



GROUP AGAINST SMOG & POLLUTION

1133 South Braddock Avenue, Suite 1A

Pittsburgh, PA 15218

412-924-0604

gasp-pgh.org

November 19, 2018

VIA e-Mail (jparihar@pa.gov)

Jesse S. Parihar, Air Quality Engineering Specialist

Department of Environmental Protection

Southwest Regional Office

400 Waterfront Drive

Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Re: Proposed Title V Operating Permit No. 65-00028
Lehigh Specialty Melting, Inc./Latrobe Facility
Latrobe Borough, Westmoreland County

Dear Mr. Parihar:

The Group Against Smog and Pollution (“GASP”) offers the following comments regarding proposed Title V Operating Permit No. 65-00028 (the “Permit”) for Lehigh Specialty Melting, Inc.’s Latrobe Facility (the “Facility”), located in Latrobe Borough, Westmoreland County. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (the “Department”) published notice of the Permit in the October 20, 2018 Pennsylvania Bulletin. According to that notice, the Department will accept comments on the Permit for thirty days after the date of publication of that notice, or through November 19, 2018.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you have any questions regarding them, please email (john@gasp-pgh.org) or call (412-924-0604 x 202) me.

Very truly yours,

/s

John K. Baillie
Senior Attorney

**COMMENTS OF THE GROUP AGAINST SMOG AND POLLUTION
REGARDING THE DRAFT TITLE V OPERATING PERMIT FOR
LEHIGH SPECIALTY MELTING, INC.'S LATROBE FACILITY
(PERMIT NUMBER 65-00028)**

I. THE PERMIT SHOULD INCLUDE LIMITS ON EMISSIONS OF NO_x, PM-10, AND METALLIC HAPs FROM THE FACILITY'S ELECTRIC ARC FURNACE

Section D.101 #006 of the Permit requires that the Facility perform a stack test on the electric arc furnace “to establish compliance with the NO_x, ... nm VOC, PM-10, and HAPs emission limits specified in this Permit.” However, although the Department’s review memo for the Permit includes estimates of emissions of particulate matter (“PM-10”),¹ oxides of nitrogen (“NO_x”),² and certain metallic hazardous air pollutants (“HAPs”) (specifically, cadmium, chromium, lead, manganese, and nickel)³ from the electric arc furnace, the Permit does not establish limits on such emissions. Further, the Department’s Review Memo does not estimate emissions of non-methane volatile organic compounds (“VOCs”) from the electric arc furnace, and the Permit does not establish limits on such emissions.

A Title V Operating Permit must include “those operational requirements and limitations that assure compliance with all applicable requirements at the time of permit issuance.”⁴ For the Facility to be able to comply with section D.101 #006’s testing requirement related to emissions of PM-10, NO_x, non-methane VOCs, and metallic HAPs from the electric arc furnace, the Permit must include limits on such emissions. Accordingly, the Permit must be revised to include limits on emissions of PM-10, NO_x, non-methane VOCs, and metallic HAPs from the Facility’s electric arc furnace. Further, because a stack test that is performed only once every five years is

¹ See Review Memo at 7-8 (estimates based on the results of a June 20, 2008 stack test)

² See *id.*

³ See *id.*, at 8-9.

⁴ 40 C.F.R. § 70.6(a)(1).

not sufficient to assure compliance with an emission limitation,⁵ the Permit must also include such testing, monitoring, and recordkeeping requirements as are necessary to assure the Facility's compliance with the emission limits on PM-10, NOx, non-methane VOCs, and metallic HAPs.

II. THE PERMIT'S TESTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ELECTRIC ARC FURNACE ARE NOT SUFFICIENT TO ASSURE COMPLIANCE WITH EMISSION LIMITS

A Title V Operating Permit must require "testing ... sufficient to assure compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit."⁶ A test that is performed once every five years may be sufficient to assure compliance with terms and conditions of a Title V Operating Permit that apply continuously if the Permit requires that the test be used to establish operating parameters relating to the emissions of each pollutant, and also requires that those parameters be monitored on a basis sufficient to assure compliance.⁷ However, in the absence of such monitoring, testing that is conducted only once every five years may not by itself be sufficient to assure compliance with the Permit's continuous emission limits.⁸

A. A Stack Test That is Conducted Only Once Every Five Years is Not Sufficient to Assure Compliance with a Permit Limit on the Concentration of Sulfur Dioxide in the Electric Arc Furnace's Effluent Gas that Applies Continuously

The Permit imposes a limit on the concentration of oxides of sulfur ("SOx") (expressed as sulfur dioxide ("SO2")) in the effluent gas emitted by Facility's electric arc furnace; that limit

⁵ See *In the Matter of Luke Paper Co.*, 2010 EPA CAA Title V LEXIS 7, *14-15 (Oct. 18, 2010).

