINAL-CONOCOPHILLIPS	Petroleum Storage/Industrial Boilers	7
NY	ROSETON GENERATING STATION	EGU	4
NY	SAMUEL A CARLSON GENERATING STATION	EGU	2
NY	SCHENECTADY INTERNATIONAL ROTT JCT FAC	Chemical Plant/Industrial Boilers	18
NY	ST LAWRENCE CEMENT CORP-CATSKILL QUARRY	Portland Cement	37
NY	WASHINGTON MILLS ELECTRO MINERALS	Glass Fiber Processing Plants	3



## Appendix B: Costs of Technologies

From NESCAUM, 2005.

### EGU Cost Effectiveness

<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>Control</i>	<i>Cost</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Cost Bin</i>
SO <sub>2</sub>	Wet/Dry Scrubbers (FGD)	200-500	Dollars per ton SO <sub>2</sub>	Low
NO <sub>x</sub>	Gas Reburn	500-2000	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Mid
NO <sub>x</sub>	Low-NO <sub>x</sub> Burners	200-500	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Low
NO <sub>x</sub>	Overfire Air	250-600	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Low
NO <sub>x</sub>	SCR	1000-1500	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Mid
NO <sub>x</sub>	SNCR	500-700	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Mid
PM	ESP	15-40	Dollars per Actual Cubic Feet per Minute	
PM	Fabric Filters	12-40	Dollars per Actual Cubic Feet per Minute	

### Industrial Boilers Cost Effectiveness

<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>Control</i>	<i>Cost</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Cost Bin</i>
NO <sub>x</sub>	Low NO <sub>x</sub> -Burners	200-3000	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Mid
NO <sub>x</sub>	SNCR	1300-10000	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Mid to High
NO <sub>x</sub>	SCR	4000-15000	dollars per MMBtu/hr	High
SO <sub>2</sub>	Wet/Dry Scrubbers	400-4000	Dollars per ton SO <sub>2</sub> (coal)	Mid
SO <sub>2</sub>	Wet/Dry Scrubbers	800-8000	Dollars per ton SO <sub>2</sub> (oil)	Mid to High
PM	ESP	15-40	Dollars per Actual Cubic Feet per Minute	
PM	Reverse Air Fabric Filter	15-40	Dollars per Actual Cubic Feet per Minute	
PM	Pule Jet Fabric Filter	17-40	Dollars per Actual Cubic Feet per Minute	
PM	Venturi Scrubber	12-40	Dollars per Actual Cubic Feet per Minute	
PM	Cyclone	1-5	Dollars per Actual Cubic Feet per Minute	

**Portland Cement Kilns****Cost Effectiveness**

<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>Control</i>	<i>Cost</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Cost Bin</i>
SO <sub>2</sub>	Spray Dryer	10.96-54.67	dollars/ton Clinker	
SO <sub>2</sub>	Wet Scrubber	10.83-47.00	dollars/ton Clinker	
NO <sub>x</sub>	Process Modifications	3100-8800	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Mid to High
NO <sub>x</sub>	Low NO <sub>x</sub> Burners w/Indirect Firing	5800-8100	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	High
NO <sub>x</sub>	Low NO <sub>x</sub> Burners w/Indirect Firing and Mid- Kiln Tire Injection	1-1800	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Low to Mid
NO <sub>x</sub>	Mid-Kiln Injection of Fuel	5100-11500	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Mid to High
NO <sub>x</sub>	CemStar	0-600	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Low
NO <sub>x</sub>	Low NO <sub>x</sub> Precalciner	2700-3600	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Mid
NO <sub>x</sub>	SNCR	900-1200	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Mid
NO <sub>x</sub>	Biosolids Injection	100-1800	Dollars per ton NO <sub>x</sub>	Low to Mid
PM	ESP	3.33-41.00	dollars/ton clinker	
PM	Baghouse	4.00-16.67	dollars/ton clinker	

**Paper and Pulp**

Cost Effectiveness Not Available

<i>Cost levels</i>	<i>SO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>NO<sub>x</sub></i>
Low	<800	<500
Mid	800-2000	500-10000
High	>2000	>10000

## Appendix C: BART Workgroup Draft Recommendations

### Draft BART Recommendations to MANE-VU Air Directors September 7, 2006

Under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) 1999 "regional haze rule" [64 Fed. Reg. 35714 (July 1, 1999)], certain emission sources that "may reasonably be anticipated to cause or contribute" to visibility impairment in downwind Class I areas are required to install Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART).<sup>4</sup> These requirements are intended to reduce emissions specifically from large sources that, due to age, were exempted from other control requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

BART requirements pertain to 26 specified major point source categories, including power plants, industrial boilers, paper and pulp plants, cement kilns and other large stationary sources. To be considered BART-eligible, sources from these specified categories must have the potential to emit at least 250 tons per year of any haze forming pollutant and must have commenced operation in the fifteen year period prior to August 7, 1977 (the date of passage of the 1977 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA), which first required new source performance standards).

