





WASHINGTON OIL REFINERY RACT

Technical Support Document

Prepared for: Washington State Department of Ecology Petroleum Refinery Greenhouse Gas Emissions Requirements Rule

Developed by:

Northwest Clean Air Agency, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, and Washington State Department of Ecology

FINAL - November 25, 2013

Publication no. 13-02-031

Contents

Section 1:	Executive Summary1
Section 2:	Introduction3
Section 3:	Air Contaminants of Concern4
3.1 Fe	ederal Programs5
3.1.1	National Ambient Air Quality Standards5
3.1.2	Federal New Source Performance Standards Requirements7
3.1.3	Federal Hazardous Air Pollutant Requirements9
3.1.4	New Source Review Requirements11
3.1.5	Regional Haze Program12
3.2 St	ate and Local Programs12
3.2.1	General Regulations12
3.2.2	Minor New Source Review Requirements12
3.3 D	etermination of Air Contaminants of Concern13
3.3.1	Traditionally Regulated Contaminants13
3.3.2	Greenhouse Gases
Section 4:	Defining Oil Refinery Facilities21
Section 5:	Petroleum Oil Refining Processes23
5.1 G	eneral Process Overview23
5.1.1	Separation25
5.1.2	Conversion
5.1.3	Treatment
5.1.4	Blending
5.1.5	Refinery General Air Emission Categories26
5.2 R	efinery Process Unit Descriptions27
5.2.1	Crude Distillation Unit27
5.2.2	Crude Residue Vacuum Distillation Unit (Vacuum Flasher)28
5.2.3	Hydrotreaters28
5.2.4	Catalytic Reformer

5.2.5	5	Benzene Reduction Units
5.2.6	5	Fluidized Catalytic Cracking Unit29
5.2.7	7	Hydrocracking
5.2.8	3	Isomerization
5.2.9	Э	Alkylation29
5.2.1	10	Delayed Coking
5.2.1	11	Treating
5.2.1	12	Hydrogen Production
5.2.1	13	Sulfur Recovery
5.2.1	14	Fuel Gas Blender
5.2.1	15	Logistics
5.2.1	16	Utilities
5.2.1	17	Wastewater Treatment Plant32
Section 6	6:	Washington State Refineries-Specific Information
6.1	Boil	ers34
6.2	Prod	cess Heaters
6.3	Flui	dized Catalytic Cracking Units37
6.4	Dela	ayed Coking37
6.5	Cata	alytic Reformers
6.6	Cok	e Calcining
6.7	Sulf	ur Recovery Units
6.8	Flar	es39
6.9	Hyd	rogen Production
6.10	Refi	nery Complexity40
Section 7	7:	Identify and Evaluate Control Technologies and Strategies41
7.1	Carl	bon Capture and Sequestration41
7.2	Equ	ipment-based Efficiency Strategies43
7.2.1	1	Cogeneration and Power Recovery45
7.2.2	2	Utility Boilers
7.2.3	3	Process Heaters
7.2.4	4	Flares
7.2.5	5	Process Cooling
7.2.6	5	Fluidized Catalytic Cracking Units55

7.2.7	Coking and Coke Calcining56
7.2.8	Steam-Methane Reforming – Hydrogen Production
7.2.9	Sulfur Recovery
7.2.10	Leak Detection and Repair58
7.2.11	Optimization58
7.2.12	Crude Oil Constraints61
7.3 Pro	grammatic GHG Reduction Strategies65
7.3.1	Facility- and Corporate-level Programs65
7.3.2	Existing Federal Rules68
7.3.3	Electric Utility Efficiency Incentive Programs69
7.3.4	Cap-and-Trade Programs70
7.4 Po	ential Future Information Sources72
7.5 Su	mmary of GHG Reduction Strategy Findings73
Section 8:	Proposed RACT
8.1 Se	tting the RACT Performance Bar76
8.2 Ba	sis for Benchmark Demonstration of Compliance78
8.3 Eff	iciency Benchmark Compliance Demonstration
8.4 Ba	sis for GHG Reduction Goal82
8.5 GH	G Reduction Compliance Demonstration84
8.6 Ov	erlap with Existing Rules85
8.7 Ec	onomic Analysis
8.8 Re	jected RACT Components90
Section 9:	References
Section 10:	Definitions and Acronyms95
10.1 De	finitions95
10.2 Ac	onyms
Appendicies	

Appendix A. List of Refinery Facility Utility Boilers

Appendix B. List of Refinery Process Heaters

Tables

Table 1-1	Washington State Refinery Locations and Capacities	.3
Table 3-1	Historical Notice of Construction Application/Approval Activity1	.3

Table 6-1 Overview of Washington State Refineries	34
Table 6-2 Washington State Refinery Boiler Overview	35
Table 6-3 Washington State Refinery Process Heater Overview	36
Table 6-4 Washington State Refinery Fluidized Catalytic Cracking Unit Overview	37
Table 6-5 Washington Refinery Delayed Coking Overview	37
Table 6-6 Washington State Refinery Catalytic Reforming Overview	38
Table 6-7 Washington State Refinery Sulfur Recovery Overview	39
Table 6-8 Washington State Refinery Flare Overview	39
Table 6-9 Washington State Refinery Hydrogen Production Overview	40
Table 7-1 Efficiency Improvement Projects for Steam Systems	47
Table 7-2 EPA Refinery ICR Responses for Steam System Efficiency Measures	49
Table 7-3 Process Heater Efficiency Measures	51
Table 7-4 EPA Refinery ICR Responses for Process Heater Efficiency Measures	52
Table 7-5 Hydrogen Production Unit Efficiency Measures	57
Table 8-1 Carbon Intensity for Local Power Providers	85
Table 8-2 Social Cost of CO ² per metric ton CO ² in 2007 dollars	89
Table 8-3 Estimated CO ₂ Emission Reductions from 2010 Baseline and Social Benefit	
Calculation	89

Figures

Figure 3-1	Annual PM_{10} Emissions for Five Washington State Refineries from 2001 to 2011
Figure 3-2	Annual SO_2 Emissions for Five Washington State Refineries from 2001 to 201115
Figure 3-3	Annual NO_X Emissions for Five Washington State Refineries from 2001 to 2011
Figure 3-4	Annual VOC Emissions for Five Washington State Refineries from 2001 to 2011
Figure 3-5	Relative Distribution of Washington State Stationary-Source GHG Emissions
during 201	1
Figure 5-1	Typical Refinery Layout25
Figure 7-1	Life-Cycle Well-to-Tank GHG for Diesel Production from Specific Crude Sources 62
Figure 7-2	Refined Crude Quality for US Refineries64
Figure 8-1	DOE Energy Price Projections from 2010 to 2025

Section 1: Executive Summary

This technical support document identifies Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions from the five petroleum refineries in Washington State. This rulemaking was initiated in response to a Remedy Order that resulted from a lawsuit filed by the Washington Environmental Council and the Sierra Club against the Washington State Department of Ecology, Northwest Clean Air Agency, and Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (collectively referred to as "the Agencies" in this document) for failing to implement RCW 70.94.154 requiring RACT determinations for existing sources.

In Washington State, RACT is defined as "the lowest emission limit that a particular source or source category is capable of meeting by the application of control technology that is reasonably available considering technological and economic feasibility." The agencies found no reasonably available control technologies to collect and remove GHG emissions from these facilities. Instead, the Agencies identified control strategies reducing the amount of fuel required to refine a barrel of crude oil, or energy efficiency of refining.

The Agencies reviewed approaches that have been used for control of GHG emissions and found no existing regulations that limit GHG emissions at oil refineries. Programmatic approaches to GHG reductions such as cap and trade programs or carbon taxes are not viable for a rule covering only five facilities, though cap and trade programs have been adopted on a state-wide and broader regional basis. The Agencies found that the existing GHG reduction programs rely on *benchmarking*.

Benchmarking in this document is the process of comparing the energy performance of a single facility over time, or comparing its performance against the range of performance of that industry. The most common benchmarking index used by the petroleum refinery sector found by the Agencies is a proprietary product; Solomon Associates Energy Intensity Index[®] (EII[®]). Approximately 90% of the US refining capacity subscribes to this service. The Solomon index is a tool that is commonly used to prioritize process units for which energy efficiency improvements should be assessed.

Refineries are highly integrated and complex facilities. Therefore, the impact of a specific efficiency strategy is a complex task that requires specific expertise in refining and refining efficiency assessment. The Agencies found a large number of strategies available both on the supply side (improving the efficiencies of fuel-burning equipment) and the demand side (reducing the amount of energy needed). A detailed energy audit of an individual refinery requires extensive resources. The end result of such assessments would be specific for each facility and would not be amenable to a rule covering all five Washington State refineries.

Publications by various groups including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Energy, California State Air Resources Board, Canadian Government and industry experts indicate that a 10% reduction in GHG emissions is readily achievable by implementing efficiency projects at refineries. Facilities that have already implemented such efficiency projects, and thereby improved the facility energy efficiency performance,

have a narrowing scope of cost-effective opportunities for additional efficiency improvements. For practical purposes, the Agencies have defined a *reasonably energy efficient refinery* in this GHG RACT proposed rulemaking as a facility that has implemented efficiency measures demonstrated by an energy efficiency performance at or above the 50th percentile Solomon EII[®] benchmark for similar-sized US refineries.

For those facilities that do not perform to the 50th percentile benchmark or choose not to demonstrate efficiency performance, the proposed rule requires implementation of efficiency projects totaling a 10% reduction in GHG emissions from the 2010 baseline (or alternate 2011 if qualifying) year. The proposed rule uses 2010 as the baseline year for calculation of the 10% GHG emissions because it is the first year for which GHG emissions data has been reported on a consistent basis. Eligible GHG reduction projects under the proposed rule must be completed on or after the baseline year. Facilities demonstrating emission reductions have up to 10 years for projects to be completed and approved or until the facility meets the performance benchmark.

The proposed rule is anticipated to reduce GHG emissions from refineries by less than 1% of Washington State's total GHG emissions (based on 2010 emissions data).

The Agencies have maintained an ongoing dialog with both the plaintiffs and the Washington State refineries. Several opportunities for input have been provided during the rulemaking process. A number of comments were received, some of which have been incorporated in the proposed rule.

The court provided 26 months for the Agencies to complete this rulemaking, which is scheduled to be completed on May, 28, 2014.

Section 2: Introduction

The reasonably available control technology (RACT) determination process described in this document was undertaken in response to a March 27, 2012, Remedy Order entered in the United States District Court – Western District of Washington at Seattle (Case No. C11-417 MJP, Washington Environmental Council, et al. vs. Sturdevant, et al.). In that order, the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA), and Northwest Clean Air Agency (NWCAA) (collectively referred to as "the Agencies" in this document) were ordered to complete a RACT determination process pursuant to Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 70.94.154 within 26 months addressing greenhouse gases (GHGs) for each of five Washington State petroleum oil refineries owned and operated by the following companies: BP PLC (BP), Phillips 66 Company (Phillips 66), Shell Oil Company (Shell), Tesoro Refining & Marketing Company (Tesoro), and US Oil & Refining Company (US Oil). The locations and capacities of these five refineries are presented in Table 2-1. This document provides the technical background and conclusions reached during the RACT determination process.

Owner/Operator	Location	Capacity (barrels/day)
BP	Cherry Point	234,000
Phillips 66	Ferndale	107,500
Shell	Anacortes	149,000
Tesoro	Anacortes	125,000
US Oil	Tacoma	42,000

Table 2-1 Washington State Refinery Locations and Capacities

RACT is a pollution control standard created by statute. The purpose of the Federal Clean Air Act RACT requirements is to define emission reductions required to bring an area into attainment with a National Ambient Air Quality Standard. Whereas under Washington State law (RCW 70.94.030(20) and RCW 70.94.154) RACT is a more flexible tool that can be used to:

- Implement attainment plan requirements for non-attainment areas.
- Correct a specific air quality problem that can be attributed to a specific source or source category.
- Develop regulations for establishing emission control requirements for a source category.

RACT stringency can range from approving use of currently installed emission controls to requiring installation of emission controls that would meet the criteria of Best Available Control Technology (BACT). For example, for the Centralia Power Plant RACT determination (SWAPCA, 1997), the level of control for sulfur dioxide was based on a company proposal that went beyond what the permitting authority initially proposed as RACT.

There are two overarching requirements in determining RACT. The determination must be:

- Technologically feasible.
 - This is addressed by limiting the potential emission reduction options to actions that have already been implemented in practice or are technically available in the area of the refineries.
- Economically feasible.
 - This is addressed in several ways. As a result of decades of experience with refineries, air quality agencies have determined that projects requiring the redesign, replacement, or reconstruction of process units are not economically feasible when determining a reasonably available control technology. However, the agencies' proposed RACT determination does not prevent an individual refinery from proposing and implementing such projects to comply with this proposal or for other corporate reasons.

In addition to technical and economic feasibility, the determination of RACT must consider:

- The impact of the source upon air quality.
- The availability of additional controls.
- The emission reduction to be achieved by additional controls.
- The impact of additional controls on air quality.
- The capital and operating costs of the additional controls.

This document evaluates each of the required factors used to determine RACT.

Section 3: Air Contaminants of Concern

In establishing RACT requirements, Ecology and local authorities must address, where practicable, all air contaminants deemed to be of concern for that source or source category. The purpose of this section is to identify the air contaminants of concern for the RACT determinations for the five Washington State petroleum oil refineries.

In RCW 70.94.030, air contaminant is defined as "dust, fumes, mist, smoke, other particulate matter, vapor, gas, odorous substance, or any combination thereof." For the purpose of this analysis, the definition specifically refers to the following pollutants:

- 1. Particulate matter (PM) and precursors (i.e., organics and ammonia):
 - a. PM_{10} : PM with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 10 μm
 - b. $PM_{2.5}$: PM with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 2.5 μm
- 2. Carbon monoxide (CO)
- 3. Nitrogen oxides (NO_X) including nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)
- 4. Sulfur dioxide (SO₂)

- 5. Ozone precursors, including volatile organic compounds (VOCs), as defined by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and NO_X
- 6. Lead
- Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) 187 compounds defined in Section 112 of the Federal Clean Air Act (USCAA)
- Toxic air pollutants (TAPs) approximately 350 compounds as defined in Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-460
- 9. GHGs:
 - a. Carbon dioxide (CO₂)
 - b. Methane (CH₄)
 - c. Nitrous oxide (N₂O)
 - d. Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
 - e. Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
 - f. Sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆)

Many of these pollutants are produced by refinery emission sources. All of the Washington State oil refineries are major sources (as defined by Title V Operating Permit thresholds) of NO_x , CO, SO₂, VOCs, and HAPs; the four larger oil refineries (i.e., all but the US Oil refinery) are also major sources of PM.

3.1 Federal Programs

In determining the air contaminants of concern for a RACT determination, it is useful to review the existing regulatory programs that apply to the source or source category being reviewed. As detailed below, oil refineries in Washington State are subject to many federal, state, and local air quality regulations.

3.1.1 National Ambient Air Quality Standards

The 1970 USCAA established EPA and directed it to develop and enforce regulations for all air pollutants that might reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. Section 109 of the USCAA required that EPA set primary National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) to protect human health with an adequate margin of safety and secondary NAAQS to protect against other effects, such as damage to vegetation, structures, ecosystems, and visibility.

EPA has set primary NAAQS¹ for PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$, CO, NO₂, SO₂, ozone precursors, and lead. No NAAQS have been set for GHGs. There are also secondary standards for all pollutants except CO. For the Washington State oil refineries, the NAAQS are implemented and enforced through the regulations of NWCAA, PSCAA, Ecology, and EPA.

Compliance with the NAAQS is determined through the measurement of ambient air quality using specific instrumentation and methods. In Washington State, the network of ambient air quality monitoring stations is accessible by the public online (https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/enviwa/). Areas that are identified as being out of compliance

¹ Additional information on the NAAQS can be found on the US EPA webpages, including; http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html

with one or more NAAQS are classified as "nonattainment," while those areas that have no evidence of noncompliance are classified as "attainment." Once an area has fallen into nonattainment, a plan is developed to identify and address the air quality problem and return the area to attainment status.

3.1.1.1 Nonattainment – Historical

The area under the jurisdiction of the NWCAA, which has the four largest oil refineries in the state, has met ambient air quality standards continuously since the NAAQS were first established by EPA.

In contrast, the area of Pierce County that is the site of the US Oil refinery, and under PSCAA jurisdiction, has been identified as a CO nonattainment area (once), ozone nonattainment area (twice), and PM_{10} nonattainment area (once). Each of these previous incidences of nonattainment has been addressed, and Pierce County currently meets all ambient air quality standards with the exception of $PM_{2.5}$.

Sections 172(c)(1) and 182 of the USCAA require that states that fail to meet the NAAQS to submit plans to EPA that "provide for the implementation of all reasonably available control measures as expeditiously as practicable (including such reductions in emissions from existing sources in the area as may be obtained through the adoption, at a minimum, of <u>reasonably available control technology</u>) and shall provide for attainment of the national primary ambient air quality standards."

To facilitate the submittal of approvable State Implementation Plans (SIPs) for nonattainment areas, EPA developed and published a number of Control Technique Guideline (CTG) documents. The control equipment and strategies in these publications were considered presumptive RACT and included the following CTGs for petroleum refineries:

- Control of Refinery Vacuum Producing Systems, Wastewater Separators and Process Unit Turnarounds (EPA-450/2-77-025)
- Control of Hydrocarbons from Tank Truck Gasoline Loading Terminals (EPA-450/2-77-026)
- Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Storage of Petroleum Liquids in Fixed Roof Tanks (EPA-450/2-77-036)
- Control of Volatile Organic Compounds from Petroleum Refinery Equipment Leaks (EPA-450/2-78-036)
- Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Petroleum Liquid Storage in External Floating Roof Tanks (EPA-450/2-78-047)
- Control of Volatile Organic Compound Leaks from Gasoline Tank Trucks and Vapor Collection Systems (EPA-450/2-78-051)

In 1980, PSCAA adopted and incorporated the VOC rule language from these documents into PSCAA Regulation II as part of its ozone SIP submittal to EPA (at the time, Snohomish, King, and Pierce Counties were nonattainment for ozone). Because of continued nonattainment issues, in 1991, some of these PSCAA SIP rules were revised to be more

stringent. EPA approved both the 1980 and 1991 SIP submittals, determining that the PSCAA rules were RACT. EPA determined that PSCAA's standards for PM were RACT as part of the PM_{10} SIP submitted in the 1990s. These rules remain as part of PSCAA Regulation II.

