

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 6
1445 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 1200
DALLAS, TX 75202-2733

DEC 12 2012

Mr. Harry Engelhardt, Jr.
Site Leader
Rohn and Haas Texas Incorporated
1900 Tidal Road
Deer Park, TX 77536

RE: Application Completeness Determination for Rohm and Haas Texas Incorporated
Greenhouse Gas Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit
Deer Park Chemical Manufacturing Plant

Dear Mr. Engelhardt:

The EPA has reviewed your Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit application for Rohn and Haas Texas, Incorporated - Deer Park that was received by the EPA on October 26, 2012, including supporting documentation, and determined that your application is incomplete at this time. A list of the information needed from you so that the EPA can continue its completeness review is enclosed (see Enclosure). Please notify us if a complete response is not possible by January 4, 2013.

The requested information is necessary for EPA to develop a Statement of Basis and Rationale for the terms and conditions for any proposed permit. As we develop our preliminary determination, it may be necessary for EPA to request additional clarifying or supporting information. If the supporting information substantially changes the original scope of the permit application, an amendment or new application may be required.

The EPA may not issue a final permit without determining that: 1) there will be no effects on threatened or endangered species or their designated critical habitat, or 2) until it has completed consultation under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (16 USC § 1536). In addition, the EPA must undergo consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (16 USC § 470f). As a reminder, NHPA implementing regulations require that EPA provide information to the public with an opportunity for participation in the Section 106 process. 36 CFR § 800.2(d). In your response to EPA, please indicate a date when we can expect a draft biological assessment and cultural resources report to assist us in making a determination on the impact of your project under the Endangered Species Act and the National Historic Preservation Act.



If you have any questions concerning the review of your application, please contact Aimee Wilson of my staff at (214) 665-7596.

Sincerely yours,

Carl E. Edlund, P.E.
Director
Multimedia Planning and
Permitting Division

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

[Faint, mostly illegible text from the body of the letter, appearing as bleed-through or very light print.]

ENCLOSURE
EPA Completeness Comments
Rohm and Haas Texas, Incorporated
Application for Greenhouse Gas Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit
Chemical Manufacturing Facility, Deer Park

1. The application provides a five-step BACT analysis for the boilers. CCS is evaluated as a control technology, but is eliminated in Step-2 as technically infeasible. A general cost analysis is provided in Step 2. Please supplement the cost analysis with details indicating the equipment needed to implement CCS (if the CO₂ stream needs to be treated further before it can be sent to pipeline), the costs of any pretreatment of the CO₂ stream, and the size and length of the pipeline needed for transport. Provide site specific costs versus a range of approximate costs. Also, we are requesting a comparison of the cost of CCS to the current project's annualized cost. Also provide analysis of any associated energy penalty or environmental effects that may result from the implementation of CCS.

2. The application indicates that emissions from piping fugitives are generated primarily from natural gas and absorber off-gas lines, and states in Step 2 of the BACT analysis that the use of leak detection and repair programs (LDAR) is technically feasible. The applicant then eliminates LDAR in Step 4 of the BACT analysis based on "the economic practicability of such programs cannot be verified" (pg. 24). 28 LAER states connectors should be checked for fugitive emissions weekly using auditory, visual, and olfactory (AVO) methods, and at least quarterly using an approved gas analyzer with a directed maintenance program. Did the BACT analysis consider 28 LAER as the highest control? The application states on page 1 that the proposed project "represents a major modification to an existing major source with respect to Nonattainment New Source Review (NNSR) for the ozone precursors nitrogen oxide (NO_x) and volatile organic compounds (VOC)." It is assumed that TCEQ would require the use of the 28 LAER LDAR program for control of VOC fugitive emissions at the facility. Could the LDAR implemented to control VOC fugitive emissions not also be used to control fugitive greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (methane) from the same components? If LDAR is already being used to control VOC emissions is it economically feasible to implement LDAR for the natural gas and absorber off-gas lines that are primarily responsible for GHGs from piping fugitives? Please provide supporting documentation that led to the conclusion that the implementation of LDAR is not economically practicable for GHGs.