

Environmental Law Forum April 4, 2019

Michael J. Heilman, Asst. Regional Counsel, SWOCC

Tom Wolf, Governor

Patrick McDonnell, Secretary

DISCLAIMER

The views and positions expressed in this presentation and its materials are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Commonwealth or the Governor's Office of General Counsel or the Department of Environmental Protection.



- I. Enforcement: Consent Decrees
 - A. PennEnvironment v. ArcelorMittal
 Monessen, LLC, CA No. 2:15-cv-01314-CRE
 (2/2/2018)
 - 1. Background:
 - Coke Plant
 - Monessen, PA
 - Restarted in April 2014
 - Numerous violations



- 1. Background Cont'd:
 - PennEnvironment filed citizens' suit
 - EPA and DEP joint enforcement effort
 - Department of Justice represented EPA



- 2. Key Terms of Consent Decree:
 - Continuous Emission Monitors (COMs)
 - Elevated Opacity Actions
 - Nozzle Evaluation and Replacement
 - Calorimeters, O₂ & CO Monitors
 - Flue Cap Replacement



- 2. Key Terms Cont'd:
 - Coke Oven and Battery Heating Engineering Evaluation
 - Battery Repair Work Plan
 - Pushing Emissions
 - o Evaluation
 - o Pushing Emission Control System



- 2. Key Terms Cont'd:
 - Desulfurization Plant Outages
 - o Phase I
 - Full Scale Scrubber Demonstration
 - o Phase II



- 2. Key Terms Cont'd:
 - Odor Control Evaluation and Plan
 - Citizen Complaint Plan
 - o Community Meetings
 - Civil Penalties
 - PennEnvironment Community Project
 - o Clean Vehicles Project



- 2. Key Terms Cont'd:
 - Work Plans
 - Fugitive Dust
 - o PEC System
 - o Coke Ovens
 - o Odors



- B. United States v. MarkWest Liberty
 Midstream, et al, CA No. 2:18-cv-00520-LPL
 (7/9/2018)
 - Pigging Operations
 - Various locations in Pennsylvania and Ohio
 - Ohio not party to Consent Decree



- 1. Pigging:
 - a. Devices used to clean out pipelines
 - b. Components
 - Launchers
 - Receivers
 - Pigs



- 1. Pigging Cont'd:
 - c. Locations
 - Compressor Stations
 - Well Pads
 - Stand-alone sites



- 1. Pigging Cont'd:
 - d. Emissions assumed insignificant
 - e. NOT SO
 - Especially for "Wet Gas"



- 2. Key Terms of Consent Decree (PA):
 - a. Determining emissions
 - 1.2 x Real Gas Law
 - b. Connect high pressure launcher/receiver to low pressure gathering lines
 - c. Depressurize with jumper lines before opening hatch



- 2. Key Terms of Consent Decree (PA):
 - d. Install Pig Ramps
 - Contain liquids
 - e. Upgrade flares



- 2. Key Terms of Consent Decree Cont'd:
 - f. Supplemental Environmental Projects
 - i. Harmon Creek Ambient Air Monitoring
 - Around Harmon Creek Facility
 - 720 days
 - Three VOC Monitoring Stations
 - Met Station
 - Report



- f. Supplemental Environmental Projects Continued:
 - ii. Equipment transfer to PA DEP
 - iii. MarkWest Emission Control Education
 - iv. Free Licensing Pig Ramps



- g. Compressor Station Operating Permits
- h. Civil Penalties



- C. United States v. MPLX, LP, No. 3-cv-18:2526 (1/8/2019)
 - 1. Gas Fractionation and Processing Plants
 - Six States
 - Pennsylvania
 - Houston Plant (Washington County)
 - o Bluestone Plant (Butler County)



- 2. Separate natural gas constituents
- 3. Key Terms
 - a. Identify Equipment
 - b. Monitor equipment
 - Leak Detection and Repair (LDAR)
 - Third-party LDAR Audippennsylvania pennsylvania DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION PROTECTION

- c. Replace/upgrade equipment
 - To reduce emissions
 - E.g. Valve Replacement and Improvement Program:
 - New or replaced
 - Low E Valves and packing



- -- Connector replacements
- -- Process units
- e. NSPS compliance
- f. Mittigation
- g. Civil penalties



- 4. Supplemental Environmental Projects
 - a. Fence Line Monitoring
 - Upwind & Downwind
 - GCMS Monitors
 - Common gas constituents
 - Met station
 - Three years (min)
 - b. Predictive Leak Monitoring Software
 Study

 pennsylvania
 DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL

- II. Regulatory/Permitting: Natural Gas Sector
 - A. Gas Facilities and Well Pads (June 9, 2018)
 - GP-5 (Revised)
 - GP-5a (New)
 - Exemption 38 (Revised)



- 1. GP-5 Revision Compressor Stations and Transmission Stations:
 - a. All sources and controls at station:
 - Compressor engines
 - Turbines
 - Dehydration units
 - Pigging
 - Flares



- Storage tanks
- Load-out
- Pneumatic controls and pumps
- Catalysts
- SCR
- NSCR
- Adsorbers