Ecology also adopted the VOC rule language from the CTGs into WAC 173-490² (Emissions Standards and Controls for Sources Emitting VOCs), which applies to any ozone nonattainment area in the state.

Even though the area in NWCAA jurisdiction was not identified as an ozone nonattainment area in the early 1990s NWCAA also adopted the Ecology rules. NWCAA also included similar rules in its regulation (NWCAA regulation Section 580). The NWCAA regulation is SIP-approved.

3.1.1.2 Nonattainment – Current

The only current Washington nonattainment area that includes an oil refinery is the "Wapato Hills-Puyallup River Valley Nonattainment Area" which resulted from PM_{2.5} monitoring data that was in excess of the 24-hr average standard. Efforts to develop an attainment plan have been underway for several years. The combined efforts of Ecology, PSCAA, the Clean Air Task Force, and other partners have led to development of a SIP, which will be submitted to EPA for review and approval. In the plan for this area, the PM_{2.5} nonattainment status has been identified as a wood smoke issue associated with residential heating practices. Thus, the focus of the attainment plan is the wood smoke issue; the plan does not include any emission reductions from US Oil (or other industrial sources) because the technical evaluation concluded they were not significant contributors to the nonattainment condition. The most up-to-date information available regarding this and other potential nonattainment issues in Washington is available to the public at http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/air/nonattainment/nonattainment.htm.

3.1.2 Federal New Source Performance Standards Requirements

Section 111 of the USCAA requires that EPA promulgate standards of performance for new stationary sources (i.e., the New Source Performance Standards [NSPS]), "which reflect the degree of emission limitation achievable through the application of the best system of emission reduction which (taking into account the cost of achieving such reduction and any non-air quality health and environmental impact and energy requirements) the Administrator determines has been adequately demonstrated." These standards, which are generally considered to be at least as stringent as RACT, are specific to the criteria pollutants and, for ozone, its precursors (VOC and NO_x). Although the rules apply to criteria pollutant is also a criteria pollutant. Examples of this include benzene and toluene, which are VOCs. GHG emissions reductions may be also achieved in cases where more-efficient combustion devices are installed to achieve compliance with criteria pollutant emission

² WAC 173-490-040 (requirements), -200 (Petroleum refinery equipment leaks), -201 (Petroleum liquid storage in external floating roof tanks), and -202 (Leaks from gasoline transport tanks and vapor collection systems); WAC 173-491-040 (Gasoline vapor control requirements)

limits. Such reductions are difficult to quantify and generally would vary by installation. Furthermore, although the rules affect only new, modified, or reconstructed stationary sources, many of the rules have been in place for years. Substantial portions of equipment at the oil refineries as they now exist are subject to NSPS. The following NSPS (promulgated under 40 CFR Part 60) apply to affected facilities (as defined in the regulations) at the Washington State petroleum oil refineries:

•	Subpart A	General Provisions Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil
•	Subpart Db	Standards of Performance for Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units Applies at: BP, Philips 66, and Tesoro Pollutants addressed: PM , ³ NO_x , and SO_2
•	Subpart J	Standards of Performance for Petroleum Refineries Applies at: BP, Tesoro, Shell, Phillips 66, and US Oil Pollutants addressed: CO, PM, and SO ₂
•	Subpart Ja	Standards of Performance for Petroleum Refineries for which Construction, Reconstruction, or Modification Commenced after May 14, 2007 Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutants addressed: CO, NO _x , PM, and SO ₂
•	Subpart Kb	Standards of Performance for Volatile Organic Liquid Storage Vessels (Including Petroleum Liquid Storage Vessels) for which Construction, Reconstruction, or Modification Commenced after July 23, 1984 Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutant addressed: VOCs
•	Subpart UU	Standards of Performance for Asphalt Processing and Asphalt Roofing Manufacture Applies at: Tesoro Pollutant addressed: PM
•	Subpart XX	Standards of Performance for Bulk Gasoline Terminals Applies at: BP and Shell Pollutant addressed: VOCs
•	Subpart GGG	Standards of Performance for Equipment Leaks of VOC in Petroleum Refineries for which Construction, Reconstruction, or

 $^{^3}$ PM in this list of NSPS regulations indicates PM_{10} and/or $PM_{2.5}$ and is rule-specific depending on promulgation date and source.

Modification Commenced after January 4, 1983, and on or before November 7, 2006. Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutant addressed: VOCs

- Subpart GGGa Standards of Performance for Equipment Leaks of VOC in Petroleum Refineries for which Construction, Reconstruction, or Modification Commenced after November 7, 2006. Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutant addressed: VOCs
- Subpart QQQ Standards of Performance for VOC Emissions from Petroleum Refinery Wastewater Systems Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutant addressed: VOCs
- Subpart IIII Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutants addressed: CO, NO_x, PM, VOCs
- Subpart JJJJ Standards of Performance for Stationary Spark Ignition Internal Combustion Engines Applies at: Does not apply currently to any Washington refinery but might be triggered by a new spark ignition engine. Pollutant addressed: CO, NO_x, PM, VOCs

3.1.3 Federal Hazardous Air Pollutant Requirements

Section 112 of the USCAA requires EPA to promulgate national emission standards for HAPs (NESHAPs). For major sources of HAPs (including refineries), these standards require that "The maximum degree of reduction in emissions that is deemed achievable for new sources in a category or subcategory shall not be less stringent than the emission control that is achieved in practice by the best controlled similar source, as determined by the Administrator." For the specific pollutants regulated therein, the requirements promulgated pursuant to Section 112 of the USCAA exceed the threshold for RACT.

The initial NESHAPs were promulgated under 40 CFR Part 61. Eight HAPs were addressed under 40 CFR Part 61 before EPA changed the NESHAP methodology and began issuing NESHAP rules under 40 CFR Part 63. The following rules, which affect Washington State petroleum refineries, were issued under 40 CFR Part 61:

- Subpart A General Provisions
 Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil
- Subpart J National Emission Standard for Equipment Leaks (Fugitive Emission Sources) of Benzene

Applies at: BP, Shell, Tesoro Pollutant addressed: Benzene

- Subpart M National Emission Standard for Asbestos Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutant addressed: Asbestos
- Subpart V National Emission Standard for Equipment Leaks (Fugitive Emission Sources) Applies (by reference from Subpart J) at: BP, Shell and Tesoro Pollutants addressed: Volatile HAPs
- Subpart FF National Emission Standard for Benzene Waste Operations Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutant addressed: Benzene

The 1990 amendments to the USCAA redirected EPA to promulgate technology-based standards for 188 HAPs, reflecting "the average emission limitation achieved by the best performing 12 percent of the existing sources." These standards can apply to both new and existing sources and therefore are in effect at substantial portions of the refineries. Section 112(f)(2) of the USCAA requires that EPA review the residual risk within 8 years of the promulgation of the standards "in order to provide an ample margin of safety to protect public health... or to prevent, taking into consideration costs, energy, safety, and other relevant factors, an adverse environmental effect." If the standards "do not reduce lifetime excess cancer risks to the individual most exposed to emissions from a source in the category or subcategory to less than one in one million," EPA is required "to promulgate standards under this subsection for such source category."

Nearly 130 such NESHAPs (also referred to as maximum achievable control technology [MACT] standards) have been promulgated, including the following that affect petroleum refineries:

•	Subpart A	General Provisions Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil
•	Subpart Y	National Emission Standards for Marine Tank Vessel Loading Operations Applies at: BP Pollutants addressed: HAPs
•	Subpart CC	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants from Petroleum Refineries Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutants addressed: HAPs

- Subpart UUU National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Petroleum Refineries: Catalytic Cracking Units, Catalytic Reforming Units, and Sulfur Recovery Units Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutants addressed: HAPs
- Subpart ZZZZ National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutants addressed: HAPs
- Subpart DDDDD National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Major Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters Applies at: BP, Phillips 66, Shell, Tesoro, and US Oil Pollutants addressed: HAPs
- Subpart GGGGG National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Site Remediation Applies at: Tesoro and US Oil Pollutants addressed: HAPs

3.1.4 New Source Review Requirements

Part C of the USCAA requires that EPA establish a permitting program for new major sources and major modifications⁴ of existing sources. The Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permitting program is designed to accommodate growth while protecting air quality, preventing potential future violations of NAAQS, and preventing impacts to national parks and wilderness areas. Sources are required to employ the best available control technology (BACT). BACT means that an "emission limitation based on the maximum degree of reduction of each pollutant subject to regulation under this chapter emitted from or which results from any major emitting facility, which the permitting authority, on a case-by-case basis, taking into account energy, environmental, and economic impacts and other costs, determines is achievable for such facility through application of production processes and available methods, systems, and techniques, including fuel cleaning, clean fuels, or treatment or innovative fuel combustion techniques for control of each such pollutant. In no event shall application of 'best available control technology' result in emissions of any pollutants which will exceed the emissions allowed by any applicable standard established pursuant to section 7411 [NSPS] or 7412 [NESHAP] of this title."

⁴ At refineries, major modifications include projects resulting in a net emission increase greater than: 100 ton/yr of CO; 40 ton/yr of VOC, NO_x or SO_2 ; 25 ton/yr of PM; 15 ton/yr of PM₁₀; 10 ton/yr of PM_{2.5}; 0.6 ton/yr of lead; 7 ton/yr of sulfuric acid mist; or 10 ton/yr total reduced sulfur. Under the 2009 Tailoring Rule, this list was expanded to include projects resulting in a net emission increase greater than 75000 ton/yr of GHG.

Both BP and Phillips 66 have obtained PSD permits for modifications to their oil refineries. US Oil obtained early (1979) PSD permit approval for a project that was never constructed.

3.1.5 Regional Haze Program⁵

In 1999, EPA announced a major effort to improve air quality in national parks and wilderness areas. The Regional Haze Rule calls for state and federal agencies to work together to improve visibility in 156 national parks and wilderness areas. In Washington, initial best available retrofit technology (BART) determinations have been issued by Ecology and submitted to EPA for review and approval. Ecology has issued BART orders that establish reductions pursuant to the Regional Haze Rule for $NO_{X,} SO_2$, and PM to BP (Order 7836 and amendments) and Tesoro (Order 7838).

3.2 State and Local Programs

3.2.1 General Regulations

General regulations are developed and adopted by Washington State air quality agencies to address regional needs. The general regulations support the maintenance of ambient air quality standards, and many of these regulations have been submitted to and approved by EPA for incorporation into the SIP. The general regulations for the NWCAA and PSCAA jurisdictions (where the five Washington State refineries are located) include emission limits for PM, visible emissions, and SO₂. The general emission requirements are detailed in WAC 173-400 (for Ecology), NWCAA Regulation Sections 450-470, and PSCAA Regulation I. The various emission limits and other regulations that help limit emissions are included in each refinery's air operating permit as applicable and enforceable requirements.

3.2.2 Minor New Source Review Requirements

Section 70.94.152 of the Washington State Clean Air Act (WCAA) goes beyond the USCAA PSD program requirements by requiring permits for all new sources and modifications, even those that are minor.⁶ Moreover, the minor new source review program also includes approximately 400 TAPs. Even the smallest of the local refineries (i.e., the US Oil refinery) has nearly five dozen such permits covering an even greater number of emission units. Similar to the PSD program, BACT is a requirement for permit approval.

BACT is no less stringent than RACT and is often considerably more stringent. Per RCW 70.94.030(6), BACT means that "an emission limitation based on the maximum degree of reduction for each air pollutant subject to regulation under this chapter emitted from or that results from any new or modified stationary source, that the permitting authority, on a case-by-case basis, taking into account energy, environmental, and economic impacts and other costs, determines is achievable for such a source or modification through application

⁵ http://www.epa.gov/airquality/visibility/actions.html

⁶ Per RCW 70.94.152(11), "No person is required to submit a notice of construction or receive approval for a new source that is deemed by the Department of Ecology or board to have *de minimis* impact on air quality." Per RCW 70.94.152(12), *de minimis* means "new sources with trivial levels of emissions that do not pose a threat to human health or the environment."

of production processes and available methods, systems, and techniques, including fuel cleaning, clean fuels, or treatment or innovative fuel combustion techniques for control of each such a pollutant. In no event shall application of BACT result in emissions of any pollutants that will exceed the emissions allowed by any applicable standard under 40 *C.F.R.* Part 60 [NSPS] and Part 61 [NESHAP], as they existed on July 25, 1993, or their later enactments as adopted by reference by the director by rule."

RCW 70.94.153 (adopted in 1991) requires the acquisition of permits for the replacement or substantial alteration of emission-control technology. RACT is required for permit approval. (Projects that result in an emissions increase are subject to RCW 70.94.152 and its BACT requirements for the pollutants for which emissions have increased.) Per RCW 70.94.030(20), RACT means that "the lowest emission limit that a particular source or source category is capable of meeting by the application of control technology that is reasonably available considering technological and economic feasibility. RACT is determined on a case-by-case basis for an individual source or source category taking into account the impact of the source upon air quality, the availability of additional controls, the emission reduction to be achieved by additional controls, the impact of additional controls on air quality, and the capital and operating costs of the additional controls."

Each of the five Washington State refineries has obtained a large number of Notice of Construction (NOC) orders of approval under these statutory requirements. These NOC applications are reviewed by the local air authorities (NWCAA and PSCAA), sometimes in coordination with associated PSD permit reviews (completed by Ecology). Over time, the number of emission units operating under the authority of specific orders of approval (and case-specific BACT/RACT decisions, as described in the previous paragraphs) has continued to increase. To illustrate the level of NOC application processing for each of the refineries, a summary of NOC activity is presented in Table 3-1.

Company	Total Number of NOC Orders Issued	Total Number of Active NOC Orders	Total Number of NOC Orders Issued since January 1, 2001
BP	106	33	38
Phillips 66	45	21	27
Shell	82	29	37
Tesoro	73	38	50
US Oil	68	54	24

Table 3-1 Historical Notice of Construction Application/Approval Activity

Data on file as of 12/31/12 at NWCAA and PSCAA

3.3 Determination of Air Contaminants of Concern

3.3.1 Traditionally Regulated Contaminants

Petroleum refineries are one of the most heavily regulated source categories in the US faced with ongoing compliance demonstration with regulations that involve hundreds of

requirements. For the traditionally regulated air contaminants (i.e., PM, CO, NO_X, SO₂, ozone precursors, lead, HAPs, and TAPs), the existing requirements cover many of the activities, facilities and equipment at Washington State refineries, are more stringent than RACT, and are achieving significant reductions in emissions. These requirements for the five refineries are included in their respective Title V Air Operating Permits.

Annual stationary-source emissions of PM_{10} , SO_2 , NO_X , and VOCs from the five Washington State oil refineries from 2001 through 2011 are shown in Figures 3-1 through 3-4, respectively.



Figure 3-1 Annual PM₁₀ Emissions for Five Washington State Refineries from 2001 to 2011



Figure 3-2 Annual SO₂ Emissions for Five Washington State Refineries from 2001 to 2011



Figure 3-3 Annual NO_x Emissions for Five Washington State Refineries from 2001 to 2011



Figure 3-4 Annual VOC Emissions for Five Washington State Refineries from 2001 to 2011

As shown in these figures, annual emissions of PM_{10} , SO_2 , NO_X , and VOCs from these refineries have decreased dramatically since 2001. These emissions reductions are the result of the installation of control equipment combined with work practices to comply with increasingly stringent regulations as described in the previous sections. Furthermore, EPA's National Refinery Enforcement Initiative has also resulted in SO_2 , PM, NO_X , and VOC/HAP emission reductions over the past 10 years. Settlements resolving non-compliance issues at the BP, Phillips 66, Shell, and US Oil refineries are accessible to the public online (http://www.epa.gov/enforcement/air/oil.html).

The five Washington State refineries are either located in attainment areas (BP, Phillips 66, Shell, and Tesoro) or don't contribute to non-attainment (US Oil). Furthermore, the measured air quality in the areas with the four largest Washington State refineries typically receives the best (i.e., cleanest) EPA air quality rating of "good," meaning that "air pollution poses little or no risk."⁷

For these reasons, the Agencies conclude that PM (including both PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$), CO, NO_X , SO_2 , ozone precursors, lead, HAPs, and TAPs are not air contaminants of concern for this categorical RACT evaluation. It is possible that collateral reductions in these pollutants will

⁷ http://airnow.gov/index.cfm?action=airnow.main.

be achieved through the implementation of a RACT standard for GHGs. It is also possible that a plant-specific RACT evaluation might identify and require specific emission reductions of one or more traditionally regulated pollutants.

It should be stressed that this conclusion is not a RACT determination in itself and is only used to scope further work to be included in the RACT analysis for use in a RACT determination. The Agencies are aware of other air quality issues that may lead to further analyses, separate from this review. These issues would likely be addressed by other programs or standards, including, but not limited to the following:

- **Regional Haze Program** This ongoing program has many facets. Initial BART determinations have been issued by Ecology and submitted to EPA for review and approval. Additional emission reductions may be required to achieve reasonable progress in meeting the Class I area visibility goals. Visibility goals are unrelated to GHG issues. Therefore, it is logical that visibility issues would be resolved through a separate mechanism. This court-ordered RACT process only addresses refineries; whereas regional haze issues involve several source categories.
- SO₂ 1-Hr Standard EPA has promulgated a 1-hr standard for SO₂, but the guidance for states regarding how to complete the analysis for an attainment/nonattainment determination is still pending. Thus, it is not yet clear whether Washington State will have SO₂ nonattainment areas, where they might be located, or which sources might be identified as contributors to that determination. A RACT analysis that meets the requirements of a nonattainment area RACT determination might be needed. However, the SO₂ RACT determination process first requires a determination that the source is causing or contributing to actual or potential nonattainment, and such a determination has not yet been made.
- NO_x 1-Hr Standard EPA also has a new 1-hr standard for NO_x based on roadside continuous monitoring results. While the SO₂ standard described in the previous paragraph has is based in part on dispersion modeling, this standard is based on monitoring. Monitoring for this standard has not yet begun. Similar to the SO₂ standard, once a nonattainment area is identified through monitoring, the nonattainment area RACT determination process will address any sources identified as causing or contributing to nonattainment.

3.3.2 Greenhouse Gases

On December 7, 2009, the EPA Administrator issued two distinct findings regarding GHGs under Section 202(a) of the USCAA:

- Endangerment Finding The Administrator finds that the current and projected concentrations of the six key well-mixed GHGs CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆ in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations.
- **Cause or Contribute Finding** The Administrator finds that the combined emissions of these well-mixed GHGs from new motor vehicles and their engines contribute to the GHG pollution, which threatens public health and welfare.

