

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

AIR QUALITY DIVISION

PART 9. EMISSION LIMITATIONS AND PROHIBITIONS—MISCELLANEOUS

R 336.1906 Diluting and concealing emissions.

Rule 906. Unless prior written approval is obtained from the department, a person shall not build, erect, install, or use any article, machine, equipment, or other contrivance if the sole purpose of the article, machine, equipment, or other contrivance is to dilute or conceal an emission without resulting in a reduction in the total release of air contaminants into the atmosphere. This rule does not apply to the control of odors.

History: 1979 ACS 1, Eff. Jan. 19, 1980; 2002 MR 5, Eff. Mar. 19, 2002.

R 336.1910 Air-cleaning devices.

Rule 910. An air-cleaning device shall be installed, maintained, and operated in a satisfactory manner and in accordance with these rules and existing law.

History: 1979 ACS 1, Eff. Jan. 19, 1980.

R 336.1911 Malfunction abatement plans.

Rule 911. (1) Upon request of the department, a person responsible for the operation of a source of an air contaminant shall prepare a malfunction abatement plan to prevent, detect, and correct malfunctions or equipment failures resulting in emissions exceeding any applicable emission limitation.

(2) A malfunction abatement plan required by subrule (1) of this rule shall be in writing and shall, at a minimum, specify all of the following:

(a) A complete preventative maintenance program, including identification of the supervisory personnel responsible for overseeing the inspection, maintenance, and repair of air-cleaning devices, a description of the items or conditions that shall be inspected, the frequency of the inspections or repairs, and an identification of the major replacement parts that shall be maintained in inventory for quick replacement.

(b) An identification of the source and air-cleaning device operating variables that shall be monitored to detect a malfunction or failure, the normal operating range of these variables, and a description of the method of monitoring or surveillance procedures.

(c) A description of the corrective procedures or operational changes that shall be taken in the event of a malfunction or failure to achieve compliance with the applicable emission limits.

(3) A malfunction abatement plan required by subrule (1) of this rule shall be submitted to the department and shall be subject to review and approval by the department. If, in the opinion of the commission, the plan does not adequately carry out the objectives as set forth in subrules (1) and (2) of this rule, then the department may disapprove the plan, state its reasons for disapproval, and order the preparation of an amended plan within the time period specified in the

order. If, within the time period specified in the order, an amended plan is submitted which, in the opinion of the department, fails to meet the objective, then the department, on its own initiative, may amend the plan to cause it to meet the objective.

(4) Within 180 days after the department approves a malfunction abatement plan, a person responsible for the preparation of a malfunction abatement plan shall implement the malfunction abatement plan required by subrule (1) of this rule.

History: 1979 ACS 1, Eff. Jan. 19, 1980; 2002 MR 5, Eff. Mar. 19, 2002.

R 336.1912 Abnormal conditions, start-up, shutdown, and malfunction of a source, process, or process equipment, operating, notification, and reporting requirements.

Rule 912. (1) The owner or operator of a source, process, or process equipment shall, to the extent reasonably possible, operate a source, process, or process equipment in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions during periods of abnormal conditions, start-up, shutdown, and malfunctions. A source, process, or process equipment that complies with all applicable emission standards and limitations during periods of abnormal conditions, start-up, shutdown, and malfunction shall be presumed to have been operated in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions.

(2) The owner or operator of a source, process, or process equipment shall provide notice of an abnormal condition, start-up, shutdown, or a malfunction that results in emissions of a hazardous air pollutant which continue for more than 1 hour in excess of any applicable standard or limitation established by the clean air act or the emissions of a toxic air contaminant which continue for more than 1 hour in excess of an emission standard established by a rule promulgated under the air pollution act or an emission limitation specified in a permit issued or order entered under the air pollution act.

(3) The owner or operator of a source, process, or process equipment shall provide notice and a written report of an abnormal condition, start-up, shutdown, or a malfunction that results in emissions of any air contaminant continuing for more than 2 hours in excess of a standard or limitation established by any applicable requirement.

(4) The notices required by this rule shall be provided to the department as soon as reasonably possible, but not later than 2 business days after the start-up or shutdown or after discovery of the abnormal conditions or malfunction. Notice shall be by any reasonable means, including electronic, telephonic, or oral communication.

(5) The written reports required under this rule shall be submitted within 10 days after the start-up or shutdown occurred, within 10 days after the abnormal conditions or malfunction has been corrected, or within 30 days of discovery of the abnormal conditions or malfunction, whichever is first. The written reports shall include all of the following information:

(a) The time and date, the probable causes or reasons for, and the duration of the abnormal conditions, start-up, shutdown, or malfunction.

(b) An identification of the source, process, or process equipment which experienced abnormal conditions, was started up or shut down, or which malfunctioned and all other affected process or process equipment that have emissions in excess of an applicable requirement, including a description of the type and, where known or where it is reasonably possible to estimate, the quantity or magnitude of emissions in excess of applicable requirements.

