

Worldwide Pollution Control Association

WPCA-Duke Energy

Is Your Precipitator Ready For MATS?

August 28, 2012 – Plainfield

September 11, 2012 – Charlotte

Reference Material

MATS Affirmative Defense for Exceedence of Emission Limit

All presentations posted on this website are copyrighted by the Worldwide Pollution Control Association (WPCA). Any unauthorized downloading, attempts to modify or to incorporate into other presentations, link to other websites, or to obtain copies for any other purposes than the training of attendees to WPCA Conferences is expressly prohibited, unless approved in writing by the WPCA or the original presenter. The WPCA does not assume any liability for the accuracy or contents of any materials contained in this library which were presented and/or created by persons who were not employees of the WPCA.



Visit our website at www.wpca.info



currently applicable to your unit(s), and the subcategory of this subpart that will be applicable after you commence or recommence operation that will cause the unit(s) to meet the definition of an EGU subject to this subpart;

(iii) The date on which you became subject to the currently applicable emission limits;

(iv) The date upon which you will commence or recommence operations that will cause your unit to meet the definition of an EGU subject to this subpart, consistent with paragraph (f) of this section.

(i)(1) If you own or operate an EGU subject to this subpart, and it has been at least 6 months since you operated in a manner that caused you to meet the definition of an EGU subject to this subpart, you may, consistent with paragraph (g) of this section, select the date on which your EGU will no longer be subject to this subpart. You must be in compliance with any newly applicable section 112 or 129 standards on the date you selected.

(2) You must provide 30 days prior notice of the date your EGU will cease complying with this subpart. The notification must identify:

(i) The name of the owner or operator of the EGU(s), the location of the facility, the EGU(s) that will cease complying with this subpart, and the date of the notice;

(ii) The currently applicable subcategory under this subpart, and any 40 CFR part 60, part 62, or part 63 subpart and subcategory that will be applicable after you cease complying with this subpart;

(iii) The date on which you became subject to this subpart;

(iv) The date upon which you will cease complying with this subpart, consistent with paragraph (g) of this section.

(j) All air pollution control equipment necessary for compliance with any newly applicable emissions limits which apply as a result of the cessation or commencement or recommencement of operations that cause your EGU to meet the definition of an EGU subject to this subpart must be installed and operational as of the date your source ceases to be or becomes subject to this subpart.

(k) All monitoring systems necessary for compliance with any newly applicable monitoring requirements which apply as a result of the cessation or commencement or recommencement of operations that cause your EGU to meet the definition of an EGU subject to this subpart must be installed and operational as of the date your source ceases to be or becomes subject to this

subpart. All calibration and drift checks must be performed as of the date your source ceases to be or becomes subject to this subpart. You must also comply with provisions of §§ 63.10010, 63.10020, and 63.10021 of this subpart. Relative accuracy tests must be performed as of the performance test deadline for PM CEMS, if applicable. Relative accuracy testing for other CEMS need not be repeated if that testing was previously performed consistent with CAA section 112 monitoring requirements or monitoring requirements under this subpart.

§ 63.10001 Affirmative defense for exceedance of emission limit during malfunction.

In response to an action to enforce the standards set forth in § 63.9991 you may assert an affirmative defense to a claim for civil penalties for exceedances of such standards that are caused by malfunction, as defined at 40 CFR 63.2. Appropriate penalties may be assessed, however, if you fail to meet your burden of proving all of the requirements in the affirmative defense. The affirmative defense shall not be available for claims for injunctive relief.

(a) To establish the affirmative defense in any action to enforce such a limit, you must timely meet the notification requirements in paragraph (b) of this section, and must prove by a preponderance of evidence that:

(1) The excess emissions:

(i) Were caused by a sudden, infrequent, and unavoidable failure of air pollution control and monitoring equipment, process equipment, or a process to operate in a normal or usual manner, and

(ii) Could not have been prevented through careful planning, proper design or better operation and maintenance practices; and

(iii) Did not stem from any activity or event that could have been foreseen and avoided, or planned for; and

(iv) Were not part of a recurring pattern indicative of inadequate design, operation, or maintenance; and

(2) Repairs were made as expeditiously as possible when the applicable emission limitations were being exceeded. Off-shift and overtime labor were used, to the extent practicable to make these repairs; and

(3) The frequency, amount and duration of the excess emissions (including any bypass) were minimized to the maximum extent practicable during periods of such emissions; and

(4) If the excess emissions 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

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

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

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

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

(9) 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 excess emissions resulting from the malfunction event at issue. The analysis shall also specify, using best monitoring methods and engineering judgment, the amount of excess emissions that were the result of the malfunction.

(b) *Notification.* The owner or operator of the affected source experiencing an exceedance of its emission limit(s) during a malfunction shall notify the Administrator by telephone or facsimile (FAX) transmission as soon as possible, but no later than two business days after the initial occurrence of the malfunction or, if it is not possible to determine within two business days whether the malfunction caused or contributed to an exceedance, no later than two business days after the owner or operator knew or should have known that the malfunction caused or contributed to an exceedance, but, in no event later than two business days after the end of the averaging period, if it wishes to avail itself of an affirmative defense to civil penalties for that malfunction. The owner or operator seeking to assert an affirmative defense shall also submit a written report to the Administrator within 45 days of the initial occurrence of the exceedance of the standard in § 63.9991 to demonstrate, with all necessary supporting documentation, that it has met the requirements set forth in paragraph (a) of this section. The owner or operator may seek an extension of this deadline for up to 30 additional days by submitting a written request to the Administrator before the expiration of the 45 day period. Until a request for an extension has been approved by the Administrator, the owner or operator is subject to the requirement to submit such report