These findings do not themselves impose any requirements on industries or other entities. However, these actions were a prerequisite for implementing GHG emissions standards for vehicles. In collaboration with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, EPA finalized emission standards for light-duty vehicles (2012 to 2016 model years) in May of 2010 and heavy-duty vehicles (2014 to 2018 model years) in August of 2011. The final vehicle emission standard rule that became effective on January 14, 2010 prompted including GHGs as regulated pollutants.

Of the six GHGs, oil refineries emit primarily CO_2 , with small amounts of CH_4 and N_2O . HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆ are not reported as being emitted from oil refineries in Washington State. Over 99% of GHG emissions from oil refineries are CO_2 . CH_4 and N_2O (CO_2 equivalent mass basis [CO_2e]) emissions are approximately 0.4% and 0.3%, respectively, of the total GHG emissions reported by oil refineries. Figure 3-5 shows the relative distribution (%) of reported GHG emissions from large stationary sources in Washington State during 2011, as well as the number of facilities by industry (EPA, 2013).⁸

⁸ The EPA GHG reporting rule includes large stationary source emissions of at least 25,000 mtons/yr of CO_2e . It does not include emissions from the transportation sector (e.g., cars, trains, planes, or ships).



Source: EPA, 2011

Figure 3-5 Relative Distribution of Washington State Stationary-Source GHG Emissions during 2011

The EPA database indicates that nationally, oil refining accounts for <6% of GHG emissions from large stationary sources. In contrast, oil refining is the second largest portion (28.6%) of stationary-source GHG emissions in Washington State, according to the data collected by EPA for 2011 accounting for approximately 6.5 million metric tons of GHG. The largest source category of GHG emissions in Washington State is mobile sources, accounting for 44 percent of the total 96 million metric tons of GHG emissions.

Based on EPA reporting information, reporting stationary sources emitted about 3.1 billion metric tons of greenhouse gases nation-wide. Washington State's five refineries produce less than one percent of the nation's GHGs from stationary sources. For the purpose of this RACT review, GHGs (calculated as CO_2 equivalents $[CO_2e]$) are deemed to be a pollutant of concern for the refinery source category in Washington State based on the following:

• GHGs have only recently been classified as air pollutants under federal regulations, so there has been little if any historical regulation of GHGs at refineries. There is only one known GHG requirement for Washington State refineries. The NWCAA was the first air quality regulatory agency in the country to establish both a GHG

emission limit and a continuous monitoring requirement for oil refineries, which was applied to the BP refinery in 2010 (NWCAA, 2010). 9

- Oil refineries are the second largest stationary source of GHGs in Washington State.
- The March 27, 2012 Remedy Order requires the Agencies to conduct a RACT analysis to address GHGs at oil refineries in Washington State.

Nothing in this discussion of the air contaminants of concern included for the purpose of this RACT review precludes the performance of a separate RACT analysis to support other rulemaking actions (e.g., those related to regional haze or future NAAQS attainment).

Section 4: Defining Oil Refinery Facilities

Oil refineries are integrated facilities that often dovetail operations with industrial units at the periphery of the facility. This is clearly the case for Washington State oil refineries. For the purpose of this RACT review, the "boundary" of the oil refinery is defined by the ownership status for each company.

The definition of a stationary source as provided in EPA Title V guidance was considered for the RACT review boundary. That boundary would include all industrial emission units operating in a location that is contiguous and adjacent to and under common control of the facility as defined in the EPA guidance. Applying this standard would result in the inclusion of three additional plants: the hydrogen plants operated by Air Liquide and Linde Gas and the sulfur recovery unit (SRU) operated by General Chemical, all located on March's Point. However, the inclusion of these units was dismissed for this determination for the following reasons: The SRU GHG emissions are relatively small when compared with overall refinery GHG emissions, and no hydrogen unit-specific RACT-level efficiency strategies were identified during this review.

Determining the universe of individual emission sources to be considered for RACT analysis within the facility boundaries is facilitated by assuming a *de minimis* threshold. This is reasonable because at a sprawling industrial site, such as a refinery, there is a wide range of emissions sources, from small laboratory instrument vents that emit a few hundred pounds (lbs) of CO_2e per year to massive fluidized catalytic cracking unit (FCCU) stacks that emit 500,000 to 1,000,000 tons per year [tpy] of CO_2e .

A potential-to-emit threshold of 75,000 tpy CO_2e^{10} is used to identify the sources to be considered for equipment-specific RACT development for two reasons: 1) The GHG

⁹ BP Order of Approval to Construct 1064 includes terms for GHG mitigation and monitoring for a hydrogen plant.

¹⁰ On June 29, 2012, EPA issued a final rule (77 FR 41050 published July 12, 2012) that did not revise the GHG permitting thresholds that were established in Step 1 and Step 2 of the GHG Tailoring Rule. The GHG Tailoring Rule emissions thresholds determine when USCAA permits under the New Source Review PSD and Title V Operating Permit programs are required for new and existing industrial facilities. The Tailoring Rule requires new facilities

Tailoring Rule is the only regulatory action that requires a control technology review that addresses stationary sources of GHG emissions; and 2) PSD thresholds have traditionally been used to identify sources subject to a RACT determination. The federal 75,000 tpy CO_2e threshold was based on an economic analysis of the impacts of new permitting and controls requirements. The threshold was adopted by EPA with the understanding that the economic impact of the application of GHG BACT is reasonable and will be incurred by an industry that can absorb the costs of review and the installation of controls. EPA expected the threshold to account for approximately 70% of the stationary-source GHG emissions.

The Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) GHG guidance document (Ecology, 2011) was also reviewed as a potential basis for a *de minimis* threshold. The guidance uses two thresholds that result in three categories of projects:

- 1. Projects expected to produce <10,000 metric tpy (mtpy) CO_2e^{11} are not required to address GHGs.
- 2. Projects expected to produce >10,000 mtpy CO_2e but <25,000 mtpy CO_2e are required to address GHG emissions qualitatively.
- 3. Projects expected to produce >25,000 mtpy CO_2e must address GHG emissions quantitatively and may be considered significant.

Washington State SEPA guidance was not used as a *de minimis* threshold for this RACT analysis for two primary reasons. First, the EPA GHG Tailoring Rule rejected the thresholds of 25,000 and 50,000 tpy CO_2e for PSD (and BACT) review due, in part, to the large number of projects that would be included, which would overwhelm the permitting agencies. These projects were expected to be accompanied by potentially high implementation costs for a relatively small amount of emissions addressed (<3%). The RACT process includes an economic component that is generally less stringent than BACT in that it applies to a group of existing separate sources constructed over a period of time. In contrast, BACT addresses only new equipment (or groups of related equipment) at the time of construction. It is presumed that the RACT economic impact analysis would likely reject the same sources that were rejected by BACT based on the same cost-benefit rationale.

Second, Washington State SEPA guidance thresholds are based on "expected" emissions, not potential emissions. Expected emissions are analogous to the "projected actual emissions" used in federal major source permitting programs and generally result in emissions that are lower than the potential emissions estimated for a source based 8,760 hrs of operation at maximum rate. Thresholds based on expected emissions do not provide

¹¹ RCW 70.94.151(5) emission reporting threshold.

with GHG emissions of at least 100,000 tpy CO_2e and existing facilities with at least 100,000 tpy CO_2e , making changes that would increase GHG emissions by at least 75,000 tpy CO_2e to obtain PSD permits. Facilities that must obtain a PSD permit anyway, to cover other regulated pollutants must also address GHG emissions increases of 75,000 tpy CO_2e or more. New and existing sources with GHG emissions above 100,000 tpy CO_2e must also obtain Tile V Operating Permits.

adequate certainty for the regulated community with regard identifying which specific emission units are included or excluded from review.

The 75,000-tpy CO_2e threshold (as potential to emit) is discussed in Section 7, Proposed RACT.

The following discussion of refinery processing uses traditionally regulated facility emission sources that historically have been reported on facility emissions inventories to determine where these emissions sources stand with regard to the proposed *de minimis* threshold. The traditionally reported sources of air emissions at the refineries are the largest stationary sources at the facilities for all pollutants, including GHGs.

Section 5: Petroleum Oil Refining Processes

5.1 General Process Overview

This section provides a brief overview of the petroleum refining process. This discussion is not intended to be comprehensive but rather to provide the reader with a basic understanding of the process steps involved in refining, how they fit together, and the complexity of the operating issues, as well as to identify the largest sources of GHG emissions within each of the refinery process units.

An oil refinery, or petroleum refinery, is an industrial process plant where crude oil is separated and transformed into more useful petroleum products, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, asphalt base, heating oil, kerosene, and liquefied petroleum gas (LPG). Oil refineries are typically large industrial complexes that are composed of processing units with extensive piping throughout the facility. The process units are highly integrated, with materials passing through and among the various units at each stage of processing, as well as for heat recovery.

Of importance for this discussion is the fact that no two refineries are identical. Each refinery is designed and operated to process a certain crude oil blend into an array of products. Each type of crude oil (identified by the geographical location of extraction) has specific properties that are unique; these include density (the content defined by small vs. long carbon chains), acidity, and metal contamination. Each refinery is designed for a certain range of crude oil feedstock (i.e., crude slate) properties. The crude slate options available to a given refinery are further limited by the chemical compatibilities among the crude oils (which affects the propensity for fouling during the refining process) and the compatibility of the crude oils with the metals composition of the refinery equipment and the reactor catalysts. Within these constraints, the crude slate is targeted for those crudes that are the most economically attractive and available to the refinery on an hourly basis. The products produced by each refinery are largely determined by the characteristics of the

crude slate because the processing equipment has limited flexibility with respect to operating conditions and capacity.

Although each facility is unique in terms of its specific equipment, all refineries use the same basic continuous closed process that requires an input of energy to transform crude oil into usable products through a series of steps: separation, conversion, treatment, and blending. These steps are used to create "process units," groups of equipment assembled together to accomplish a specific process task. Most refinery operations involve the performance of more than one of these steps and all refineries operate multiple process units to produce final products. Figure 5-1 shows a typical refinery layout with common feedstocks, processing units, and products. Brief descriptions of the four steps follow.



Source: CARB, 2013

Figure 5-1 Typical Refinery Layout

5.1.1 Separation

Hydrocarbon mixtures are typically separated into their components by exploiting differences in relative volatility (i.e., boiling point), most frequently by fractional distillation. In the distillation column, lower-boiling-temperature components (i.e., those that are lighter, with a lower number of carbon atoms) are converted to a vapor and rise to the top of the vessel, where they are removed, while the higher-boiling-temperature components (i.e., those that are heavier, with a higher number of carbon atoms) pass out the bottom of

the column or are extracted from some intermediate point on the column. Alternatively, a hot vapor stream can be cooled to "knock out" the heavier, lower-boiling-temperature material. Separation processes are performed at different pressures in order to expand the range of boiling points over which materials can be separated. Distillation columns are usually equipped with a reboiler, which is a process heater on the bottom stream of the column that provides the heat energy needed to perform the separation.

Wash water is used and collected in many refinery process units and must be removed from hydrocarbon products and intermediates. Water is removed in settling vessels, where over time, gravity causes the water and oil to separate into two phases. Water is usually removed from the process equipment from the bottom and is often referred to as "blow down." This process water is always contaminated with some amount of residual hydrocarbons and must be routed into the facility's wastewater collection system and treated in an onsite treatment plant.

5.1.2 Conversion

Conversion is the process that thermally or catalytically converts a low-value hydrocarbon component to a more useable product. For example, "cracking" is the process whereby heavy, long-chain hydrocarbons are converted to lighter, shorter-chain hydrocarbons. Conversion processes often take place under high pressures, higher than atmospheric pressure. The catalysts used in conversion can be liquids or solids; solid catalysts can be in the form of fixed beds (in which the catalysts are contained in a vessel with process fluids passing through them) or fluidized (in which the catalyst particles are entrained in the liquid).

Refinery process units that include conversion equipment are typically identified by the conversion portion of the unit (e.g., the FCCU). The FCCU also incorporates separation equipment, as well as treatment and blending equipment within the process unit.

5.1.3 Treatment

Intermediate and product streams contain contaminants such as sulfur and nitrogen that must be removed to protect downstream catalysts and meet final product specifications. Treatment processes remove these contaminants, most commonly through hydrogenation. Organically bound sulfur reacts with hydrogen at high pressure and temperature to form hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) gas, which is then separated and further treated to remove the sulfur (in non-toxic elemental form).

5.1.4 Blending

Some process unit feed streams (e.g., crude oil) and final products are created by blending streams to meet the required product specifications. Refineries operate many individual tanks connected by complex pumping and piping systems (i.e., "tank farms") to accommodate the blending of each component.

5.1.5 Refinery General Air Emission Categories

Air emissions are generally categorized as point sources, which are identified individually in the facility emissions inventory, and fugitive sources, which are generally identified as a

group or area of emissions. Following the general refinery process discussion, the specifics of the five refineries operating in Washington are provided in Section 5.

Refinery process units are equipped with pressure relief valves (PRVs) that release system pressure during emergency conditions. These devices may release to the atmosphere or be connected to the facility's flare system. In either case, PRV emissions are not specifically addressed in this document because they do not release normal or routine process emissions.

Every refinery is equipped with a flare header system, a large system of pipes that collects process vent and PRV emissions. The collected material may be piped to a recovery system (i.e., compressors) in order to recycle the material back into the process as fuel gas, or it may be combusted by a flare, which is designed and built to suit the needs of the each individual facility. Flares, which are essentially large burners, are equipped with pilot flames, steam injections (for mixing the flame), and monitoring devices to sure that the pilot flames are operating. Flares can combust large volumes of process vent emissions, including hydrocarbons and sulfur, converting them to less dangerous compounds with regard to flammability and toxicity (e.g., H_2S to SO_2).

Refineries also feature a variety of vessels, heaters, heat exchangers, and distillation columns that are connected by an intricate system of piping and associated components (e.g., valves, pumps, and compressors) that control flow rate and direction. Each of these components has the potential to leak process material; and if the material is volatile, it will be released to the atmosphere. Equipment component leak emissions are grouped together and characterized as fugitive (non-point source) emissions.

5.2 Refinery Process Unit Descriptions

5.2.1 Crude Distillation Unit

The crude distillation unit separates crude oil (including some recycled stocks) by distilling material into fractions according to their boiling-point range. The resulting fractions are sent to storage and/or other refinery process units.

Crude oil from onsite storage tanks is first desalted (water-washed) to remove contaminants that could cause downstream fouling or corrosion. The desalted crude is then heated and pumped to the crude column, where it is distilled into fractions; the fractions are routed to other process units and/or storage tanks. The crude column is also known as the atmospheric column because it operates at approximately atmospheric pressure.

The atmospheric column overhead liquid, which contains LPG- and gasoline-range material, is subjected to further distillation before being sent to other refinery process units. Products in the gasoline and gas-oil boiling ranges are routed to storage and/or treatment processes. The highest-boiling-point (i.e., heaviest) fraction, straight-run residue, is generally fed to the vacuum flasher.

The largest emissions point sources from the crude unit are the crude heaters. The emissions are combustion products.

5.2.2 Crude Residue Vacuum Distillation Unit (Vacuum Flasher)

The vacuum flasher separates heavy straight-run residue into fractions under vacuum. The distillation takes place under vacuum conditions because otherwise, the high temperatures required to fractionate the residue at high pressure would result in the thermal cracking of the residue and coke formation in the process equipment. The recovered distillates are fed to the FCCU; the remaining fraction, pitch, is sent on for further processing or may be blended into fuel oil or asphalt binder.

The largest emissions point sources from the vacuum unit are the combustion units associated with heating the feed stream to the distillation column.

5.2.3 Hydrotreaters

Hydrotreaters, also known as hydrodesulfurization units, are conversion units that are identified by their feed stream characteristics (e.g., diesel hydrotreater). Hydrotreaters use hydrogen and a fixed-bed catalyst to remove contaminants, such as sulfur, nitrogen, and metals, from their feed. The feed stream to the hydrotreaters is generally heated prior to passing into the catalyst vessel. The treated product is then separated, and streams are routed for further processing. The hydrotreated product may be fed to other process units (e.g., gasoline-range products to the catalytic reformer [CR]) or used as blending components in fuel products. The hydrotreater catalyst is typically removed from the process reactor vessel and regenerated offsite.

The largest emissions from hydrotreating/hydrodesulfurization are combustion products from the process heaters.

5.2.4 Catalytic Reformer

A CR is a conversion unit that uses a system of heaters and fixed-bed catalytic reactors to increase the octane rating of its gasoline-range feed. The resulting product is sent to gasoline component storage for use in fuel blending. The reforming reaction generates hydrogen, which is recovered and used in other process units, including the hydrotreaters. The CR catalyst requires periodic regeneration to maintain activity. The regeneration process involves removing coke from the catalyst through combustion and adding chlorine to the catalyst via a chloriding agent.

Emissions from the catalytic reformers are primarily combustion products from process heaters. Much smaller amounts of combustion products that may have chlorine from the regeneration process are also emitted from the CR unit.

5.2.5 Benzene Reduction Units

Multiple patented technologies are used to reduce benzene in gasoline products, including catalytic benzene hydrogenation and fractionation schemes. Benzene reduction is necessary to meet mobile source air toxic regulations. Heating may be required in the process and may be accomplished through the use of steam or direct-fired heaters.

The primary point source emissions from benzene reduction units are combustion products from process heaters, when they are used.

5.2.6 Fluidized Catalytic Cracking Unit

The FCCU uses a circulating fluidized solid catalyst at elevated temperatures and pressures to convert heavy gas-oil feeds into lighter materials, such as gasoline. Liquid- and vaporphase products are separated from the catalyst and sent on for further processing. Coke formed as a reaction product remains on the catalyst and is removed through combustion in a low-oxygen environment in the FCCU regenerator. Regenerator flue gas is then passed into CO boilers, completing the conversion of CO to CO₂, destroying residual organic HAPs, and generating steam.

The FCCU regenerator vent is one of the largest sources of emissions at a refinery. FCCU emissions include combustion products with potentially high levels of CO, SO_2 , particulates, and NO_x . At the Washington State refineries, FCCU regenerator exhaust gases pass through CO boilers and are treated in flue gas scrubbers (FGSs). The FGSs remove SO_2 and PM through contact with a caustic solution. Other refineries may have alternative control devices, such as electrostatic precipitators.

In addition to the regenerator vent, the FCCU may have additional process heater point sources emitting combustion products and catalyst handling operations emitting particulates.

5.2.7 Hydrocracking

Hydrocracking is a process that uses high temperature, high pressure, hydrogen, and catalyst to convert gas oil materials into product streams such as gasoline, blending components, reformer feeds, and jet fuel. Similar to hydrotreating, hydrocracking removes sulfur and nitrogen compounds. The value of the process is that it produces more-valuable lower-molecular-weight hydrocarbons. Butane and refinery fuel gas are byproducts of this process.