(c) Information describing the measures taken and air pollution control practices followed to minimize emissions.

(d) For abnormal conditions and malfunctions, the report shall also include a summary of the actions taken to correct and to prevent a reoccurrence of the abnormal conditions or malfunction and the time taken to correct the malfunction.

(6) Actions taken to correct and to prevent a reoccurrence of an abnormal condition or a malfunction shall become a part of any preventative maintenance and malfunction abatement plan required by R 336.1911.

(7) The truth, accuracy, and completeness of the written reports required under this rule for a stationary source subject to the requirements of R 336.1210 shall be certified by a responsible official in a manner consistent with the clean air act.

History: 1979 ACS 1, Eff. Jan. 19, 1980; 1995 MR 7, Eff. July 26, 1995. Corrected 2007 MR 9, June 1, 2007.

R 336.1915 Enforcement discretion in instances of excess emissions resulting from malfunction, start-up, or shutdown.

Rule 915. (1) In determining whether the department will pursue enforcement against a person, the department shall consider evidence that the emission violations resulted from a malfunction, start-up, or shutdown.

(2) If the department determines that the emission violations resulted from a malfunction, start-up, or shutdown, then the department may use enforcement discretion when resolving the emission violations based upon subrules (3) and (4) of this rule, as applicable.

(3) A person may submit evidence to the department for its consideration in determining that the emission violations resulted from a malfunction. The evidence shall demonstrate all of the following, as applicable:

(a) The excess emissions were a result of a sudden and unavoidable breakdown of process or control equipment, beyond the reasonable control of the person.

(b) The air pollution control equipment, process equipment, and processes were maintained and operated in a manner consistent with good practice for minimizing emissions, to the maximum extent practicable.

(c) The excess emissions caused by a bypass (an intentional diversion of control equipment) were unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage.

(d) Repairs were made in an expeditious fashion when the person knew or should have known that applicable emission limitations were being exceeded. To the extent practicable, off-shift labor and overtime shall have been utilized to ensure that the repairs were made expeditiously.

(e) The amount and duration of excess emissions, including any bypass, were minimized to the maximum extent practicable during periods of the emissions.

(f) All reasonably possible steps were taken to minimize the impact of the excess emissions on ambient air quality.

(g) The excess emissions resulting from the malfunction were not part of a recurring pattern indicative of inadequate design, operation, or maintenance.

(h) The malfunction was an infrequent event and was not reasonably preventable.

(i) All emission monitoring systems were kept in operation if at all possible.

(j) The person responsible for operating the source of air contaminants has a malfunction abatement plan, consistent with the requirements set forth in R 336.1911(2) and with both of the following provisions:

(i) Any malfunction abatement plan developed in accordance with R 336.1911(2) shall be maintained onsite and available for inspection, upon request, by the department for the life of the emission unit or units. The department may require that the person responsible for the malfunction abatement plan make revisions to the plan. The person shall revise the malfunction abatement plan within 45 days after a request by the department. The revised malfunction abatement plan shall be developed in accordance with R 336.1911(2).

(ii) If the malfunction abatement plan fails to address or inadequately addresses an event that meets the characteristics of a malfunction at the time the plan is initially developed, then the person shall revise the malfunction abatement plan within 45 days after the event occurs. The revised malfunction abatement plan shall be developed in accordance with R 336.1911(2).

(k) The excess emissions presenting an imminent threat to human health, safety, or the environment were reported to the department as soon as possible. Unless otherwise specified in the facility's permit, other excess emissions were reported as provided in R 336.1912. If requested by the department, a person shall submit a full written report that includes the known causes, the corrective actions taken, and the preventive measures to be taken to minimize or eliminate the chance of recurrence.

(l) The actions during the period of excess emissions were documented by contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence as provided by R 336.1912.

(m) Any information submitted to the department under this subrule shall be properly certified in accordance with the provisions of R 336.1912.

(4) A person may submit evidence to the department for its consideration in determining that the emission violations resulted from a start-up or shutdown. The evidence shall be based upon subrules (3)(b), (c), (e), (f), (i), (k), (l), and (m) of this rule; subdivisions (a), (b), (c) of this subrule; and R 336.1912, as applicable.

(a) The periods of excess emissions that occurred during start-up or shutdown were short and infrequent and could not have been prevented through careful planning and design.

(b) The excess emissions that occurred during start-up or shutdown were not part of a recurring pattern indicative of inadequate design, operation, or maintenance.

(c) The person responsible for operating the source of air contaminants has a preventative maintenance plan, consistent with the requirements set forth in R 336.1911(2)(a).

(5) For an emission unit or units subject to standards and limitations promulgated pursuant to section 111 or 112 of the clean air act, the start-up, shutdown, or malfunction provisions of the applicable requirements within section 111 or 112 shall apply.