MANE-VU formed the BART workgroup as part of an effort to assist states and tribes as they prepare to comply with the Best Available Retrofit Technology Requirements (BART) of the Regional Haze Rule. To date states have made substantial progress in identifying sources that are BART-eligible, however that is only the first step in the process. Once a source is identified as "BART eligible", an analysis must be conducted to determine what will constitute BART control levels. The Haze Rule requires states to determine the most stringent technologically feasible system of controls that can reasonably be installed at each facility eligible for BART. The BART workgroup has developed a list of draft recommendations for the BART control process that will be submitted to the MANE-VU Directors. Feedback on these recommendations will be useful to assist the Air Directors in their review. The recommendations include overall BART policies and specific "presumptive" levels and types of control. These recommendations will serve as a regional foundation for conducting BART engineering reviews on a state-by-state basis. The workgroup recommendations are presented below:

1. ***Any BART-eligible facility may "cap-out" of BART via a permit emission limit, however all permit modifications must be finalized prior to December 16, 2006\* in order to eliminate BART-eligibility.*** Caps must limit emissions from BART eligible units below 250 tons per year of any visibility impairing pollutant

---

<sup>4</sup> There are seven designated Class I areas in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic States. They include Acadia National Park and Moosehorn Wilderness Area in Maine; Roosevelt-Campobello International Park in New Brunswick and Maine; the Lye Brook Wilderness Area in Vermont; the Great Gulf and Presidential Range-Dry River Wilderness Areas in New Hampshire; and the Brigantine Wilderness Area in New Jersey.

- \* It is not clear from the final rule when a federally enforceable permit limitation would need to be in place in order to avoid BART-eligibility. We are recommending to EPA that they allow permit limits which go into place prior to December 16, 2006. This will enable states to take action to get permit limitations in place and achieve emission limits (though probably not reductions) prior to SIP submission avoiding the need for formal BART determinations. The 2006 date will give states one full year prior to the submission deadline for public notice and hearing processes on a final SIP package.
2. MANE-VU staff continues to support the policy decision made by the MANE-VU Board in June 2004, that ***if a source is eligible for BART, it is subject to BART.*** (i.e. no exemptions will be given).
  3. ***Regional performance standards or cost thresholds are appropriate*** for many individual categories of BART eligible sources. The attachment contains an initial round of recommended presumptive levels of control for EGUs, industrial boilers and cement kilns. The workgroup may develop additional presumptive levels in the future.
  4. ***Remaining useful life*** of a source will be considered in the following way: Facilities have the option to ***either control a BART-eligible facility prior to 2013 or accept federally enforceable permit limitation or retirement date prior to December 16, 2006.***
  5. ***Control technology in place*** (other than for source categories covered by the attached list of presumptive control levels) ***will likely have to be dealt with on a source by source basis.*** (i.e. no regional recommendation)
  6. ***Energy and non-air quality environmental impacts will likely have to be dealt with on a source by source basis.*** (i.e. no regional recommendation) however the workgroup is still considering regional recommendations for non-air quality environmental impacts.
  7. ***If data does not exist*** to accurately determine the installation date for emission unit(s) within a facility ***then the unit will be treated as though it IS within the BART date range unless the facility can provide proof otherwise (i.e., proof that the unit was in operation prior to 1962).*** Many states are having difficulty identifying installation dates for pre-1977 units. All states felt they could easily identify post-1977 units. Therefore, the workgroup supported a policy position that when the state could not accurately determine the "in existence" date, the burden of proof lay with the facility in proving that the unit was installed prior to 1962.

**MANE-VU BART Workgroup Recommendations**  
**DRAFT Presumptive Control Levels**  
**\*Updated September 7, 2006\***

**Non-CAIR EGUs:**

- SO<sub>2</sub> – Coal - 95% control or 0.15 lb/MMBtu\*  
Oil - 95% control or 0.33 lb/MMBtu (0.3% sulfur content)\*
- NO<sub>X</sub>
  - in NO<sub>X</sub> SIP call area, extend use of controls to year-round
  - 0.1 – 0.25 lb/MMBtu, depending on boiler and fuel type
- PM – 0.02 – 0.04 lb/MMBtu\*\*

**CAIR EGUs:**

- SO<sub>2</sub> – CAIR requirements
- NO<sub>X</sub> – CAIR requirements
- PM – 0.02- 0.04 lb/MMBtu\*\*

If an EGU is only enrolled in CAIR for one or two pollutants, it still must complete an analysis for the remaining visibility impairing pollutants such as particulate matter.

**Industrial Boilers**

- SO<sub>2</sub> – 90% control, MACT acid gas control level, ICI-RACT, or 0.55 lb/MMBtu (0.5% fuel sulfur limit)
- NO<sub>X</sub>
  - 0.1 – 0.4 lb/MMBtu, depending on boiler and fuel type\*\*\*
- PM – 0.02 - 0.07 lb/MMBtu

**Cement Kilns**

No common emission threshold has been identified. The following lists, however, recommend control technologies to evaluate.

- SO<sub>2</sub>
  - in process removal
  - wet or dry scrubbers
  - conversion from wet kiln to dry kiln
- NO<sub>X</sub>
  - Combustion optimization
  - Low NO<sub>X</sub> burners
  - Secondary combustion control (SNCR/SCR)
  - Mid-Kiln firing
  - Flame shape adjustment
- PM
  - baghouse
  - electrostatic precipitator
  - baghouse/ESP upgrades of existing controls

\*Consistent with EPA presumptive BART for EGUs and OTC Control Strategy

\*\* PM measures are based on front-half (Method 5) particulate matter measures

\*\*\* Consistent with OTC Control Strategies and NO<sub>X</sub> SIP call emission limits