The primary point sources of emissions from hydrocracking are heaters, which emit combustion gases.

5.2.8 Isomerization

Two isomerization processes are used in petroleum refining: one that uses butane (C_4) and one that uses pentane/hexane (C_5/C_6). Isomerization is a process that converts n-butane, n-pentane, and n-hexane into their respective isoparaffins, which have substantially higher octane numbers. Isomerization accomplishes the conversion of n-butane into isobutane, to provide feedstock for alkylation units, and the conversion of normal pentanes and hexanes into higher-branched isomers for gasoline blending.

The primary emission point from isomerization units is the process heater, which emits combustion products.

5.2.9 Alkylation

The alkylation plant uses sulfuric acid or hydrofluoric acid as a catalyst to make alkylate, a high-octane gasoline blending component, from low-octane naphtha intermediates. Alkylate is sent to gasoline component storage following fractionation and in-plant treatment.

There are no point sources of emissions from the alkylation process.

5.2.10Delayed Coking

Delayed coking is the only main process in a modern petroleum refinery that is a continuous-batch process. Delayed coking units process heavy feed material, converting it into light hydrocarbons (i.e., coker gas) and solid coke. Coker feed enters the system through the lower portion of the main fractionator distillation column (sometimes referred to as the combination tower), where it combines with drum recycle prior to entering the coker heater. Feed heated in the coker heater then passes to one of the coke drums, where it thermally cracks to form solid coke (roughly 50% conversion) and lighter hydrocarbons. Flow through the feed heater is continuous, with the heated stream being switched between at least two drums. While one drum is on line filling with coke, the other drum is being steam-stripped, cooled, decoked, pressure checked, and warmed up. Coke drum overhead vapors flow to the fractionator distillation column and are generally recycled to other refinery units. The solid coke is cut out of the drum using high-pressure water drilling and then dropped into a pit to dewater. The solid coke is then sold as a product or may be further processed.

The main air pollutant emissions from the coking process include combustion products from the coker heater, coke drum venting volatile organic compounds (including toxic air pollutants), and particulates from coke handling operations.

5.2.11Treating

Treating process operations remove contaminants from various process streams so that the streams can be used in other refinery processes or blended into finished products.

Circulating amine solution (e.g., methyl diethanolamine), is used to remove acid gases, primarily H_2S , from fuel-gas-range streams (methane $[C_1]$ to C_4). In the amine regenerator, recovered acid gases are steam-stripped from the rich amine solution and routed to sulfur recovery (discussed separately). The stripped (lean) amine solution is recirculated. Treated fuel gas is routed to the refinery fuel gas system for use in the refinery.

Fuel streams that carry sulfur contamination, particularly "straight run" fuels that are collected directly from the crude atmospheric column, (including gasoline, jet, and diesel) are treated for removal of H_2S , mercaptans and naphthenic acids. In general, the treatment processes do not require significant heating. Caustic soda is used to remove H_2S and mercaptans from propane (C₃) and it is also used to remove H_2S , mercaptans, and organic acids from FCCU gasoline streams. Merox (mercaptan oxidation) treating is also used to convert FCCU gasoline mercaptans to disulfides. The majority of spent caustic streams from these treaters are recovered and shipped offsite or treated in the refinery wastewater treatment plant.

Treating units do not have large sources of emissions. However, they may be significant energy consumer units, using steam and power.

5.2.12Hydrogen Production

Hydrotreating and hydrocracking units consume hydrogen. Hydrogen is produced as a by-product in catalytic reforming units. Hydrogen may also be produced in captive or merchant hydrogen production units, which typically use steam methane reforming (SMR) techniques.

The hydrogen processes used in the Washington refineries involve both the older-style and modern units. The older-style SMR unit at the BP facility has scrubbing and methanation for purification of the hydrogen product stream. Newer hydrogen plants recover the product through pressure swing absorption (PSA).

Hydrogen production emissions consist of combustion products from the SMR furnace.

5.2.13Sulfur Recovery

Acid gases from the amine treatment process (described in section 4.2.11) are routed to SRUs. The most comment SRU is a Claus process unit, which recovers and produces elemental sulfur from acid gas. Tailgas from the Claus process unit is treated in a secondary recovery process unit to reduce SO_2 emissions. Secondary recovery processes include Shell Claus off-gas treating (SCOT) units that convert residual H₂S to elemental sulfur and units that scrub the sulfur out of the tailgas stream and recycle it back to the Claus unit.

The primary air emission point in the sulfur recovery process is an incinerator that is used to ensure that any residual sulfur is oxidized to SO_2 .

5.2.14Fuel Gas Blender

The fuel gas blending system mixes process gases recovered from refinery process units with propane, butane, or purchased natural gas, as needed, to supply fuel for the refinery's furnaces. Fuel gas is collected in a header system and routed to a fuel gas blending vessel (the fuel gas blend drum) prior to distribution to combustion units.

A continuous emissions monitoring system analyzes the blended fuel gas sulfur concentration (primarily in the form of H_2S) to demonstrate compliance with fuel H_2S and stack SO_2 emission standards. The monitoring system is typically installed on the outlet of the fuel gas blend drum (i.e., on a single monitoring location instead of each heater and boiler combusting fuel gas) in order to minimize the cost of monitoring. Refinery fuel gas is combusted within the refinery and is generally not sold for use by other facilities. The exception is when a refinery has an associated electricity/steam cogeneration plant, and the refinery provides fuel and receives steam in return.

5.2.15Logistics

Raw materials, process intermediates, blending components, process chemicals and additives, and finished products are stored in a variety of storage tanks and vessels at the refinery. Gasoline blending, all petroleum product shipments and receipts, and some of the process chemical/additive shipments and receipts take place outside of the process unit boundary limits.
Examples of the modes of transportation employed in the movement of petroleum and process chemicals, and the materials moved, include:

- Marine shipments and receipts: includes crude oil, process intermediates (e.g., FCCU feed), blending components, finished liquid products, and coke
- Pipeline shipments and receipts: includes crude oil, finished liquid products, process intermediates, H_2S , and acid transfers
- Rail shipments and receipts: includes crude oil, LPG, fresh and spent caustic, asphalt binder, coke, sulfur, and catalytic cracking catalysts
- Truck shipments and receipts: includes finished liquid products, asphalt binder, process chemicals, catalysts and additives, sulfur, fresh and spent caustic/acid, and coke

5.2.16Utilities

The refining process requires a significant amount of steam. Steam used at a refinery may be generated in onsite boilers, either as direct-fired boilers or waste-heat boilers. Direct-fired boilers are typically operated as a utility unit. Alternatively, steam may be generated by electricity/steam cogeneration facilities consisting of a combustion turbine (linked to an electrical generator) and a heat recovery steam generator (HRSG). For refineries that operate FCCUs, the CO boilers recover waste heat from CO combustion and can be fired with auxiliary fuel to generate large volumes of steam. Other boilers generate steam exclusively from waste heat within a process unit (e.g., FCCU catalyst coolers). The steam generated by the boilers is generally delivered to the users at multiple pressure levels that range from 650 to 15 pounds per square inch gauge (psig). Recovered condensate is recycled for boiler feed water (BFW) treatment. Air pollutant emissions from the direct-fired boilers and turbines are combustion products.

BFW treatment prepares makeup water and recycled steam condensate for use in the refinery steam generators. Ionic species present in makeup water are removed by regenerable strong acid ion exchange, decarbonation, and regenerable strong base ion exchange. The treated makeup water is mixed with recovered steam condensate, deaerated to remove dissolved gases, treated with chemicals to prevent fouling and corrosion in the boilers and downstream equipment, and pumped to the boilers.

Utilities are typically a large portion of the facility-wide combustion emissions at an oil refinery.

5.2.17Wastewater Treatment Plant

The wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) protects the environment from potentially harmful discharges of waterborne material by treating wastewater generated in the refining process. Process wastewater streams, domestic wastewater, and surface runoff from non-process areas are routed through the WWTP. The WWTP may also receive oil/water mixtures from offsite facilities, such as marketing locations and pipeline stations, and may also receive ballast water from marine vessels.

In general, process area wastewater is collected in individual drain systems and routed to an oil/water separator (commonly known as an American Petroleum Institute [API] separator) system via closed sewers. The water leaving the API separator is combined with treated domestic wastewater and routed to clarifiers for further oil/solids removal. The clarified water is then biologically treated in aeration basins to remove remaining organics. The treated effluent water is combined with non-process surface runoff (storm water) and is discharged via a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)-permitted outfall. Oil recovered at the WWTP is recycled to refinery process units; recovered solids are removed, concentrated, and shipped offsite for disposal, except for biological solids, which are typically applied to land.

Air emissions from the wastewater collection and treatment system include leaks of hydrocarbons from the sealed portions. The biological treatment portion of the system can be a source of odorous air emissions and methane.

Section 6: Washington State Refineries-Specific Information

Five refineries operate in the State of Washington:

- BP Cherry Point refinery
- Phillips 66 Ferndale refinery
- Shell Puget Sound refinery
- Tesoro Anacortes refinery
- US Oil Tacoma refinery

This section summarizes the common air pollution sources at the refineries and highlights the important differences between the facilities. Table 6-1 is an overview of the five Washington State refineries. The sources of this information are noted.

	Process Capacity	Footprint	Year	Crude Slate Source?	Total Faci (mto	lity CO₂e ns) ^d
Refinery	(bbls/day) ^a	(acres) ^b	Built	(generalized) ^c	2010	2011
ВР	234,000	3,300	1971	ANS + global + Canadian	2,536,736	2,429,027
Phillips 66	107,500	900	1954	ANS + Canadian	880,729	1,004,379
Shell	149,000	800	1958	ANS + Canadian	2,047,238	2,085,203
Tesoro	125,000	900	1955	Canadian + global + Bakken	588,102 ^e	1,164,665
US Oil	42,000	136	1957	ANS + Canadian	185,406	147,116

Table 6-1 Overview of Washington State Refineries

^a Crude unit capacity in bbls/day (EIA, 2012).

^b Approximate areas reported in state and local water quality and air quality permits and technical support documents.

^c Crude slate reported in Agency permit technical support documents ANS = Alaska North Slope.

^d 2010 and 2011 EPA GHG emission inventory data.

^e The Tesoro refinery was shut down for approximately 6 months in 2010 following a fire.

6.1 Boilers

There are 14 permanent utility boilers in operation at Washington State refineries for a total heating capacity of approximately 3,000 million British thermal units per hour (MMBtu/hr). The boilers are primarily operated using refinery fuel gas, followed by natural gas (or natural gas as supplemental fuel) and fuel oil. Based on emissions inventory documents, all boilers except one in operation in Washington State are able to use refinery fuel gas. The exception is Tesoro's F-753, which can only be fired using natural gas or propane. Based on the refineries' air operating permits, in addition to fuel gas, one boiler at US Oil (B-4) and two boilers at Tesoro (F-751 and F-752) are equipped to fire fuel oil. Table 6-2 summarizes the boiler capacity and related emissions at the five Washington State refineries. A detailed list of the utility boilers operating at Washington State refineries is included as Appendix A.

		Emissions				
Definence	Utility Boiler Capacity	Annual Potential CO ₂ e	Actual 2010 CO ₂ e	Actual 2011 CO ₂ e		
RP	(MMBtu/nr)* 1 169	(tons)* 666 588	(tons) ² 281 057	(tons) ² 282 622		
Phillips 66	525	299,366	137,681	191,033		
Shell	390	222,386	45,958	56,458		
Tesoro	756	431,087	119,409	202,406		
US Oil	179	102,070	53,995	34,902		

Table 6-2 Washington State Refinery Boiler Overview

^a Excludes cogeneration capacity.

^b Assumes 8,760 hrs of operation at capacity (firing fuel gas) – 40 CFR Part 98 Subpart C emission factors.

^c 2010 and 2011 EPA GHG emission inventory data except for US Oil data, which were reported directly to NWCAA.

Shell operates an electricity/steam cogeneration facility within the Anacortes refinery. The cogeneration unit operates two combustion turbines that burn natural gas and refinery fuel gas as their primary fuels to produce steam and electricity. The cogeneration unit electricity output is tied into the regional power grid, with 100% of the produced electricity being sold to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The refinery then purchases its operating power back from PSE. The unit is capable of producing a nominal 140 megawatts of electricity, while the refinery receives approximately 300,000 lbs/hr of steam from the HRSG. Duct burners are installed at the inlet of the HRSG to provide addition steam, and they are configured to burn natural gas and/or refinery fuel gas.

The refineries also have numerous waste heat boilers within the process units. These boilers also provide steam to the header systems (described in more detail in the next paragraphs) for use throughout the plant. Some waste heat boilers require supplemental fuel firing; others have no supplemental fuel.

Some of the refineries also receive steam into the header system from offsite sources. Shell purchases steam from the adjacent Air Liquide hydrogen plant. The Phillips 66 refinery has an adjacent facility (Tenaska) that operates a cogeneration unit that occasionally provides steam to the refinery.

Utility boilers, along with cogeneration units, waste heat boilers (e.g., CO boilers and catalyst coolers), and offsite steam sources, operate as integrated units, providing steam to refinery, as needed, via a complex piping, or "header," system. The header systems include two to four delivery pressures of steam via extensive interconnected piping systems. The high-pressure portions of the header systems are fed by the utility boilers and high-heat process units, such as the FCCU. In general, the lower-pressure headers collect spent high-pressure steam and are augmented by waste heat boilers in lower-heat-rate units.

Often, backup steam generation (in the form of a boiler running at idle) is available in the system for rapid response. The steam system in the refinery is essential for normal

processing and for bringing the units into and out of operation (starting up and shutting down the units). Therefore, all refineries maintain excess steam capacity for emergency events (e.g., unit upsets or boiler upsets).

Improvements in operating efficiencies or steam load requirements can be realized throughout the entire steam system. Therefore, the utility steam system is most effectively approached as a group, and emissions considered as a combined total.

6.2 Process Heaters

The five Washington State refineries operate 79 process heaters, with a combined total of approximately 9,500 MMBtu/hr of potential heat input. A detailed list of the refinery process heaters is included as Appendix B. A summary of their capacities and CO_2e emissions is presented in Table 6-3. The majority of the heaters are gas-fired, burning either treated refinery fuel gas or purchased natural gas. A few of the heaters (i.e., five [three at Tesoro and two at US Oil]) have the capability or are permitted to fire fuel oil; however, fuel oil is rarely used in those units.

Refinery	Total Heater Capacity (MMBtu/hr) ^a	No. of Heaters with Capacity >75,000 tpy CO ₂ e ^b	Total Potential CO2e (tons) ^c	Actual 2010 CO₂e (tons) ^d	Actual 2011 CO2e (tons) ^d
BP	4,900	10	2,779,000	1,547,171	1,388,417
Phillips 66	990	3	565,000	381,810	413,809
Shell	1,730	5	986,482	662,339	551,558
Tesoro	1,500	5	831,000	55,793	166,832
US Oil	290	0	165,000	145,589	119,773

Table 6-3 Washington State Refinery Process Heater Overview

^a Individual heater capacities from Agency records.

^b Number of individual heaters or aggregated heaters operating together

^c Assumes 8,760 hrs of operation at capacity (firing fuel gas) – 40 CFR Part 98 Subpart C emission factors

^d 2010 and 2011 EPA GHG emission inventory data, except for US Oil data, which were reported directly to the Agencies.

Unlike the steam system, process heaters generally function independently and serve a specific purpose. Heater duty varies with demand within the process unit. Process heat demand is based on feed rate and composition, as well as catalyst life cycle and equipment limitations.

The principal energy-using processes in refineries (in order of overall energy consumption based on the national oil refining sector) are crude (or atmospheric) distillation, hydrotreating, reformer, vacuum distillation, alkylate production, catalytic cracking, and hydrocracking (Worrell and Galitsky, 2005). The energy use for each of these processes is predominantly associated with the unit's heaters and steam demand. The five Washington State refineries are generally consistent with this energy-use profile.

6.3 Fluidized Catalytic Cracking Units

Three of the Washington State refineries operate FCCUs: Phillips 66, Shell, and Tesoro. The units are detailed in Table 6-4. It is important to note that the Tesoro FCCU operated for only a portion of the year in 2010.

Table 6-4 Washington State Refinery Fluidized Catalytic Cracking Unit Overview

	FCCU Capacity	Type of Pollutant-Control Equipment	Regenerator CO₂e (tons) ^b		Supplemental Fuel CO ₂ e (tons) ^b	
Refinery	(bbls/day) ^a	Installed	2010	2011	2010	2011
Phillips 66	36,100	SO_2 and PM – caustic scrubber NO_X - ESNCR	336,501	439,591	37,235	38,316
Shell	57,900	SO_2 and PM – caustic scrubber	635,166	703,522	6,336	6,049
Tesoro	52,000	SO_2 and PM – caustic scrubber	276,459	563,329	60,561	124,074

^a Capacity as reported by EIA (2012).

^b EPA GHG emission inventory data.

6.4 Delayed Coking

Two of the Washington State refineries operate delayed cokers: BP and Shell. Air emissions from the cokers are primarily from the feed heaters, which were discussed in Section 5.2. The remaining GHG emission sources are methane emissions from the blowdown system and venting that occurs at the end of drum depressurization. GHG emissions consist only of methane, which is converted to CO₂e emissions in the Table 6-5.

Table 6-5 Washington Refinery Delayed Coking Overview

	Coker Capacity	Coker CO₂e Emissions (tons)		Uncontrolled CO₂e Blowdown (tons)	
Refinery	(bbls/day) ^a	2010	2011	2010	2011
BP	58,000	84	69	6,597	4,217
Shell	25,300	245	245	3,007	2,694

Capacity as reported by EIA (2012).

6.5 Catalytic Reformers

Each of the five refineries in Washington State operates one or more CRs. The reformers vary in size and design. The majority of the emissions from CR units come from the heaters. However, a small amount of emissions result from catalyst regeneration. Catalyst regeneration schedules vary significantly based on the design of the unit, ranging from semi-continuous to multi-year cycles. Regeneration emissions reported by Washington State refineries are summarized in Table 6-6.

	CR Capacity	Regeneration CO ₂ e Emissions (tons)		
Refinery	(bbls/day) ^a	2010	2011	
BP	65,000	3	4	
Phillips 66	17,400	not reported	Not reported	
Shell	33,300	9	23.4	
Tesoro	26,000	23	61	
US Oil	6,800	11	0	

Table 6-6 Washington State Refinery Catalytic Reforming Overview

^a Capacity as reported by EIA (2012).