⁶ 40 C.F.R. § 70.6(c)(1).

⁷ See *In the Matter of Kentucky Syngas, LLC*, 2012 EPA CAA Title V LEXIS 4, *165 (June 22, 2012).

⁸ *Luke Paper Co.*, 2010 EPA CAA Title V LEXIS 7, *14-15.

applies continuously.⁹ The Permit does not require that the concentration of SO₂ in the electric arc furnace's effluent gas be monitored continuously, or even at all. Nor does the Permit require monitoring of other parameters or recordkeeping relating to the concentration of SO₂ in the electric arc furnace's effluent gas that might be used to demonstrate compliance with the Permit limit. Rather, the Permit only requires that the Facility perform a stack test "to establish compliance with the ... SO_x ... emission limitations specified in the permit" at least once every five years.¹⁰

In the absence of monitoring or recordkeeping requirements that can be used to demonstrate the Facility's compliance with the Permit's continuous limits on the concentration of SO₂ in the electric arc furnace's effluent gas, a stack test that is conducted once every five years is not sufficient to assure compliance with that limit.¹¹ Accordingly, the Permit must be revised to require that emissions from the electric arc furnace be tested on a basis sufficient to assure compliance with its continuous limits on the concentration of SO₂ in the electric arc furnace's effluent gas, or alternatively, to require testing to establish operating parameters relating to the emissions of SO₂ and monitoring of those parameters that is sufficient to assure compliance with that emission limit.

⁹ See §§ D.101 #001 (establishing a 500 ppmv limit on the concentration of sulfur oxides, expressed as SO₂, limit).

¹⁰ § D.101 # 006.

¹¹ Cf. *Luke Paper Co.*, at *14-15 (determining that biannual stack tests were not sufficient to assure compliance with hourly emission limits in the absence of any monitoring requirement).

B. A Stack Test That is Conducted Only Once Every Five Years is Not Sufficient to Assure Compliance with a Permit Limit on Carbon Monoxide Emissions That Applies Continuously

The Permit imposes a limit on carbon monoxide (“CO”) emissions from the Facility’s electric arc furnace of 5.76 lbs/ton of steel production; that limit applies continuously.¹² The Permit does not require that CO emissions from the electric arc furnace be monitored. Nor does the Permit require monitoring of other parameters or recordkeeping relating to CO emissions from the electric arc furnace that might be used to demonstrate compliance with the Permit limit. Rather, the Permit only requires that the Facility perform a stack test “to establish compliance with the ... CO ... emission limitations specified in the permit” at least once every five years.¹³

As is the case with the Permit’s limit on the concentration of SO₂ in the electric arc furnace’s effluent gas, a stack test that is conducted once every five years is not sufficient to assure compliance with the Permit’s limit on CO emissions from the electric arc furnace.¹⁴ Accordingly, the Permit must be revised to require that emissions from the electric arc furnace be tested on a basis sufficient to assure compliance with the Permit’s limit on CO emissions from the electric arc furnace, or alternatively, to require testing to establish operating parameters relating to such emissions and monitoring of those parameters that is sufficient to assure compliance with that emission limit.

¹² See §§ D.101 #002.

¹³ § D.101 # 006.

¹⁴ Cf. *Luke Paper Co.*, at *14-15 (determining that biannual stack tests were not sufficient to assure compliance with hourly emission limits in the absence of any monitoring requirement).

III. THE PERMIT MUST INCLUDE ALL COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS THAT APPLY TO THE FACILITY'S ELECTRIC ARC FURNACE

PM-10 emissions from the Facility's electric arc furnace are subject to the Compliance Assurance Monitoring ("CAM") requirements of 40 C.F.R. Part 64. Although the Department's Review Memo describes the CAM plan for the electric arc furnace, the specifics of that plan are not fully incorporated into the Permit. For example, the Department's Review Memo indicates that the Facility must continuously measure pressure drop across the compartments of the baghouse that filters exhaust from the electric arc furnace,¹⁵ but the Permit does not include such a requirement.¹⁶

As noted above, a Title V Operating Permit must include "those operational requirements and limitations that assure compliance with all applicable requirements at the time of permit issuance."¹⁷ Not all CAM requirements to which the Facility is subject are incorporated into the Permit. Accordingly, the Permit must be revised to incorporate such requirements.

¹⁵ See Review Memo, at 4.

¹⁶ See § D.101 # 014.

¹⁷ 40 C.F.R. § 70.6(a)(1).