(6) Nothing in this rule shall be construed to limit the authority of the department to seek injunctive relief or to enforce the provisions of the act and the regulations promulgated under the act.

History: 2002 MR 10, Eff. May 28, 2002.

R 336.1916 Affirmative defense for excess emissions during start-up or shutdown.

Rule 916. (1) The person operating a source with emissions in excess of an applicable emission limitation due to start-up or shutdown may claim an affirmative defense to an

enforcement proceeding, excluding a judicial action seeking injunctive relief, if the person has complied with the reporting requirements of R 336.1912 and has demonstrated all of the following:

(a) The periods of excess emissions that occurred during start-up or shutdown were short and infrequent and could not have been prevented through careful planning and design.

(b) The excess emissions that occurred during start-up or shutdown were not part of a recurring pattern indicative of inadequate design, operation, or maintenance.

(c) The excess emissions caused by a bypass (an intentional diversion of control equipment) were unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage.

(d) The facility was operated at all times in a manner consistent with good practice for minimizing emissions.

(e) The frequency and duration of operating in start-up or shutdown mode were minimized to the maximum extent practicable.

(f) All reasonably possible steps were taken to minimize the impact of the excess emissions on ambient air quality.

(g) All emission monitoring systems were kept in operation if at all possible.

(h) The actions during the period of excess emissions were documented by contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence as provided by R 336.1912.

(i) Excess emissions presenting an imminent threat to human health, safety, or the environment were reported to the department as soon as possible. Unless otherwise specified in the facility's permit, other excess emissions were reported as provided in R 336.1912. If requested by the department, a person shall submit a full written report that includes the known causes, the corrective actions taken, and the preventive measures to be taken to minimize or eliminate the chance of recurrence.

(j) Any information submitted to the department under this subrule shall be properly certified in accordance with the provisions of R 336.1912.

(2) This affirmative defense does not apply when a single emission unit, or multiple emission units at a stationary source, causes an exceedance of the national ambient air quality standards or any applicable prevention of significant deterioration increment.

(3) If the proximate cause of the excess emissions which occurred during routine start-up or shutdown periods was due to a malfunction, then, absent any intervening acts or superseding causes, the instances shall be treated as malfunctions in accordance with R 336.1915.

(4) Nothing in this rule shall be construed to limit the authority of the department to seek injunctive relief or to enforce the provisions of the act and the regulations promulgated under the act.

History: 2002 MR 10, Eff. May 28, 2002.

R 336.1930 Emission of carbon monoxide from ferrous cupola operations.

Rule 930. (1) After December 31, 1982, it is unlawful for a person to operate a ferrous cupola that has a melting capacity of 20 or more tons per hour located within any area listed in table 91, unless the ferrous cupola is equipped with an afterburner control system, or equivalent, which reduces the carbon monoxide emissions from the ferrous cupola by 90%.

(2) The emission rate of carbon monoxide from a ferrous cupola shall be determined by using reference test method 10, unless otherwise specified by the department.

(3) A person responsible for the operation of a ferrous cupola subject to the provisions of this rule shall submit to the commission, within 6 months after the effective date of this rule, a written program, acceptable to the commission, for compliance with this rule or evidence of compliance with this rule. The evidence shall include available data, control equipment specifications, or other information that demonstrates compliance. The required control program shall demonstrate that compliance will be achieved as expeditiously as practical.

(4) The program required by subrule (3) of this rule shall include the method by which compliance with this rule will be achieved, a complete description of new equipment to be installed, modifications to existing equipment to be made, and a timetable that specifies, at a minimum, all of the following dates:

- (a) The date equipment will be ordered.
- (b) The date construction or modification of equipment will begin.
- (c) The date initial start-up of equipment will begin.
- (d) The date final compliance will be achieved, if not the same as the date specified in subdivision (c) of this subrule.

TABLE 91
Areas subject to R 336.1930

| <u>County</u> | <u>Area</u> |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Saginaw | T12N, R4E, Sections 1, 12, 13, and 24; T12N, R5E, Sections 4, 9, and 16-21 |
| Macomb, Oakland, and Wayne | Area included within the following (counter-clockwise): Lake St. Clair to 14 Mile Road to Kelly Road north to 15 Mile Road to Hayes Road south to 14 Mile Road to Clawson city boundary, following north Clawson city boundary to north Royal Oak city boundary to 13 Mile Road to Evergreen Road to southern Beverly Hills city boundary to southern Bingham Farms city boundary to southern Franklin city boundary to Inkster Road to 8 Mile Road to western Livonia city boundary to western Westland city boundary to western Wayne city boundary to western and to southern Romulus city boundary including Pennsylvania Road extended to Detroit River. |

History: 1979 ACS 1, Eff. Jan. 19, 1980; 2002 MR 5, Eff. Mar. 19, 2002.