6.6 Coke Calcining

BP operates a coke calcining unit. Coke calcining is a process used to improve the quality and value of "green" coke from the delayed coker. Coke is calcined to convert green coke to a more valuable "needle" coke and to reduce sulfur and VOC content. Green coke is fed to one of three calciner kilns, each with a rotating hearth that heat the coke to 2,400 to 2,700 °F. The calcined coke leaves the kiln and goes through a water spray cooler. The cooled coke is then conveyed by covered belt to the calcined coke storage barns, where it is stored until it is loaded to rail cars or trucks. Waste heat from the calciner is recovered in a steam generator. The calciner waste heat steam generators may be used to generate steam directly from fuel gas combustion (while not processing coke). Additional materials processed in the calciner include WWTP-recovered slop oils and recovered coke and coke fines.

Air pollutant emissions from the calciners are primarily combustion pollutants with high amounts of SO₂ and PM. Flue gases from the calciner hearths are routed to caustic scrubbers followed by wet electrostatic precipitators in two parallel systems; hearth 1 and 2 flue gases are combined and routed to stack 1; hearth 3 flue gases are routed to stack 2. BP calciner GHG emissions were reported to the EPA GHG inventory for 2010 to be 443,932 tons CO₂e plus an additional 9,533 tons CO₂e from the combustion of fuel gas in the waste heat boilers. For 2011, BP reported 490,945 tons CO₂e from the calciners plus an additional 11,035 tons CO₂e from the combustion of fuel gas in the waste heat boilers.

6.7 Sulfur Recovery Units

Each of the five Washington State refineries has associated SRUs, four of which are located onsite. The Tesoro refinery does not operate an SRU onsite but instead contracts with General Chemical to treat the facility's acid gas. General Chemical typically uses a portion of the acid gas stream for its sulfuric acid plant and also operates an SRU that treats excess acid gas as well as during times when the acid plant is off-line. The SRU at General Chemical is owned by Tesoro but operated by General Chemical through a contract agreement. The SRUs associated with the Washington State refineries are presented in Table 6-7.

	SRU	CO ₂ e Emise	sions (tpy)
Refinery	Technology	2010	2011
BP	Claus/SCOT/ CanSolve [®]	27,332	32,645
Phillips 66	Claus/SCOT	2,169	6,957
Shell	Claus/SCOT	18,106	20,529
Tesoro ^a	Claus/SCOT	1,809	3,867
US Oil	Claus/LO-CAT [®]	482	710

Table 6-7 Washington State Refinery Sulfur Recovery Overview

^a Tesoro contracts with General Chemical to treat acid gas offsite.

6.8 Flares

Flaring can account for a large portion of the GHG emissions from refineries if a facility upset requires the relief of system pressure. However, the four largest Washington State refineries operate recovery systems that recycle the emissions back to the facility fuel gas header for use in combustion devices. Table 6-8 summarizes the amount of flaring at the Washington refineries.

Table 6-8 Washington State Refinery Flare Overview

	Recovery	Flare GHG Emissions (tons CO2e)		
Refinery	Capacity?	2010	2011	
BP	Yes	53,882	34,923	
Phillips 66	Yes	22,960	6,493	
Shell	Yes	13,336	14,982	
Tesoro	Yes	42,960	8,404	
US Oil	No	4,022	5,746	

6.9 Hydrogen Production

Two Washington State oil refineries use hydrogen production, both via steam methane reforming: BP and Shell. The total hydrogen capacity for these refineries was reported as 122 million standard cubic feet per day (MMscfd) in 2012 (EIA, 2012). Additional hydrogen capacity at both the Shell and BP refineries has been permitted recently, so the available hydrogen production capacity for 2013 is expected to increase. The GHG emissions from hydrogen production are presented the Table 6-9. The BP hydrogen reformer heater emissions are also included in the process heater totals. Hydrogen for the Shell refinery is produced by Air Liquide and Linde Gas.

	GHG Emissions (tons CO₂e)		
Facility	2010	2011	
BP	308,712	428,823	
Air Liquide	Not reported	69,599	
Linde Gas (March 2013 startup)	Not applicable	Not applicable	

Table 6-9 Washington State Refinery Hydrogen Production Overview

6.10 Refinery Complexity

The Nelson Complexity Index (NCI) is an index that reflects the capital investment in the secondary conversion capacity of a petroleum refinery. The larger the NCI for a given refinery, the more capacity that facility has to upgrade crude oil using complex units such as reforming, catalytic cracking, and isomerization. The most complex refineries in the world are reported to have NCIs of 14 to 15, while the US average NCI is about 9.5 and the European average NCI is 6.5 (Wikipedia, 2013).

The NCI was developed by Wilbur L. Nelson in a series of articles in *Oil & Gas Journal* in the early 1960s and updated in 1976.¹² The NCI calculation assigns a complexity factor to each major type of process unit in the refinery based on its operational complexity and investment cost as compared to the crude distillation unit, which is assigned a complexity factor of 1.0. The complexity of each process unit is then calculated by multiplying its complexity factor by its throughput ratio as a percentage of crude distillation capacity. Adding up the complexity values assigned to each process unit, including crude distillation, determines a refinery's complexity on the NCI.

The Agencies calculated the NCI using publicly available information for the purpose of identifying the relative complexity of the five Washington State refineries. The Washington State refineries rank (in order of least to most complex) according to the Agencies calculation as follows: US Oil, Tesoro, Phillips 66, BP, and Shell. The average NCI for the five Washington State refineries as calculated by the Agencies is 8, with a range of 5 to 10.5.

The process units that contribute most to the NCI are also the units that are most energy intensive. That energy intensity is reflected in facility GHG emissions. Therefore, two facilities with equal crude throughput ratings that have NCIs that are significantly different will likely have significantly different levels of GHG emissions. Other factors that are not complexity related could also influence GHG emissions for a facility, such as what type of steam generation system is operated (e.g., cogeneration verses conventional boilers).

¹² The *Oil & Gas Journal* article is available from the publisher for a fee.

Section 7: Identify and Evaluate Control Technologies and Strategies

This section generally describes the GHG reduction strategies currently in use in the oil refining sector and then focuses more closely on how the strategies may apply at the five Washington State oil refineries. For each GHG reduction strategy that is identified, an evaluation and reasoning for rejecting or pursuing further each strategy is explained.

The reasons for eliminating technologies or strategies include that the option is technological infeasible, not commercially demonstrated, requires changes of existing laws, applies to equipment outside the refinery boundary as stipulated in this RACT review, and/or requires a process redesign. A given strategy may be rejected for one or more of these reasons.

In this document, redesign means substantially altering or reengineering the structural design of an existing process unit. While reengineering a process unit can reap efficiency benefits and CO_2 emission reductions, such approaches are not considered as potential RACT candidates. Redesign projects present a number of insurmountable challenges for a RACT determination including process safety implications, process performance specifications, the complexity of economic analysis, and the precedent that air quality regulations do not dictate the operations of a manufacturer, but rather set the applicable emissions standards¹³.

The use of redesign projects would be appropriate by regulated facilities to improve efficiency in order to meet a broader goal, such as a unit-specific or facility-wide benchmark or benchmark improvement. The refinery may use these redesign projects to meet an overall goal for efficiency as is feasible on a facility specific basis.

The possible RACT candidates identified only one proposed technology solution in the traditional sense of air pollution control, where a pollutant is collected and either destroyed or transferred to a non-atmospheric media; the use of carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) (such as underground storage or deep sea injection). In addition, there are a number of control *strategies* that result in GHG reductions by improved efficiencies. It is appropriate that this GHG RACT determination take such strategic approaches into account. The intent of the strategies is to reduce GHG emissions through the application of technology, either as equipment upgrades or in improved operating methods.

7.1 Carbon Capture and Sequestration

CCS is a set of technologies that controls CO_2 emissions from large industrial sources, including refineries. CCS systems generally include the three-step process that follows:

¹³ In the Prevention of Significant Deterioration permitting process, the determination of BACT is restricted from redefining the source, as discussed in Desert Rock Energy Company, LLC, PSD Appeal No. 08-03 et al., Slip. Op. (Environmental Appeals Board [EAB] Sept. 24, 2009), *Sierra Club v. EPA*, 499 F.3d 653, 655-6 (7th Cir. 2007) (on appeal of EAB's Prairie State decision), EPA NSR manual and others.

- 1. Capture CO_2 from power plants or industrial processes.
- 2. Transport the captured and compressed CO₂ (usually in pipelines).
- 3. Use underground injection and geologic sequestration to store the CO_2 in deep underground rock formations.¹⁴

EPA notes that CCS can significantly reduce emissions from large stationary sources of CO_2 , which include coal- and natural gas-fired power plants, as well as ethanol and natural gas processing plants. According to the GHG reporting program, CO_2 is currently being captured at over 120 facilities in the US; this CO_2 is primarily used for enhanced oil recovery (EOR), with smaller amounts being used in food and beverage manufacturing, pulp and paper manufacturing, and metal fabrication.

Ecology has evaluated the potential for geologic sequestration in Washington State (Norman and Stormon, 2007). The review identified no readily accessible sequestration opportunities. The major points of the report are summarized as follows:

- Little is known about any potential deep basins in Washington State that could be used to sequester CO₂ because there has been relatively little exploration for oil and gas in the state.
- Little is known about any potential deep saline aquifers or geological structures in Washington State due to the lack of deep drilling.
- Saline aquifers capable of sequestering CO₂ in western Washington might exist but these aquifers might not be capable of achieving the goal of permanent sequestration due to the extensive faulting and fracturing of rock and the proximity of volcanoes.
- Known coal deposits in Washington State are too shallow to use for storing CO₂. Currently, the West Coast Regional Carbon Sequestration Partnership and TransAlta are investigating deeper coal beds in the Centralia area for potential use to sequester CO₂.
- Geologic sequestration in eastern Washington basalt is under investigation. However, basalt sequestration has not yet been demonstrated to be commercially viable.

According to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) (2013a) and US Department of Energy (DOE) National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) (2013), as of April 2013, approximately 25 to 30 CCS projects were underway worldwide. At least one project included in these databases involves an SMR unit where the captured CO_2 is used for injection/EOR purposes at a nearby oil well in Texas (MIT, 2013b).

The Pacific Northwest lies approximately 1,000 miles from the nearest oil fields east of the Rockies. This distance to oil and gas fields would require the development of a pipeline system to carry the collected CO_2 to the fields or a sequestration site. Based on review of

¹⁴ These formations are often a mile or more beneath the surface and consist of porous rock capable of reacting with and holding the CO_2 . Overlying these formations are impermeable, non-porous layers of rock that trap the CO_2 and prevent it from migrating upward.

the documented projects, none of the CCS technologies have been proven in the Pacific Northwest; and none are being demonstrated as common production practices in other regional areas.

In Washington:

- There is no demonstrated, technically feasible CO₂ sequestration site.
- There is no ongoing oil and gas development in Washington State that could use the collected oil and gas.
- There is no demonstrated location that meets Ecology's definition of "permanent storage" in WAC 173-407.

For these reasons, CCS is not considered to be a technically feasible option for RACT-level GHG reductions at the oil refineries in Washington State.

 CO_2 capture and utilization efforts focus on pathways and novel approaches for reducing CO_2 emissions by developing beneficial uses for CO_2 , converting it to useful products such chemicals, cements, or plastics. Revenue generated from the used CO_2 could also offset a portion of the capture costs.

Many of the current CO_2 uses are small-scale efforts, and many emit the CO_2 to the atmosphere after use, which results in no reduction in overall CO_2 emissions. Some of the more significant current and potential uses of CO_2 are in cement manufacturing (Biello, 2008), polycarbonate production, and enhanced oil and gas recovery. The bioconversion of CO_2 to fuel products has been, to date, a small-scale effort; and ultimately, the CO_2 is emitted upon fuel combustion.

Praxair, Inc., operates a CO_2 purification and compression/liquefaction facility that produces CO_2 for the beverage industry. The facility is adjacent to the BP refinery and reported collecting approximately 90,000 tons of CO_2 in 2012. However, the end use ultimately emits the CO_2 to the atmosphere, resulting in no reduction in overall CO_2 emissions. The beneficial use replaces the generation of the 90,000 tons of CO_2 needed for the product.

The requirement for beneficial use is not an appropriate option for RACT control.

The beneficial use of CO_2 is an entirely separate process from refining, which is reflected in their separate Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes¹⁵. A beneficial use facility would not be considered a support facility under the Title V program because the refinery could operate independent of the beneficial use facility. Because beneficial use facilities are a separate source category, they are beyond the scope of this RACT determination.

7.2 Equipment-based Efficiency Strategies

Nearly all GHG reduction strategies are, in their simplest form, energy efficiency improvement strategies. In general, these strategies include multiple levels of approach.

¹⁵ SIC codes are numerical codes used by government to classify industries.

This section describes the strategies specific to pieces of equipment or groups of equipment at Washington State oil refineries.

For complex industrial process plants such as oil refineries, there are four general categories for energy efficiency improvement:

- Improved operating practices, including process control and variability reduction
- Equipment upgrade
- Process integration
- Process modification

The amount of available literature that provides GHG reduction information specific to the oil refinery sector is limited. Of the available literature that discusses GHG reductions and/or efficiency improvements at refineries, the discussions are often generalized or aggregated to protect confidential business information. However, in cases where this information has been found, the documents are cited in this description. This RACT determination relies on the efforts undertaken by other refineries and reported in these publications, which then serve as a baseline that is evaluated for application at the five Washington oil refineries.

Among the most recent relevant government-issued publications is an EPA 2010 oil refiningsector efficiency white paper (EPA, 2010), which provides a summary of GHG reduction opportunities. The following discussion is closely aligned with the recommendations/findings of that publication.

For complex facilities such as oil refineries, there are many combinations of equipment upgrades or alterations that could result in efficiency improvements that have the effect of reducing GHG emissions. However, to further complicate matters, that same equipment upgrade implemented at different facilities would not necessarily have the same result. An approach that is successful in improving efficiency at one facility could result in neutral or even negative efficiency impacts at another facility.

Some of the general approaches that typically yield efficiency improvements have been highlighted by EPA through the 2005 Energy Star[®] guide for refineries (Worrell and Galitsky, 2005) and the 2010 refinery and boiler white papers (EPA, 2010 and EPA, 2010) as well as by energy efficiency experts in the field.¹⁶

Energy use in the refineries has two sides: the demand for energy (in the form of steam, fuel, or electricity) for process operations and the generation side to meet that demand in the form of steam, fuel, or electricity. Process energy demand is integral to the operating practices, controls, equipment configuration and design, crude slate, product slate, and other factors. The supply of energy is usually considered under the broad category of "utilities." Utilities deliver energy to the process units based on demand. Traditionally, most industrial energy efficiency projects, including those in refineries, focus on the utilities

¹⁶ ABB Limited, KBC Process Technology Ltd, Kumana & Associates, Refining Process Services.

side of energy use. This approach is limited in its effectiveness because the utility system will always have to meet the process energy demand (in order for the process to function). Therefore, efficiency gains within the process (i.e., reducing the overall demand for energy for a given production rate) must be considered in order to fully realize the potential for reducing GHG emissions from the facility.

Utility equipment at oil refineries includes:

- Cogeneration units and electricity production equipment
- Steam generating boilers
- Process heaters and hot oil loops
- Cooling towers and cooling loops
- Air coolers
- Process flares

A refinery utility system is ideally designed to be thermodynamically integrated with the process heating and cooling profiles. However, four of the five Washington State oil refineries were constructed in the 1950s and have undergone multiple process modifications that have significantly altered the heat balance and utility demands. Even the newest facility, the BP Cherry Point refinery, which was built in the 1970s, has made process modifications that have resulted in altered heat balances at the facility. Although engineering designs take heat balance into account at the time of construction, as with most projects, over time, there will likely be additional opportunities to make improvements and ensure the continued performance of the overall system..

7.2.1 Cogeneration and Power Recovery

Combined heat and power (CHP), or cogeneration, has an overall energy efficiency of approximately 80% (EPA, 2010). By comparison, a standard power plant (Rankine cycle) has a power generation efficiency of up to 35%. A well-tuned standard boiler has a steam generation efficiency of about 83%. The benefit of CHP is that 40% of the energy output of the unit is in the form of electricity, which has a value that is approximately 4 times greater than steam (primarily because of its versatility). Therefore, for complex facilities that use significant amounts of power as well as steam, the installation of appropriately sized CHP equipment would represent a significant boost to the efficiency profile of the overall facility.

However, the installation of cogeneration requires significantly higher capital investment than that for conventional boilers. Most importantly, in order for cogeneration to be a successful investment, the energy demand (or market) must be available. In other words, the unit must be sized correctly to meet the needs of the application. In western Washington, several cogeneration projects have been either abandoned, delayed/tabled or, upon completion, have operated at low rates (DOE, 2003; Ecology, 2010; EFSEC, 2013).

A July 2013 white paper from the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (Hayes et al., 2013) stated that the energy intensity of the US industrial sector appears to be improving slightly overall, but there is a clear backsliding in cogeneration. The paper did

not include specific references to the oil refining industry. However, refining is among the most energy-intensive industrial processes in the US. The report went on to note that if the US energy efficiency trajectory continues at the current pace, the country may fall behind in the global economy.

Nine of twenty-one State of California oil refineries have reported operating cogeneration units (EPA, 2011). A total of 21 of 146 US oil refineries have reported operating cogeneration units. One Washington State refinery (i.e., Shell) operates a cogeneration unit. The Shell cogeneration plant operates at nearly full capacity, and the electricity production from that unit accounts for approximately 9% of the total Washington State refinery CO_2 emissions.

Cogeneration is technically feasible for the installation of new steam-generating units. However, cogeneration is not a technically feasible option for the retrofit of exiting boilers. **Therefore, CHP are not evaluated further as a potential RACT candidate.**

Power recovery equipment such as turbo expanders or steam turbines can be installed on high-pressure and/or high-temperature equipment to produce electricity. The turbines are most commonly driven by pressure let-down and/or HRSG steam. However, power generators are considered to be a process redesign, significantly affecting the pressure and heat balance of the process unit. **Therefore, power generators are not considered further as RACT candidates.**

The use of power recovery can improve facility energy efficiency and may be economically viable, particularly for new equipment installations. However, Washington State law effectively prohibits industries from considering the introduction of power recovery into the process. The rule is commonly referred to as the "net metering rule" (RCW 80.60.030(4)(b)) and limits a power customer to 100 kW of generation capacity.¹⁷

7.2.2 Utility Boilers

Steam production at the Washington State refineries accounts for approximately 11% of the total CO_2 emissions from the facilities. Steam production is a common industrial source; therefore, there is a relatively large amount of information available on efficiency improvements for these systems.

