Environmental Protection Agency

§ 63.1155

(1) Approval of alternatives to the nonopacity emissions standards in §63.1103(a)(3), (b)(3) through (5), (c)(3), (d)(3), (e)(3), (f)(3), (g)(3) and (4), and (h)(3) under §63.8(g). Follow the requirements in §63.1113 to request permission to use an alternative means of emission limitation. Where these standards reference another subpart, the cited provisions will be delegated according to the delegation provisions of the referenced subpart.

(2) [Reserved]

(3) Approval of major changes to test methods under §63.7(e)(2)(ii) and (f) and as defined in §63.90.

(4) Approval of major changes to monitoring under §63.8(f) and as defined in §63.90.

(5) Approval of major changes to recordkeeping and reporting under §63.10(f) and as defined in §63.90.

[67 FR 46289, July 12, 2002]

Subparts ZZ–BBB [Reserved]

Subpart CCC—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Steel Pickling—HCl Process Facilities and Hydrochloric Acid Regeneration Plants

Source: 64 FR 33218, June 22, 1999, unless otherwise noted.

§ 63.1155 Applicability.

(a) The provisions of this subpart apply to the following facilities and plants that are major sources for hazardous air pollutants (HAP) or are parts of facilities that are major sources for HAP:

(1) All new and existing steel pickling facilities that pickle carbon steel using hydrochloric acid solution that contains 6 percent or more by weight HCl and is at a temperature of 100 °F or higher; and

(2) All new and existing hydrochloric acid regeneration plants.

(b) For the purposes of implementing this subpart, the affected sources at a facility or plant subject to this subpart are as follows: Continuous and batch pickling lines, hydrochloric acid regeneration plants, and hydrochloric acid storage vessels.

(c) Table 1 to this subpart specifies the provisions of this part 63, subpart A that apply and those that do not apply to owners and operators of steel pickling facilities and hydrochloric acid regeneration plants subject to this subpart.

(d) In response to an action to enforce the standards set forth in this subpart, the owner or operator may assert an affirmative defense to a claim for civil penalties for violations of such standards that are caused by a malfunction, as defined in §63.2. Appropriate penalties may be assessed, however, if the owner or operator fails to meet the burden of proving all the requirements in the affirmative defense. The affirmative defense shall not be available for claims for injunctive relief.

(1) To establish the affirmative defense in any action to enforce such a standard, the owner or operator must timely meet the reporting requirements of paragraph (d)(2) of this section, and must prove by a preponderance of evidence that:

(i) The violation was caused by a sudden, infrequent, and unavoidable failure of air pollution control equipment, process equipment, or a process to operate in a normal and usual manner; and could not have been prevented through careful planning, proper design, or better operation and maintenance practices; and did not stem from any activity or event that could have been foreseen and avoided, or planned for; and was not part of a recurring pattern indicative of inadequate design, operation, or maintenance; and

(ii) Repairs were made as expeditiously as possible when exceeded violation occurred. Off-shift and overtime labor were used, to the extent practicable to make these repairs; and

(iii) The frequency, amount, and duration of the violation (including any bypass) were minimized to the maximum extent practicable; and
(iv) If the violation resulted from a bypass of control equipment or a process, then the bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage; and

(v) All possible steps were taken to minimize the impact of the violation on ambient air quality, the environment, and human health; and

(vi) All emissions monitoring and control systems were kept in operation if at all possible, consistent with safety and good air pollution control practices; and

(vii) All of the actions in response to the violation were documented by properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs; and

(viii) At all times, the affected source was operated in a manner consistent with good practices for minimizing emissions; and

(ix) A written root cause analysis has been prepared, the purpose of which is to determine, correct, and eliminate the primary causes of the malfunction and the violation resulting from the malfunction event at issue. The analysis shall also specify, using the best monitoring methods and engineering judgment, the amount of excess emissions that were the result of the malfunction.

(2) Report. The owner of operator seeking to assert an affirmative defense shall submit a written report to the Administrator with all necessary supporting documentation, that it has met the requirements set forth in paragraph (d)(1) of this section. This affirmative defense report shall be included in the first periodic compliance, deviation report or excess emission report otherwise required after the initial occurrence of the violation of the relevant standard (which may be the end of any applicable averaging period). If such compliance, deviation report or excess emission report is due less than 45 days after the initial occurrence of the violation, the affirmation defense report may be included in the second compliance, deviation report or excess emission report due after the initial occurrence of the violation of the relevant standard.