- b. Emission Limits
 - Minor Facilities Only
 - Updated BAT
 - Incorporates Relevant NSPS
 - Methane Limit: 200 TPY/source
- c. Leak Detection and Repair (LDAR)
- d. Ownership Transfer



- 2. GP-5a NEW:
 - Unconventional Well Pad sources
 - Remote pigging
 - Prior and current GP-5 did not apply to well pads



- a. Sources Covered
 - Similar to GP-5
- b. Emission Limits
 - Consistent with GP-5



- c. Restrictions
 - Minor Facilities
 - VOC greater than 2.7 TPY
 - Subset of well pads



- 3. Exemption 38:
 - Well Pads
 - a. No Plan Approval or Permit required
 - b. Limitations
 - Not a major facility



- c. Three Groups
 - i. 38(a), Existing Facilities: Constructed prior to August 10, 2013
 - ii. 38(b): Constructed between August 10, 2013 and August 7, 2018
 - iii. 38(c): Constructed after August 7, 2018



- d. Exemptions 38(a) and 38(b) for existing pads and 38(c) for **new** conventional well pads
 - Largely status quo



- e. Exemption 38(c): New **Unconventional** Well Pads
 - Green Completion
 - Methane less than 200 TPY/source
 - VOC less than 2.7 TPY/pad
 - HAP (total) < 1.0 TPY/pad
 - HAP (individual) < 1,000 lbs/pad



- e. Exemption 38(c) (New Unconventional Well Pads) Cont'd:
 - HAP limits
 - Limited flaring
 - LDAR (semiannually)
 - Recordkeeping
 - No report to DEP



- f. Tangible Progress NO_x Emissions
 - Gas Fired IC Engines
 - o 2010: 2.0 lb/BHP-hr (no control)
 - 2018: as low as 0.2 lb/BHP-hr (0.03 lb/BHP-hr control)



B. Well Pad RACT:

- Well Pad Control Techniques Guidance (CTG) issued by EPA October 27, 2016
- CTG → RACT
- SIP revision required January 1, 2021
- Section 184(b) of Clean Air Act
- March 9, 2018 EPA proposed withdrawing CTG



- 1. DEP Draft Well Pad RACT Regulations
 - At least as effective as CTG
 - To reducing VOC emissions
 - Methane reduction a co-benefit



- 2. Sources covered
 - Storage vessels
 - Gas-driven pneumatic controllers
 - Gas-driven diaphragm pumps
 - Compressors
 - Fugitive emissions components
- 3. Regs not yet published



- III. EPA's NSR Reform
 - A. Project Aggregation (11/17/2018)
 - 1. EPA Guidance (nonbinding)
 - 2. Activities comprising the "Project" for NSR:
 - Nominally separate changes
 - Consider a single project
 - Prevent circumvention



A. Project Aggregation Cont'd:

- 3. History
 - 2006: EPA proposed regulations
 - 2009: EPA issued guidance
 - 2009: EPA stay and reconsideration
 - 2018: EPA affirms 2009 aggregation action



FEDERAL AND STATE AIR QUALITY

A. Project Aggregation Cont'd:

- 4. Test: "Substantially related"
 - Case specific
 - Same/related processes
 - Timing not determinative



- 5. Rebuttable presumption
 - 3 years between projects
 - Different projects
- 6. Rejected Test: "Overall basic purpose"
 - Past EPA documents
 - "Open-ended"



- B. Project Emissions Accounting MemorandumNSR Step 1 (3/13/2018)
 - 1. NSR Major Modification Applicability
 - Step 1: Emissions change of project alone
 - Significant emissions increase
 - Step 2: Emissions changes in "contemporaneous period" at Facility
 - o 5 years (typ)
 - o Significant net emissions increase



- 2. EPA 2006 Rulemaking Notice
 - Step 1 only considered project emission increases
 - Decreases ignored
 - "Sum of the emissions increases"40 CFR § 52.21(a)(2)(iv)(F)
 - Step 2 considers increases and decreases in contemporaneous period



- 3. EPA 2018 Memo:
 - Step 1 should consider emission increases *and* decreases
 - NSR Purpose: "Changes that increase actual emissions"



- 3. EPA 2018 Memo (Cont'd)
 - Change based on 40 CFR
 § 52.21(a)(2)(iv)
 - "Sum of the difference"
 - Step 2 is unchanged



- 3. EPA 2018 Memo (Cont'd)
 - Reason for Step 1 change?
 - Neglecting emissions decreases in Step
 1 believed to have killed some projects



- C. Projected Actual Emissions Memo (12/17/2017) "No Second Guessing"
 - 1. NSR Modification Applicant: Must Determine "Projected Actual Emissions"
 - Would "significant emission increase" result?
 - If significant, NSR may apply
 - Consider "all relevant information"



- 2. Challenge to "Projected Actual Emissions"
 - Some NSR enforcement cases
 - Permit review



New Approach:

"NSR rules provide no mechanism for agency review of procedurally compliant emission projections." Memo at 7.



- 1. EPA will not examine analysis unless "clear error"
- 2. No enforcement
 - Unless <u>actual</u> emissions increase
- 3. Impact: DTE litigation (and other cases) would not have occurred



QUESTIONS?





Michael J. Heilman, Assistant Regional Counsel

E-mail: mheilman@pa.gov