Utility boilers, along with cogeneration units, waste heat boilers (e.g., CO boilers and catalyst coolers), and offsite steam sources, operate as integrated units, providing steam to the refinery via a header system as needed. The header system includes two to four delivery pressures of steam. The high-pressure systems are fed by the utility boilers and high-heat process units, such as the FCCUs. In general, the lower-pressure loops collect spent high-pressure steam and are augmented by waste heat boilers in lower-heat-rate units.

¹⁷ "Not more than a total of one hundred kilowatts shall be aggregated among all customergenerators participating in a generating facility under this subsection" (RCW 80.60.030(4)(b)).

Often, backup steam generation (in the form of a boiler running at idle) is available in the system for rapid response. The steam system in the refinery is essential for normal processing and for bringing the units into and out of operation (i.e., starting up and shutting down). Therefore, all of the refineries maintain immediately available excess steam capacity for emergency events (e.g., unit upsets or boiler upsets resulting in unplanned shutdown events).

Improvements in operating efficiencies or steam load requirements are realized throughout the entire the steam system. Therefore, the utility steam system is most effectively approached as a group, and emissions considered as a combined total.

All five Washington oil refineries operate steam systems that have the potential to emit greater than 75,000 tpy CO_2e .

All boilers in use at the Washington State refineries are water tube/water wall-type boilers. Two of the major parameters that impact energy efficiency in boilers are flue gas temperature (which should be as low as possible) and percent oxygen in the flue gas.

Table 7-1 lists efficiency measures identified in the EPA boiler white paper (EPA, 2010) that are applicable for the Washington State refinery steam generation systems.

		Efficiency Improvement	CO ₂ Reduction	Capital	
Measure	Applicability	(%)	(%)	Costs	Notes/Issues
Replace/upgrad e burners	All, except for stoker-type boilers and fluidized bed boilers	Up to 4 to 5%	Up to ~ 6%	\$2,500 to \$5,100 per MMBtu/hr	Site-specific considerations (retrofit ability) and economic factors may affect the installation of burners
Tuning	All	CO from 1,000 to 2,000 to <200 ppm Unburned carbon (UBC) from 20 to 30% to 10 to 15%	up to ~3%	Up to \$3,000	Manual tuning with parametric testing
Optimization	All	0.5% - 3.0%	up to ~ 4%	\$100,000	Neural network- based
Instrumentation and controls	All, especially at large plants	0.5 to 3.0% (in addition to optimization)	up to ~ 4%	>\$1 million	System integration, calibration, and maintenance
Economizer	Units with capacity over 25,000 lbs steam/hr	40 °F decrease in flue gas temperature equals 1% improvement	Relates to efficiency gain in boiler	\$2.3 million (for 650 MMBtu/hr)	Larger units; must consider pressure loss, steam conditions

Table 7-1 Efficiency Improvement Projects for Steam Systems

		Efficiency	CO ₂		
		Improvement	Reduction	Capital	
Measure	Applicability	(%)	(%)	Costs	Notes/Issues
Air preheater	Units with	300 °F decrease	~ 1% per	\$200,000 to	Used in large
	capacity over	in gas	40 °F	\$250,000	boiler
	25,000 IDS OF	temperature	temperature	(TOF 10 MMBtu/br)	applications, not
	hour	6% improvement	ueciease	initiota/ini j	to increase in NO _x
Insulation	All, most	Dependent on	Up to 7%		Radiation losses
	suitable for	surface			increase with
	temperatures	temperature			decreasing load
	above 120 °F				
Reduce air	All	1.5 to 3%	Up to ~ 4%	Site-specific	Requires routine
leakages		potential			maintenance
		(effect similar to			procedures
		air)			
Capture energy	Most suitable	Site-specific	Up to ~ 8%		Water quality
from boiler	for units with	depending on			issue important
Diowdown	hoiler	Steam conditions $1 \ln t_0 \propto 7\%$			
	blowdown	0 10 7 70			
	exceeding 5%				
Condoncato	of steam rate	Cita aposificu	Same ac	¢75.000	Enorgy covings
return system	larger units	depends on	efficiency	\$73,000	is the energy
	more	condensate	improvement;		contained in the
	economical to	temperature and	ratio of Btu/hr		return
	retrofit	% recovery	saved from		condensate;
			Btu/hr input		quality affects
					use
BFW	Use of	70 to 90%	Up to 10%	2- to5-year	
preparation	reverse-	reduction in		раураск	
	membrane	than lime water			
	treatment	softening			
Reduce slagging	Water tube	1 to 3%; site-	Up to ~ 4%	\$50,000 to	Downtime/
and fouling of	Dollers	specific; fuei		\$125,000	economic factors regain
surfaces		operating			lost capacity
		condition have			. ,
The secolar block of	6	large impact	C	Describer	Nie de alexander and
insulating	Surfaces over	3 to 13% of holler emissions	Same as	Depends on	harriers
Juckets	120 1		improvement	of insulation	barriers
				required for	
				implementa-	
				tion	

Measure	Applicability	Efficiency Improvement (%)	CO ₂ Reduction (%)	Capital Costs	Notes/Issues
Reduce steam trap leaks	All			None to cost of maintenance program	No deployment barriers
Combined heat and power	All	Overall efficiency improves from 30 to 50% to 70 to80%		\$1,000 to 2,500/kW	High capital investment

Because utilities are a typical focus of efficiency improvements, the actual total efficiency realized from the improvements listed in Table 7-1 is likely to be small overall (e.g., a maximum of 5%) for a boiler system that is operated by trained, competent personnel with a sufficient budget.

The EPA oil refinery information collection request (ICR)¹⁸ included a request for energy efficiency measures for electricity and steam generation information (ICR Question 5, Table 1-2). Table 7-2 is a summary of the efficiency information provided in responses to ICR Question 5, Table 1-2. The boiler efficiency measures surveyed by the ICR indicate that the Washington State refineries have implemented significantly more measures than either the national average or the California average.

Type of Energy	Total Unit		Washington		California Unit		
Efficiency Measure	Installations		Ur	Unit		Installations	
			Installations				
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
None	116	1	1	3	3	0	
Insulation on boiler	1248	16	23	62	164	12	
Insulation on distribution lines	1354	17	19	51	215	15	
Oxygen monitors used to control	494	6	21	57	55	4	
excess oxygen							
Intake air monitors to optimize	189	2	10	27	32	2	
fuel/air mixtures							
Combustion air preheat from flue	134	2	11	30	12	1	
gas							
BFW preheat from flue gas	372	5	11	30	74	5	
Blowdown steam recovery system	385	5	16	43	46	3	
for low-pressure needs							
Steam trap maintenance	1,078	14	20	54	217	16	
Steam condensate return lines to	926	12	16	43	214	15	

Table 7-2 EPA Refinery ICR Responses for Steam System Efficiency Measures

¹⁸ On April 1, 2011, EPA sent a comprehensive industry-wide ICR to all US petroleum facilities. The ICR was designed to collect information on processing characteristics, crude slate, emission inventories, and limited source testing to fill known data gaps. The template for the ICR letter sent to the refineries, general instructions and the response database are available at https://refineryicr.rti.org/.

boiler						
Steam expansion turbines	364	5	6	16	65	5
Boiler maintenance program to reduce scaling	727	9	9	24	188	13
Boiler maintenance program to maintain burners	405	5	14	38	76	5
Total number of units reported	7,87	72	37	7	1,3	96

These boiler efficiency measures are readily demonstrated in practice and include both equipment standards and work practices. Some of these strategies are codified in federal rules such as the Boiler MACT (40 CFR Part 63 Subpart DDDDD). **Therefore, these measures are potential RACT candidates.**

7.2.3 Process Heaters

Process heaters are located in nearly every refinery unit. The Washington State refineries operate a total of 79 process heaters, ranging in capacity from 5 to 1,075 MMBtu/hr. Process heater emissions account for approximately 39% of Washington refinery CO_2 emissions. Twenty of the process heaters operating at the five Washington refineries each have potential emissions greater than 75,000 tpy CO_2e . These 20 process heaters accounted for 69 and 66% of the total heater emissions in 2010 and 2011, respectively.

There are a few situations where feed to a single refinery unit is split between multiple heaters. For example, Tesoro's crude unit is fed through a team of three process heaters, only one of which has a potential to emit (PTE) of greater than 75,000 tpy CO_2e . BP operates the north and south vacuum heaters as a parallel team. These three team-operated units results in a total of 23 individual process heaters with a PTE of greater than 75,000 tpy CO_2e .

There are a few general approaches for improving efficiency in process heaters. Table 7-3 is a summary of process heater efficiency projects from the EPA refinery white paper (EPA, 2010).

GHG Control Measure	Description	Efficiency Improvement/ GHG Reduction	Retrofit Capital Cost	Payback Time (years)	Other Factors
Combustion air controls: limit excess air	O ₂ monitors and intake air flow monitors used to optimize the fuel/air mixture and limit excess air	1 to 3%		6 to18 months	
Heat recovery: air preheater	Compact air-to- air heat exchanger installed at grade level; hot stack gas exchanges heat with the incoming combustion air	10 to 15% over no preheat	Natural draft heaters must be converted to mechanical draft		May increase NO _X

Table 7-3 Process Heater Efficiency Measures

Source: EPA (2010).

Table 7-4 is a summary of the EPA refinery ICR responses for process heater efficiency measures. However, the Washington State unit installations are updated using the ICR response information received directly from the Washington State refineries and was submitted under confidential business information (CBI) provisions. Therefore, the data comparisons may be skewed by CBI information withheld at EPA.

Type of Energy Efficiency Measure	Total Unit Installations No. %		Washington Unit Installations ^a No. %		California Unit Installations No. %	
None	251	8	4	6	48	10
Oxygen monitors used to control excess oxygen	1,436	45	57	86	191	40
Intake air monitors to optimize fuel/air mixtures	199	6	0	0	19	4
Maintenance program to reduce scaling	236	7	23	35	23	5
Maintenance program to maintain burners	1,104	35	55	83	153	32
Finned or dimpled tubes to increase heat transfer	701	22	44	67	125	26
Air preheat	107	3	16	24	0	0
Total number of units reported	3,168		66		478	

Table 7-4 EPA Refinery ICR Responses for Process Heater Efficiency Measures

^a Washington unit installation information was updated from facility information submitted to EPA, not from the ICR database.

The theoretical maximum efficiency for a process heater efficiency (using highest heating value) is estimated to be 92% (Petrick and Pellegrino, 1999), while the average thermal efficiency of industrial furnaces (with heat recovery in the convection section) is between 75 and 90%. For the Washington State oil refineries, each 1% of the total annual emissions reduction from heaters equals approximately 28,000 tons of GHG. Therefore, a 5% improvement in overall heater efficiency could result in up to 142,000 tons of actual GHG reductions in Washington State.

The Energy Star[®] refinery manual (EPA and DOE, 2005) highlights the management of excess air, either through control or increased maintenance activity to improve heater efficiency. Such maintenance activities might include intake air plenum checks and air-leak-minimization projects. These activities are similar to air control projects but require only temporary monitoring and ongoing maintenance to maintain tight fittings on heaters and the proper adjustment of intake air plenums. For each 1% reduction of excess air, energy efficiency improves up to 3%.

The installation of air pre-heat devices (also known as economizers) could also result in efficiency improvements. These devices allow the transfer of waste heat from the unit stack to the incoming air – allowing more combustion heat to be used in the process. The use of air pre-heat devices in the refining industry is limited, as reported in the refinery ICR (EPA, 2011).

Common to all combustion devices, including process heaters and boilers, is the selection of fuels. Some oil refinery combustion units operate on liquid fuels. For these units, significant GHG reductions (>20%) could be achieved by switching to gaseous fuels. The

average CO_2 emissions from each fuel type are noted in 40 CFR Part 98 Subpart C, Table C-1. In general, heavy distillate fuel emission factors average approximately 75 kg CO_2 /MMBtu verses 53 kg CO_2 /MMBtu for natural gas and 59 kg CO_2 /MMBtu for fuel gas.

In the recent settlement agreement with environmental advocacy groups Flint Hills Resources Pine Bend Refinery agreed to CO_2 emission limits for some refinery heaters (MCEA, 2013). Compliance with the CO_2 limit is demonstrated by using only natural gas fuel.

The Washington State refineries operate primarily on gaseous fuels with a few of the 79 units permitted to burn liquid fuels. However, Washington State refineries reported no liquid fuels burned in 2010 according to the refinery ICR (EPA, 2011).

Each of these approaches is demonstrated and technically feasible. Some of these strategies are being included in federal rules, such as the Boiler MACT (40 CFR Part 63 Subpart DDDDD), which applies to process heaters at major sources, including oil refineries. **Therefore, these measures are potential RACT candidates.**

7.2.4 Flares

All five of the Washington State refineries operate flares. As noted Table 6-9, all of the facilities reported flare emissions of <75,000 tpy CO₂e for each year, 2010 and 2011. Four of the five facilities operate fuel gas recovery systems that minimize flaring. The 2 years of reported data include upset events at all of the facilities.

The refinery ICR lists a total of 798 flares nationally. Of that total, 196 flares (25%) reported the installation of some amount of gas-recovery equipment. The installation of flare gas recovery equipment is a potential opportunity for overall facility efficiency improvement and reduced GHG.

For comparison purposes, in California, of the total number of reported refinery flares, 48 flares (27%) have gas recovery systems. Some local California air quality regulations require flaring minimization to reduce VOC and HAP emissions (BAAQMD, 2012 and SCAQMD, 2009). These regulations impose a mandatory reporting requirement for all flaring events, as well as a root cause analysis with corrective actions implemented to minimize future flaring events. Furthermore, facilities are required to develop and implement flare minimization plans to address excess flaring.

Of the total number of Washington State refinery flares reported in the refinery ICR (i.e., 17 flares), 10 flares (59%) have some type of gas recovery equipment. None of the Washington State refineries operate with flaring volume limits. NWCAA regulations require the performance of a root cause analysis and corrective actions for all excess emissions events, including those at the flares.

The use of refrigerated condensers is also listed in the EPA refinery white paper (EPA, 2010). However, the paper provides no estimates of efficiency improvements, costs, or payback times.

The prevention of flaring provides immediate GHG emission reductions by minimizing the amount of gases released to the flares. These reductions can occur at the source, within the process, or through the installation of recovery equipment on the headers, which then routes the gases into the fuel gas system for heat recovery in process heaters and boilers.

Flare gas recovery compressors are becoming increasingly commonplace. Flare gas recovery equipment is complex, and the operation of gas recovery equipment is not simple. The effects of introducing flare gases into the fuel gas system can have broad effects on fuel gas composition and the stability of that composition. However, similar to fuel switching, the installation and operation of flare gas recovery has been demonstrated in practice and proven effective in the reduction of flaring. **Therefore, limitations on flaring, including the use of flare gas recovery is considered as a technically feasible RACT option.**

Although the effective prevention of material going to the flare is clearly the first line of GHG emissions management, the next step is the proper combustion of hydrocarbon (particularly methane) once it reaches the flare in order to reduce its GHG-forming potential. The EPA white paper for refinery efficiency (EPA, 2010) also includes proper flare operation, during which the heat content of the flare gas and steam/air-assist rates are controlled. Federal regulations regarding the heat content for flare gas impose minimum requirements that are used for enforcement purposes (EPA 2012). Proper operation in accordance with the existing regulations (40 CFR 60.18 and 63.11) results in high destruction efficiencies.

The proper combustion of hydrocarbon (particularly methane) at the flare in order to reduce its GHG-forming potential, including the control of the heat content of the flare gas and steam/air-assist rates, have been demonstrated in practice. The current regulations regarding heat content for flare gas impose minimum requirements to assure proper combustion and destruction of hydrocarbons. **Proper operation in accordance with the existing regulations¹⁹ results in high destruction efficiencies and is considered as a technically feasible RACT candidate.**

7.2.5 Process Cooling

To a great extent, process cooling in refining is accomplished through non-contact heat exchange with streams that require heating. The excess heat from the hot stream is passed to a stream that requires heat (and has a suitable heat driving force profile) located within a reasonable proximity. Heat exchange is discussed in more detail in the optimization section of this report.

However, at some point, additional cooling using air coolers or cooling water is required. Once the energy is transferred through these units, it is lost from the system. Any energy exiting the process in this way erodes the facility's efficiency, and so their use should only be considered for those applications where no other option for cooling exists.

¹⁹ 40 CFR 60.18 and 63.11.

Air cooler maintenance consists primarily of cleaning the fins/coils to remove fouling debris (e.g., sand, dirt, animal remains). Foaming cleaning products are the most effective for alleviating the need for high-pressure washing that can cause physical deformation of the fins or coils.

Cooling towers operate continuously with variable loads, including both product and seasonal influences. The installation of adjustable-speed drives on the fans and circulation pumps can result in energy savings. As with other heat transfer mechanisms, the proper design of cooling water heat exchange networks is the most significant opportunity for efficiency improvements by optimizing the supply-demand relationship, thereby minimizing the need for cooling.

Process cooling focuses on operating procedures, controls, and equipment such as fin-fans, and heat exchanger networks. These types of equipment are either not direct GHG emission sources or are insignificant sources (e.g., small internal combustion engines) at Washington State refineries. Therefore, process cooling optimization requirements are not considered RACT candidates.

7.2.6 Fluidized Catalytic Cracking Units

Energy recovery from elevated temperature and pressure units such as the FCCU is identified in the EPA refinery white paper (EPA, 2010). Most facilities currently employ a waste heat boiler and/or a power recovery turbine or turbo expander to recover energy from the FCCU catalyst regenerator exhaust. The three Washington State FCCUs operate waste heat boilers in the units for steam generation.

The installation of a power generator on an FCCU is a significant process change that would significantly affect the pressure and heat balance of the FCCU system. **Therefore, they are not technically feasible RACT candidates.**

For new units, the installation of high-efficiency regenerators allows for the complete combustion of coke deposits without the need for a post-combustion device to reduce the auxiliary fuel combustion associated with a CO boiler. However, use of a high-efficiency regenerator involves the redesign and replacement of the existing catalyst regenerators of the FCCU. **Therefore, this is not a technically feasible RACT candidate.**

FCCUs are significant fuel gas producers. As such, FCCU operation can significantly alter the fuel gas balance of the refinery and could cause the refinery to be fuel gas rich (i.e., produce more fuel gas than it consumes), resulting in excess fuel gas needing to be flared or an increase in the frequency of fuel gas system over-pressurization. If the FCCU is linked to increased flaring, GHG reduction measures, including flare gas recovery, for the impacted flare(s) have been demonstrated to be successful. **Therefore, flare gas recovery on flare systems affected by FCCU operation is further considered as a technically feasible RACT candidate.**

Finally, inasmuch as FCCUs are the largest single CO_2e emission sources at Washington State refineries, carbon capture techniques could be applied if there was an opportunity for

sequestration. However, CCS is not a feasible RACT candidate for FCCU GHG emissions in this analysis.

