

American Forest & Paper Association



# Boiler MACT Remand: Maximum Operating Load

CIBO end of year meeting Timothy Hunt AF&PA December 14, 2022

## **Background/Overview**

Rule published October 6, 2022

Supported use of CO as surrogate and 130 ppm as threshold

• Earth Justice, et. Al. filed petition in court AND reconsideration with EPA on 12/5 Many limits lowered – some added costs but overall reasonable New source applicability date remained 8/2010 (not 2020)

• US Sugar petition for review

AF&PA, AWC and CIBO filed DC Circuit Court petition 12/5 on Maximum Operating Load

- Protective action
- Met with OAQPS Nov 8 and Dec 8 "understand" concerns
- Became effective 12/5/2022 assume apply prospectively to upcoming tests
- Unwilling to drop language "added for a reason"
- OAQPS drafting Q&A to provide guidance to companies share with industry



#### <u>Issue</u>

- Footnote b to Table 7 added: "For maximum operating load, if you conduct multiple performance tests, you must set the maximum operating load at the lower of the maximum values established during the performance tests"
- Viewed as "technical correction" and effective December 5<sup>th</sup>
- Operating load limit could be very challenging for some multi-fuel fired boilers
  - Industry Coalition comment opposed the change
  - EPA kept added sentence to footnote
  - Unclear if truly understand the significance for testing and mill operations based on Response to Comment document – add continuous monitoring



## Max Fuel Pollutant Input vs. Operating Load

- Some solid fuel boilers cannot burn solid fuel at max operating load, gas or oil is needed to reach max load
- The requirements for multifuel boilers complying using stack testing require that the fuel mixture with the highest HCl and Hg input on a lb/MMBtu input basis (NOT lb/hr) be burned during the stack test and then monitored on a monthly basis.
- Highest fuel pollutant input loading (e.g., **HCl or Hg**) is wood only for wood/oil/gas and coal only for coal/gas or coal/wood.
- Highest operating load is the combination of fuels during **PM** and **CO** testing.
- The new language in the footnote could inappropriately restrict boiler operation and could restrict production if a backup boiler is not available or in some cases cause fuel switching increasing fossil fuels and thus GHGs.



### **Example:** coal and gas combination boiler

- Limited to 249 MMBtu/hr on coal and 500 MMBtu/hr total on coal and gas (i.e., can fire 249 MMBtu/hr coal and 251 MMBtu/hr gas or no coal and 500 MMBtu/hr gas).
- Highest fuel pollutant input loading is coal only (max 249 MMBtu/hr heat input)
- Highest operating load is coal and gas at 500 MMBtu/hr heat input

#### Concerns:

- 1. Conflict between the requirement to run the Hg/HCl testing at the highest lb/MMBtu input and the requirement to set the load operating parameter at the lowest load achieved across all stack tests.
- 2. Operating at high load conditions during all stack test runs will restrict the available fuel mix to a low coal/high gas firing scenario.
- 3. While the boiler can run at full load on gas, the facility needs to maintain fuel flexibility to be able to burn coal if gas is restricted or expensive.
- 4. Likewise, the facility would be restricted if set its load operating parameter limit based on the lowest load during the Hg/HCl testing.
- 5. The facility cannot comply using fuel analysis because the coal content is too high.



### **Example: Bark-gas combination boiler**

- Steam capacity 600 kpph (400 kpph on wood only, 600 kpph on wood + natural gas)
- Hg and HCl are fuel-based pollutants the more Hg and Cl are in the solid fuel, the higher the emissions.
- PM and CO are design-based standards the emissions of these pollutants depends on the design of the boiler.
- The rule requires facilities performing stack testing to track control device parameters and load.
- Highest fuel pollutant input loading is bark only (max 400 kpph steam)
- Highest load is bark and gas at 600 kpph steam



# **Operating Load solutions**

- Allow for load operating parameter limit to be set using PM/CO testing, not Hg/HCl testing where load conflicts with need to run at highest lb./MMBtu input.
- 2. Allow a mill do a 4<sup>th</sup> run at max/high <u>load</u> to set operating load but demonstrate compliance with HCl and Hg using just the first three runs.
- 3. Allow a mill to subtract out heat input load from non-contributing fuel (oil or gas) when developing limits for HCl or mercury in other fuels (biomass, TDF, etc). Allowed for one mill through Alternative Monitoring Plan approval.
- 4. Allow a mill to run the Hg and HCl test at the highest lb/hr fuel pollutant input (instead of lb/MMBtu) as "representative" to achieve higher load.
- Allow to set max operating load from two different tests at different times for different HAPs



#### <u>Impacts</u>

- Mill might need to revise their compliance/IT systems time and cost
- May need to adjust upcoming compliance tests
- Consider alternative approaches for multi-fueled boilers
- Avoid changes to how a mill operates do not restrict choice of fuels or curtail production



#### Next steps

- OAQPS developing Q&A next several weeks or couple of months
- Offer suggestions for both the question and answers

# Litigation broadly:

- Stay of petition on operating permit while Q&A developed
- Intervene in support of CO determinations before 1/4/23
- Amicus on new source applicability date (move to 2020) with US Sugar

