

of 0.03 gr/dscf; however, considering the high variability from run to run, the plant is not substantially overachieving the limit.

No commenters provided any evidence that the existing State limits were not being achieved on a continuing basis (e.g., in the form of violation reports), and we have no evidence that any facility has been in violation of the existing State limits. Consequently, we believe the floor based on State limits represents a reasonably accurate picture of what the best-performing sources have and continue to achieve. For new sources, we chose a limit of 0.01 gr/dscf based on the most stringent State limit. The average test results for WCI Steel (0.009 gr/dscf) show that this limit is achievable by a properly-designed and operated baghouse.

10. PM Standard for Sinter Discharge End Control Device

Comment. According to one commenter, EPA claims it has PM test data from six plants, but asserts in the preamble that it has credible test data for only one plant and never explains why data for only one plant is credible. The EPA does not explain how this represents an accurate picture of the relevant best sources' actual performance, or how it knows that the best sources are not doing better than their permits require.

Response. The reference to test data in the BID is correct; however, use of the term "test data" in the BID was not correct. We had estimates of PM emissions from the discharge end from several plants based on emission factors that they supplied in a survey questionnaire. However, these estimates were not supported by the use of reference methods for sampling and analysis or substantiated by emission test reports. For units in this category, it is not feasible to use estimates based on typical emission factors to identify the level of control that a plant routinely achieves. Therefore, this information is of no practical value for purposes of identifying the best-performing sinter discharge ends. We found the only test data we could validate for the discharge end was for the EPA test conducted at WCI Steel. The results of this test support our conclusion that the existing State limits reasonably approximate actual emissions and performance. However, we have no indication or expectation that the best-performing plants are achieving a level of control more stringent than the proposed emission limit. Consequently, we based the floor on the most stringent State limits.

Comment. Seven commenters state that three of the nine sinter plants in the existing population are now shut down, including one of the five plants used to calculate the floor for the discharge end. The commenters assert that EPA must recalculate the floor to reflect only operating sources. Also, EPA must show that the standard is consistently achievable by the best-performing sources under the foreseeable range of operating conditions.

Response. We agree that one of the five best-performing plants (Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel) used to determine the floor was shut down at the time of the floor analysis. We elected to re-calculate the floor and exclude this plant. We determined that the floor based on the average of the five best-performing sources remains the same (0.02 gr/dscf). One plant is subject to a limit of 0.01 gr/dscf, two plants are subject to a limit of 0.02 gr/dscf, one is subject to 0.03 gr/dscf, and the fifth plant has a mass rate limit that is equivalent to about 0.04 gr/dscf. The average and median value associated with the top five limits is 0.02 gr/dscf. We have detailed design information for the baghouses applied to the discharge end, and our engineering analysis of the design information, coupled with test data for baghouses in similar applications, indicates that these controls can achieve 0.02 gr/dscf under the foreseeable range of operating conditions. Although we have test data for only one baghouse, the test averaged 0.006 gr/dscf and further supports the achievability of the MACT floor. We based the MACT floor for new sources on the most stringent State limit of 0.01 gr/dscf. Again, the available test data indicate that this limit can be achieved by a properly-designed and operated baghouse.

11. PM Standard for BOPF Fugitive Emissions

Comment. One commenter stated that EPA does not explain how the floor determination represents an accurate picture of the relevant best sources' actual performance, or how it knows that the best sources are not doing better than their permits require.

Response. We have test data for only one baghouse applied to BOPF fugitive emissions, and because of the nature of the test, the results are not useful for determining the MACT floor. During the test, sampling was performed continuously over a 3-hour period, even when the furnace was not operating and when fugitive emissions were not occurring. Consequently, the reported concentrations for the baghouse outlet are unrepresentative of the concentrations that would be measured

when fugitive emissions from charging and tapping are occurring. Because of the lack of data, we based the floor on existing State limits and have made no changes to the proposed emission limits. We chose 0.01 gr/dscf as the floor from the median of the five sources with the most stringent limits (one at 0.0052, one at 0.006, two at 0.01, and one at 0.012 gr/dscf). One unit is subject to the most stringent State limit of 0.0052 gr/dscf, and we selected this limit as the MACT floor for new sources. These limits are achieved by using a capture system vented to a baghouse, and these levels are consistent with the performance of well-designed and operated baghouses. We have no evidence that plants are violating their current limits, and we have no indication they are achieving a level of control more stringent than the identified State limits. This observation is consistent with an EPA design manual for baghouses which states that typical outlet concentrations for all applications range from 0.001 to 0.01 gr/dscf (depending primarily on the design parameters).

B. What Surrogates Did We Use for HAP?

1. PM for Metal HAP

Comment. One commenter contends that PM is not a valid surrogate for HAP metal compounds and that specific limits for individual metals should be established. In support, the commenter points to other rules where EPA has recognized that PM is not a valid surrogate for mercury, lead, and cadmium because of their volatility and that these emissions cannot necessarily be controlled merely by controlling PM emissions. Consequently, EPA cannot claim PM is a valid surrogate for metal HAP in the final rule or that setting standards for individual metals would "... achieve little, if any, HAP emission reduction beyond what would be achieved using the surrogate pollutant approach based on total PM." Because EPA has already recognized that PM is not an adequate surrogate for mercury, lead, and cadmium, EPA must set individual emission standards for such HAP.

Response. We disagree with the commenter and believe that PM is a valid surrogate for the HAP metal compounds emitted from integrated iron and steel sources. The rationale in the preamble for the hazardous waste combustors (HWC) rule is unique to that source category and does not apply to the metal HAP emissions and controls in the integrated iron and steel industry.