7.2.7 Coking and Coke Calcining

Emissions from delayed coking and coke calcining account for approximately 7% of the total CO_2e (approximately 500,000 tpy CO_2e) from Washington State refineries. For example, at the BP refinery, coker blowdown comprises less than 1% of the coking CO_2e emissions, and 96% is from the coke calcining process.

Emission reduction strategies for cokers include options for heaters and steam systems, as well as limiting the amount of blowdown. Limiting the opening pressure of the coker drums (through the vent system) to 2 to 5 psig, results in fewer methane emissions. Limiting coker blowdown pressure is a demonstrated and technically feasible RACT candidate. However, emissions from coker blowdown represent an insignificant portion of all Washington State oil refinery GHG emissions.

Efficiency and GHG reduction projects for coke calcining are not published and thus not readily available. At least one cogeneration project has been conducted under the DOE's Industrial Technologies Program (ITP). The final report for that project will be available approximately 3 months following the expected completion of this project (August 2013). **Therefore, it is assumed there are no technically feasible control strategies specific to rotary hearth coke calcining.** However, general combustion strategies, such as waste heat recovery (as steam generation) and combustion optimization, might be appropriate to improve the efficiency of the process.

7.2.8 Steam-Methane Reforming – Hydrogen Production

Hydrogen production by SMR accounted for 6% of the total Washington State refinery CO_2e emissions in 2011. In April 2013, the BP refinery started up a second SMR unit with the potential to emit 480,000 tpy CO_2e . In addition, the Shell refinery purchases hydrogen from the Air Liquide facility, whose CO_2e emissions in 2011 were reported as 70,000 tons, and a new Linde Gas hydrogen plant (which started up in March 2013), which reported a PTE of 65,000 tpy GHG. Taking into account the new SMR unit at BP and the Air Liquide and Linde Gas emissions, hydrogen production are projected to be about 14% of the total refinery CO_2e emissions in 2014.

Table 7-5 summarizes the efficiency measures for hydrogen production units.

		Efficiency	
GHG Control	Description	Improvement/	Retrofit
Measure	Description	GHG Reduction	Capital Cost
Hydrogen production optimization	Implement a comprehensive assessment of hydrogen needs and consider using additional catalytic reforming units to produce hydrogen		
Combustion air and feed/steam preheat	Use heat recovery systems to preheat the feed/steam and combustion air temperature	5% of total energy consumption for hydrogen production	Natural draft heaters must be converted to mechanical draft
Cogeneration	Use cogeneration of hydrogen and electricity: hot exhaust from a gas turbine is transferred to the reformer furnace; the reformer convection section is also used as a HRSG in a cogeneration design; steam raised in the convection section can be put through either a topping or condensing turbine for additional power generation		
Hydrogen purification	Evaluate hydrogen purification processes (i.e., pressure-swing adsorption, membrane separation, and cryogenic separation) for overall energy		

Table 7-5 Hydrogen Production Unit Efficiency Measures

Source: EPA (2010).

New hydrogen plants are generally using PSA for the purification technology. PSA produces hydrogen at a very high purity, which is not needed for hydrotreating or hydrocracking. An alternative use of solvent absorption/stripping technology could produce an adequately pure hydrogen product for a lower energy use such as the process owned by Advanced Extraction Technologies, Houston, Texas.

With the exception of the combustion air and feed preheat (which is common to all combustion units), the strategies identified for hydrogen production are process-redesign or new equipment installation projects. **Therefore, there are no hydrogen production specific RACT candidates identified**.

As noted in Section 6.1 carbon capture technology has been demonstrated on at least one SMR unit. However, CCS is not a feasible RACT candidate in this analysis.

7.2.9 Sulfur Recovery

Sulfur recovery accounts for approximately 1% of the CO₂e emissions from Washington State refineries. The only proposed efficiency improvements for sulfur recovery in the refinery white paper (EPA, 2010) is the selection of efficient technology for installation. No new SRUs or significant expansions are currently proposed at Washington State refineries.

Since this approach is a redesign or replacement of the existing process equipment, it is considered technically infeasible as a RACT candidate.

7.2.10Leak Detection and Repair

All US oil refineries are subject to process line leak detection and repair (LDAR) requirements under federal regulations. However, only a few facilities include their refinery fuel gas and natural gas systems in the program.

Equipment leaks that emit volatile hydrocarbons, including methane, account for only a very small amount of total GHG emissions, less than 1% (estimated as methane) for refineries, which is well below the 75,000-tpy threshold. All five Washington State refineries report refinery-wide equipment leak emissions to be <1,000 tpy CO_2e .

Washington State and federal leak detection standards apply to equipment in VOC or organic HAP service (i.e., containing these materials). Refinery fuel gas and natural gas contain significant amounts of methane, which is neither a VOC nor a HAP. Therefore, the equipment in fuel gas service is typically exempt from the LDAR program. However, several facilities have agreed to include their fuel gas systems in LDAR programs as part of federal enforcement settlements. The inclusion of the fuel gas systems is a positive step towards improving efficiency and reducing GHG emissions; however, fuel gas system leaks are not considered significant sources of GHG reductions in this RACT determination.

Inclusion of fuel gas in LDAR programs is demonstrated and a technically feasible RACT candidate.

7.2.11Optimization

Process information reviews can be used to identify the most effective efficiency improvements for equipment and optimize a refinery's energy performance. Three items can be adjusted to improve optimal performance: operating procedures, process controls, and equipment.

The first step is to verify that the existing equipment is being used to its fullest advantage by examining operating data and identifying process input and throughput instabilities, as well as equipment bottlenecks.

Operating procedures can vary widely from operator-to-operator or from shift-to-shift. Automating a plant can help significantly, but automation is of limited value if the operators take control and run the plant (or portions of the process) in manual mode. A thorough review of both written and implemented operation practices is essential to determine what, if any, additional technology improvements are needed. In a typical processing plant, such as an oil refinery, there are hundreds or even thousands of control loops. Each control loop (which generally consists of process monitoring devices, computing hardware and software, control devices [primarily valves] and the associated wiring circuits) is responsible for controlling one part of the process, such as maintaining a temperature, level, or flow. Most importantly, if the inputs to the process are not well controlled, significant amounts of energy can be wasted in reacting to the input instability. For example, crude feed temperature swings can negatively impact the desalter operation, as well as crude tower separation efficiency. In order to make up heat in the crude unit, high-quality steam is generally used at the expense of utility demand. However, if the crude feed temperature is controlled in the feed tank, low-quality steam is used in the tank heaters, with no added expense for utilities.

Once the inputs are stabilized or at least predicted, if the control loop is not properly designed and tuned, the process runs below its optimum level, the process will be more expensive to operate, and equipment will wear out prematurely. For each control loop to run optimally, the identification of sensor, valve, and tuning problems is important.

A continually developing and powerful technique for identifying overall facility and process unit efficiency improvements is using process integration (also referred to as pinch analysis). Pinch analysis is a method of characterizing energy profiles to identify pinch points where energy is limited. The boundaries of process integration are flexible in order to meet whatever objective is identified – from a single heat exchanger network to a larger section of a process unit or facility. A pinch analysis produces clues as to how energy might be better managed through improved heat exchanger network layout or pump sizing or the installation of new heat recovery equipment or other process equipment.

However, in order for optimization to be successful, a system-wide perspective is essential. High equipment efficiency (which can come at a premium costs) does not necessarily result in high system efficiency if that piece of equipment is not the efficiency bottleneck.

Equipment that refineries use in the greatest numbers and have the greatest effect on energy consumption are distillation columns, heat exchangers, pumps, and compressors. Optimizing techniques for each group of equipment are discussed generally here.

In the case where a distillation column creates an energy bottleneck, the principal way to reduce energy consumption in distillation is to use more-efficient trays or packing, which reduces the reflux ratio to achieve the same product specification. This approach has a relatively high capital cost and requires equipment downtime while the new column equipment is being installed. The next option for improving column efficiency is to increase the feed temperature to the distillation column up to (or above, in some cases) the bubble point. This is usually accomplished outside the column by increasing heat recovery in the feed preheat train.

Heat exchangers play a critical role in minimizing thermal energy (fuel) use from utilities. A heat exchanger neither consumes nor converts energy. Heat exchangers only transfer heat from a hot fluid stream to a colder one. Therefore, traditional efficiencies cannot be used to

describe heat exchanger operation. However, heat exchangers rarely operate alone but are generally used in a series, and the concept of efficiency can be applied to these heat exchanger networks. Heat exchanger network efficiency can be defined as achieving the process temperature objectives at the least total annualized cost for both utilities and capital. Heat exchanger network efficiency can be improved by matching hot and cold streams according to the temperature-driving force profile in the process. Pinch analysis is useful to identify bottlenecks for heat transfer in heat exchanger networks and predict which individual heat exchanger needs to be improved for the overall network to operate more effectively.

Improved heat exchanger operation may include a change in the maintenance program for that exchanger in order to optimize the cleaning schedule. Alternatively, the standard shell and tube exchanger may need to be replaced with a new type of exchanger, such as a spiral, or helical coil. More comprehensive heat exchanger network configuration changes might be needed to meet the heat transfer needs of the system, either by rerouting streams or changing flow rates through the system. The heat exchanger network optimization goal should be to maximize the performance of the network as a whole, with individual exchangers modified only if and when necessary.

A large amount (estimated maximum of 95%) of power consumption within industrial facilities (including refineries) is used for electric motors. The five Washington State refineries are significant electricity consumers: in 2011, the facilities purchased approximately 1,300 GWH combined. The refineries are among the top 50 power consumers in Washington State. Many new refinery projects are expanding the use of purchased electricity, replacing steam-driven or fuel-driven equipment with electricity-driven equipment. These projects may not always result in efficiency improvements, depending on the process variability, steam production technology, source of electrical power, and distance from the electricity provider.

For pumps and compressors, the design of the piping is critical to minimizing pressure drop. For retrofit projects within existing units, this priority is challenged by limited space and existing pipe racks.

Manufacturers of electric motors offer a range of efficiencies for most motor sizes. The cost differential is typically not significant in the context of the overall capital investment. Installation costs for high- verses low- efficiency motors do not vary. The creation of a state minimum efficiency standard for new equipment is one option for driving the move toward investing in high-efficiency equipment.

Traditionally, industrial pumps and fans have been installed using a fixed-speed motor with a throttling valve or damper to control flow. This configuration results in extremely low efficiencies (in terms of energy used per pound of fluid delivered) during turndown operations. For example, the pump remains at full speed but flow is restricted or recycled back to the pump intake line.

The installation of adjustable-speed drives provides an opportunity for improving the efficiency of rotating equipment. Adjustable and variable speed drives can be mechanical, electromechanical, hydraulic, or electric.

Adjustable-speed drives are becoming more common as solutions for improving efficiency. Information sources available to the public (including Wikipedia) have reported on some of these improvements: "Some adjustable speed driven applications use less energy than fixed-speed operated loads, variable-torque centrifugal fan and pump loads being by far the world's most energy-intensive. Since most of the energy used for such fan and pump loads is currently derived by fixed-speed machines, use of efficient adjustable speed drives for these loads in retrofitted or new applications offers the most future energy savings potential. For example, when a fan is driven directly by a fixed-speed motor, the airflow is invariably higher than it needs to be. Airflow can be regulated using a damper but it is more efficient to directly regulate fan motor speed. According to affinity laws motor-regulated reduction of fan speed to 50% of full speed can thus result in a power consumption drop to about 12.5% of full power." (Wikipedia, 2013).

Variable frequency drive (VFD) technology has expanded in the past 10 years, such that the cost of this technology is becoming competitive. VFDs are electro-mechanical drive systems used to control motor speed and torque by varying motor input frequency and voltage.

Similar to high-efficiency motors, the installation of adjustable-speed drive technology could be used to meet a minimum efficiency requirement for new or modified equipment.

Optimization focuses on operating procedures, controls, and equipment such as distillation columns, heat exchanger networks, and rotating equipment. These types of equipment at Washington State refineries are either not direct GHG emission sources (e.g., electric or steam-driven) or insignificant sources (e.g., internal combustion). **Therefore, non-combustion equipment-specific optimization requirements are not considered RACT candidates.**

However, when using a benchmarking standard, optimization has the potential to provide significant GHG emission reductions through the reduction of process energy demand. The focus of energy efficiency within a refinery is reducing the energy intensity of the process (i.e., the overall energy demand per unit of production). Optimization provides the framework for identifying the most-effective equipment upgrades to meet the goal of reducing GHG emissions.

7.2.12Crude Oil Constraints

Commenters within the Washington State refinery GHG RACT stakeholder group, as well as commenter to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) regarding AB 32 have proposed including crude slate characteristics as potential GHG reduction strategies at oil refineries.

Crude slate is the crude oil mix that is purchased and fed into a refinery. The end products of each refinery are largely determined by the characteristics of the crude slate, because the processing equipment has limited flexibility with respect to operating conditions and

capacity. Heavier (longer-chain hydrocarbons), dirtier (higher sulfur and nitrogen content) crude oils require more energy to process than do lighter, cleaner crudes oils in producing the majority of refinery end products, such as gasoline and diesel fuel. The measurement of density for hydrocarbons, particularly crude oil is API gravity. API gravity is an inverse scale of the relative density of the material (e.g., heavier crude oils have lower API gravities).

Crude slate management typically encompasses the work of an entire department within any given refinery. This department is purchasing and selling crude shipments, scheduling deliveries, and projecting product demands on an hourly basis in order to meet the facility's operational goals.

Each crude oil considered for processing by any given refinery has a lifecycle GHG footprint – from production and transportation through refining. Information published by the DOE's National Energy Technology Laboratory (DOE, 2009) and others (Lattanzio, 2013; Mui et al., 2010) provide insight into how the selection of crude by a given refinery impacts the overall GHG emissions for a given fuel product. Figure 7-1 illustrates the results of an analysis that was performed by the DOE in 2005 (DOE, 2009).



Source: DOE, 2009.

Figure 7-1 Life-Cycle Well-to-Tank GHG for Diesel Production from Specific Crude Sources The information shown in Figure 7-1 is somewhat outdated and does not reflect new domestic production from unconventional sources, which has been on the rise since 2011 with the opening of the North American mid-continent shale reserves. However, the figure does show the relative GHG implications of choosing different crude oils. For example, using Venezuelan bitumen crude oil produces well-to-tank GHG emissions that are more than twice those of conventional domestic- sourced crude oil.

However, for the purpose of this RACT analysis, the boundary of the refinery facility is the scope of the GHG emissions analysis. Therefore, the GHG emissions from the production and transportation of crude oil to the refineries are outside the scope of this RACT analysis and thus not discussed further in this RACT determination.

Domestic refining trends have historically been that the average sulfur content of refining crude oil is increasing while the average API gravity is decreasing. Crude oils with higher sulfur and lower API gravity are generally considered to be lower-quality crude oils. The US Energy Information Administration (EIA) collects information on crude oil used in the US refining industry. Those data are presented in Figure 7-2 and have been used as a basis for energy intensity and GHG implication studies. It should be noted that as of the early 2000s, the quality of the crude oil purchased by US refineries was becoming more stable. For the West Coast refineries, which are identified as the Petroleum Administration for Defense District [PADD] 5²⁰ and represented by the dashed lines in Figure 7-2, crude sulfur content has been generally consistent with the national average. However, the average API gravity of the crude oil input to the West Coast refineries has traditionally been significantly lower than the national average, though is generally increasing over time.

²⁰ PADD 5 includes refineries in Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington.



Source: EIA, 2013

Figure 7-2 Refined Crude Quality for US Refineries

Beginning in the early 2010s, the North American mid-continent crude oils began entering the market. The overall impact of that event on the total average weighted sulfur content and API has not yet been published for 2013. Quality information for Bakken crude oil at Clearbrook, Minnesota has been reported by Argus (2013) as 0.17 to 0.20% sulfur and 40 to 42 degrees API gravity. Platts (2010) reported that the Bakken blend has 0.5% sulfur and 38 to 40 degrees API gravity.

A facility's crude slate impacts the energy intensity of the process, with lower-quality crude requiring more energy to process. Both sulfur removal and cracking processes are energy intensive. The general trend toward the use of lower-quality crude could provide motivation to consider crude slate as a potential GHG RACT candidate.

Although the energy intensity of any given refinery is impacted by the crude slate being processed, the concept of using crude slate as a mechanism for GHG emissions has challenges. The decision must consider the following:

• No two refineries are identical. Each refinery is designed and operated to process a certain crude oil blend (having a specific range of properties) into an array of specific products.

- Each crude oil (identified by geographical location of extraction) has specific properties that are unique, including density (small carbon chain verses long carbon chain), acidity, and metal contamination.
- Each refinery is designed for a certain range of crude oil feedstock properties, which limits the blend ratio with respect to chemical compatibility among crude oils (which affects fouling propensity), with the metallurgy of the refinery equipment, and with reactor catalysts.
- Within these constraints, the crude slate for each facility must be optimized on the basis of economics and availability on an hourly basis.
- The products from each refinery are largely determined by the characteristics of the crude slate because the processing equipment has limited flexibility with respect to operating conditions and capacity.
- Significant changes away from the design crude oil blend or the product slates would require the physical modification of equipment, typically at a high capital cost.

A potential RACT control strategy that dictates crude slate in any way would significantly impact the core operation and economics of the facility. **Therefore, crude slate requirements are rejected as a potential RACT control strategy.**

7.3 Programmatic GHG Reduction Strategies

Integrated efficiency improvement programs are implemented at a facility-wide level, a corporate level, or, in the case of government programs such as cap-and-trade, a national or international level.

7.3.1 Facility- and Corporate-level Programs

Many large corporations, including oil companies, promote programs that focus on improving overall plant efficiency through the implementation of specific tools (e.g., energy management systems [EnMS]), as well as the establishment of performance targets. Performance targets may be based on specific corporate goals or industry benchmarks. The implementation of these programs varies from facility to facility.

7.3.1.1 Energy Management Systems

EnMS are business frameworks for managing energy and promoting continuous improvement. The EPA refinery white paper (EPA, 2010) indicated that EnMS are available from the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO). However, based on a review of their available products, neither the ANSI nor ISO standards are refinery-specific, therefore they are not considered in this RACT analysis.

A total of 72 of the 146 US oil refineries (including two of the Washington State refineries, Shell and Phillips 66) reported on the EPA ICR that they have energy management plans.

EnMS are technically feasible RACT options as work practice standards. However, these programs are likely better suited for implementation by facilities on an as-needed basis to meet a regulatory standard.

7.3.1.2 Benchmarking

Benchmarking is the process of comparing the energy performance of a single site over time or comparing that sites performance with an industry-wide range of performance. Plant energy benchmarking is typically performed at a facility-wide or site level in order to capture the synergies of different technologies, operating practices, and operating conditions.

Benchmarking enables companies to set informed and competitive goals for plant energy improvements. Benchmarking also helps companies prioritize the areas in which to invest in order to improve performance while possibly learning from the approaches used by top performers. Post-project benchmarking can provide valuable feedback to help determine how well a given project succeeded in meeting the prescribed goals.

When benchmarking is conducted across an industrial sector, a benchmark that defines best-in-class energy performance can be established. There are few established energy benchmark systems in the refining industry, and none are publically available at this time. The most prominent benchmarking system identified during this review is owned by Solomon Associates LLC (Solomon) in Dallas, Texas. Solomon is a specialized firm that has developed a widely used trademark benchmarking system for energy efficiency unique to the refining industry – the Solomon Associates Energy Intensity Index[®] (EII[®]).

Benchmarking can also be a powerful tool within the confines of a process unit to identify opportunities for energy efficiency improvement. Best performance information for individual equipment groups can be compared with actual performance to identify the poorest performing part of a system. When benchmarking is implemented in tandem with process integration, energy efficiency improvements can be identified and assessed, using modeling tools to prioritize and determine the best capital spending options available to achieve the goals of the facility.

A benchmarking approach is a technically feasible RACT candidate for Washington State refineries.

7.3.1.3 Industrial Technologies Program

DOE's ITP²¹ leads the national effort to improve industrial energy efficiency and environmental performance. Under their BestPractices[®] program, ITP works with companies to implement energy management practices by providing a number of resources for corporate executives, plant managers, technical staff, and the general public. The BestPractices program provides software tools, industry best practices tip sheets, training to certify energy experts in specific energy-intensive processes, and energy assessments. Case studies that present the results of a plant-wide assessment or demonstration project are available from the BestPractices program. ITP's latest program, announced in 2009, is

(http://www1.eere.energy.gov/industry/saveenergynow/assessments.html and http://www1.eere.energy.gov/industry/saveenergynow/energy_experts.html).

²¹ DOE, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, ITP website

Save Energy Now[®], a national initiative that aims to achieve a reduction of 25% or more in industrial energy intensity in 10 years. Under this program, any company can partner with ITP to participate in a no-cost onsite plant assessment to help improve energy efficiency and increase productivity. The ITP website provides a list of large plants that have participated in Save Energy Now[®] assessments and posts their assessment reports. As of April 2013, no Washington refineries were listed as participating with either of these ITP programs.

A requirement to participate in a DOE ITP is a technically feasible RACT option if the federal agencies are willing to participate.

7.3.1.4 Energy Star[®]

Energy Star[®] is a joint program between EPA and DOE that dates back to 1992. Energy Star[®] began as a voluntary labeling program to identify and promote products that reduce GHGs. Since its inception, the program has expanded to include industrial processes, including oil refining. The refining industry program began in 2006. As of January 2013, nine oil refineries had earned the right to use Energy Star[®] labeling. None of these refineries are located in Washington State or on the West Coast.

In 2005, the Energy Star[®] program produced a guide for the oil refining industry, *Energy Efficiency Improvement and Cost Saving Opportunities for Petroleum Refineries* (EPA and DOE, 2005). The guide identifies energy efficiency opportunities for petroleum refineries and, when available, typical payback periods.

The guide goes on to say, "Major areas for energy efficiency improvement are utilities (30%), fired heaters (20%), process optimization (15%), heat exchangers (15%), motor and motor applications (10%), and other areas (10%). Of these areas, optimization of utilities, heat exchangers, and fired heaters offer the most low investment opportunities, while other opportunities may require higher investments. Experiences of various oil companies have shown that most investments are relatively modest. However, all projects require operating costs as well as engineering resources to develop and implement the project. Every refinery and plant will be different. The most favorable selection of energy efficiency opportunities should be made on a plant specific basis." Specifically, the guide identifies a few companies with demonstrated success in GHG reduction projects; including BP, Petro-Canada, ExxonMobil, Shell, and Texaco and cautions that results of efficiency programs will vary significantly for any given facility. While the *Energy Guide* provides examples for improving facility energy efficiency, it is not a roadmap for achieving Energy Star[®] labeling.

The Energy Star[®] program certification has developed benchmarks establishing best-in-class performance for specific industrial sectors. The benchmarks are known as plant Energy Performance Indicators (EPIs) for specific industrial sectors and are publicly available at <u>www.energystar.gov/industrybenchmarkingtools</u>. Using several basic plant-specific inputs, the EPIs calculate a plant's energy performance, providing a score from 0 to 100. EPA defines the average plant within the industry nationally at the score of 50; energy-efficient
plants score 75 or better. Energy Star[®] offers recognition for sites that score in the top quartile of energy efficiency for their sector using EPIs.

Energy Star[®] has not developed EPIs for the refining sector. Oil refineries requesting Energy Star[®] labeling are reviewed using an analogous benchmarking system. The facility compliance status with respect to EPA programs is first reviewed to determine that the facility has no significant non-compliance issues. Those refinery applicants found to be in good compliance standing are then asked to provide certification through a private company, Solomon Associates. EPA relies upon the Solomon certification to indicate that the applicant facility is in the top quartile of performers for energy efficiency among similarsized US oil refineries. The data set used to set the benchmark performance is from 2006. EPA has reviewed the Solomon EII[®] benchmarking approach and found it to be equivalent to the EPI benchmarking system developed for and used by other industries. The refineries that successfully complete this process are given the Energy Star[®] recognition.

The Energy Star[®] program in and of itself is not an appropriate RACT level of control because by definition, only the top 25% of performers can meet the requirements, and the remaining 75% cannot ever achieve RACT, assuming the performance thresholds are periodically updated. One way to recognize the program and its efforts would be to consider any facility that demonstrates a commitment to efficiency by achieving Energy Star[®] certification as meeting or exceeding the requirements of a RACT rule.

7.3.2 Existing Federal Rules

On January 31, 2013, the final version of the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Major Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters (Boiler MACT) was published (78 FR 7138; 40 CFR 63.7480). During initial GHG RACT stakeholder meetings, the use of the Boiler MACT was suggested as a GHG RACT strategy. However, the regulation does not compel the affected facilities to implement any of the findings of the energy assessment. Furthermore, there are no quantitative estimates of the reductions achieved to date – either in EPA or industrial literature. When, as part of this RACT process, the five refineries in Washington State were asked to estimate the GHG reductions that would result from Boiler MACT implementation, no estimates were provided.

Table 3 of 40 CFR Part 63 Subpart DDDDD states,

"4. Existing boilers or process heaters must have a one-time energy assessment performed by a qualified energy assessor. An energy assessment completed on or after January 1, 2008, that meets or is amended to meet the energy assessment requirements in this table, satisfies the energy assessment requirement. A facility that operates under an energy management program compatible with ISO 50001 that includes the affected units also satisfies the energy assessment requirement. The energy assessment must include the following with extent of the evaluation for items a. to e. appropriate for the on-site technical hours listed in § 63.7575:

a. A visual inspection of the boiler or process heater system.

- b. An evaluation of operating characteristics of the boiler or process heater systems, specifications of energy using systems, operating and maintenance procedures, and unusual operating constraints.
- c. An inventory of major energy use systems consuming energy from affected boilers and process heaters and which are under the control of the boiler/process heater owner/operator.
- d. A review of available architectural and engineering plans, facility operation and maintenance procedures and logs, and fuel usage.
- e. A review of the facility's energy management practices and provide recommendations for improvements consistent with the definition of energy management practices, if identified.
- f. A list of cost-effective energy conservation measures that are within the facility's control.
- g. A list of the energy savings potential of the energy conservation measures identified.
- h. A comprehensive report detailing the ways to improve efficiency, the cost of specific improvements, benefits, and the time frame for recouping those investments."

There is no requirement for the facility to submit the information to the regulatory agency, but rather to maintain the results on file for subsequent inspection.

These rules do not require the implementation of any identified project; instead, it is presumed that other factors, such as cap-and-trade or energy-cost economics will compel the source to undertake the projects. However, the energy assessments required for units subject to Boiler MACT are expected to identify projects pursuant to compliance with this rule.

This state-wide rule could set priorities, thresholds, and deadlines for the implementation of the projects identified by the Boiler MACT. The challenge with this approach is that the identified projects could be process redesign projects, which the Agencies have specifically precluded from being within the purview of this review. In examining the remaining list of RACT-level actions, the efficiency measures under consideration would be included in the Boiler MACT assessment. The rules are not in conflict, and the assessment required under the Boiler MACT would be beneficial for identifying GHG reduction projects at the oil refineries. **Therefore, the federal Boiler MACT rule is not evaluated further as a RACT candidate.**

7.3.3 Electric Utility Efficiency Incentive Programs

Washington State law requires the assessment and subsequent distribution of funds to improve industrial efficiency, which is implemented through utility efficiency incentive programs (also referred to as energy conservation projects). These programs are run by the utility that serves each facility, with assistance from the Bonneville Power Administration for the public utility districts (PUDs). BP, Shell, and Tesoro are served by the Puget Sound Energy. Phillips 66 is served by the Whatcom County PUD. US Oil is served by Tacoma Power (Tacoma PUD).

Each power provider is required to assess a tariff for the specific purpose of funding energy efficiency projects. For the top purchasers of power, such as the refineries, the tariff fund is reserved on an individual facility basis for the reimbursement of projects approved by the power provider. The tariff fund is earmarked for the facility a specific period of time, during which each facility can be reimbursed for the amount that they paid in. Once that time period has passed, unclaimed funds become available to any facility in the program, typically through a competitive bid process.

The power providers have in-house industrial energy experts available to assist the facilities in identifying and scoping potential projects eligible for the reimbursement program. However, according to the electric utility experts, the program has historically been underutilized by Washington State refineries; the refineries have not consistently applied for tariff funds to offset projects, thereby allowing the funds to pass on to other applicants through the competitive bid process.

A requirement to participate in the electric utility efficiency incentive programs is a technically feasible RACT candidate if the utilities are willing to participate.

7.3.4 Cap-and-Trade Programs

Wikipedia provides the following succinct summary: "Emissions trading or cap-and-trade is a market-based approach used to control pollution by providing economic incentives for achieving reductions in the emissions of pollutants. A central authority (usually a governmental body) sets a limit or cap on the amount of a pollutant that may be emitted. The limit or cap is allocated or sold to firms in the form of emissions permits which represent the right to emit or discharge a specific volume of the specified pollutant. Firms are required to hold a number of permits (or allowances or carbon credits) equivalent to their emissions. The total number of permits cannot exceed the cap, limiting total emissions to that level. Firms that need to increase their volume of emissions must buy permits from those who require fewer permits. The transfer of permits is referred to as a trade. In effect, the buyer is paying a charge for polluting, while the seller is being rewarded for having reduced emissions. Thus, in theory, those who can reduce emissions most cheaply will do so, achieving the pollution reduction at the lowest cost to society." (Wikipedia, 2013).

Benchmarking has been the primary approach used to date to address GHG emissions at oil refineries. Although there are no existing regulations that specifically limit GHG emissions at oil refineries, several cap and trade programs do include regulations intended to reduce GHG emissions over time. The background documentation for cap and trade rulemaking in Europe and North America indicates that governing bodies have found benchmarking to be the most appropriate approach for characterizing the performance of a complex process for energy efficiency. Complex industrial facilities manage energy in diverse ways. For example, even if a facility has the most efficient onsite power production available, if the equipment that uses that power is inefficient, the overall impact is limited.

California's Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32)²² imposes a cap-and-trade governance of GHG emissions in the state, which addresses large sources such as refineries, power plants, industrial facilities, and transportation systems. AB 32 provides a fixed limit on GHG emissions from the sources responsible for about 85% of the state's total GHG emissions. AB 32 reduces GHG emissions by applying a declining aggregate cap on GHG emissions and creates a flexible compliance system through the use of tradable instruments (i.e., allowances and offset credits). AB 32 became effective January 1, 2012.

The allowances for oil refineries for the first few years of the AB 32 program (2012 to 2014) were based on the Solomon Associates $EII^{(R)}$ benchmarking product directly. For 2015 to 2020, the State of California will be shifting to use of the Solomon Associates CO_2 weighted barrelsTM (CWBTM) metric for calculating allowances (Solomon, 2013). The use of the CWB metric in California was facilitated by the Western States Petroleum Association working collaboratively with the State of California.

In 2012, CARB released a notice of regulatory amendment (CARB 2013) to link the State of California's cap-and-trade program with a similar program in Québec. California and Québec have been working together to ensure that both systems' operations are compatible. To that end, the link between California and Québec will need to be effective as of January 1, 2014.

On December 14, 2011, the Government of Québec adopted a cap-and-trade system for GHG emission allowances. On December 12, 2012, the Government of Québec adopted a regulation to amend the regulation in order to better align Québec's system with California's system, as well as those of future partners such as Ontario and British Columbia. British Columbia passed GHG cap legislation in 2008 but has yet to promulgate a trading regulation. Ontario has not yet passed cap and trade regulations.

The Canadian government in conjunction with the Canadian Petroleum Products Institute (now known as the Canadian Fuels Association) has also taken separate steps to reduce GHG emissions from oil refineries. The Canadian Industry Program for Energy Conservation involved all 21 oil refineries operating in Canada. The refiners made a commitment to reduce the energy intensity (using the Solomon EII[®] score) of production by at least 1% per year from 1995 to 2000. The commitment was met and extended to 2004. The Canadian Fuels Association (2013) reported a resulting decrease in CO_2 emissions of 20% between the 1990 base year and 2010.

Considering the GHG reductions achieved by Canadian oil refineries and the expectations from California and Europe for GHG reductions, there are likely opportunities for measurable GHG reductions within the US oil refining sector, including the Washington State refineries.

²² California Code of Regulations Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 10 Climate Change, Article 5, Subarticle 9 §95891 Allocation for Industry Assistance.

The European Union (EU) elected²³ to use the CWT[™] metric that was developed by Solomon specifically to characterize GHG emissions from refinery operations at the 98 EU refineries for the EU cap-and-trade program. The CWT[™] development effort was spearheaded by the oil companies' European association for safety and environment in refining and distribution, Conservation of Clean Air and Water in Europe (CONCAWE). CONCAWE has 42 member companies, including BP, Phillips 66, and Shell.

Several researchers and public policy centers have written about ways in which cap-andtrade or market-oriented approaches to controlling GHGs could be established under existing USCAA requirements. These include the New York University Institute for Policy Integrity (Chettiar and Schwartz, 2009), the Pew Center on Global Climate Change (PCGCC, 2011), and World Resources Institute (Bianco, et. al., 2011). The NYU paper suggested that BACT determinations would be difficult to integrate into a cap-and-trade system. The other papers directed their attention at other parts of the law. None suggested that BACT determinations offer a potential means for market-based approaches to GHG control. Since RACT determinations are made using an approach similar to BACT, the same concerns would likely apply. But even if further study showed that RACT could be a market-based approach to controlling GHGs, this evaluation has not focused on that alternative because of the small number of oil refineries in Washington State. It seems unlikely that a viable market could be established among five refineries. **Therefore, cap and trade is not evaluated further as a RACT candidate.**

7.4 Potential Future Information Sources

California's AB 32 also directed CARB to prepare a scoping plan that identifies how to best reach the 2020 GHG limit. The Regulation for Energy Efficiency and Co-Benefits Assessment of Large Industrial Facilities (i.e., the Energy Efficiency Assessment Regulation)²⁴ required high-GHG-emitting stationary industrial facilities (including oil refineries) to identify their energy consumption and associated GHG emissions, determine potential opportunities for improving energy efficiency and reducing GHG emissions, and identify potential future actions for obtaining further reductions in GHG emissions. Each facility was required to submit to CARB a report that specified the results of the study and provided an action plan. CARB is compiling that information as this report is being developed. Those reductions will be used to meet each plant's GHG cap as it is set in the future.

CARB released the Phase 1 report (CARB, 2013) with the following preliminary summary statistics:

 $^{^{23}}$ April 27, 2011, commission decision determining transitional Union-wide rules for harmonized free allocation of emission allowances pursuant to Article 10a of Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (notified under document C(2011) 2772), (2011/278/EU).

²⁴ California Code of Regulations Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 10, Article 4, Subarticle 9 §95600 to 95612

- The 12 refineries subject to the Energy Efficiency Assessment Regulation identified over 400 energy efficiency improvement projects.
- The total GHG reductions associated with these projects is estimated to be approximately 2.8-million metric tons (MMT) CO₂e.
- Approximately 78% of the estimated GHG reductions (2.2 MMT CO₂e) is from completed projects, with 63% (1.4 MMT CO₂e) being from projects completed before 2010 (and therefore already accounted for in the 2009 emissions inventories) and 37% (0.8 MMTCO₂e) being from projects completed during or after 2010.
- Approximately 22% of the estimated GHG reductions (0.6 MMT CO₂e) is from projects that are scheduled (7%) or under investigation (15%).
- Corresponding reductions of NO_x and PM are 2.5 and 0.6 tons per day (tpd), respectively, with approximately 50 to 60% of the reductions from projects completed before 2010 and 40 to 50% of the reductions from projects that were either completed during or after 2010, scheduled, or under investigation.

CARB anticipates that more information will be released in the phase 2 report of the series due out at the end of 2013.

On May 23, 2012, EPA and the BP Whiting refinery entered into a consent decree that includes a study of energy efficiency measures to reduce GHG emissions at the refinery and the expenditure of \$9.5 million to implement GHG-reducing measures. Subsequent to undertaking the efficiency projects, the facility will conduct a study of the energy efficiency measures implemented and the effect of such practices on the reduction of GHG emissions. The results of the study, to the extent that they are made public, will shed light on current opportunities for the reduction of GHG emissions.

7.5 Summary of GHG Reduction Strategy Findings

In summary, the following GHG reduction strategies are dismissed as RACT candidates for one or more reasons:

- 1. CCS
- 2. Carbon capture and utilization
- 3. CHP or cogeneration
- 4. Power recovery power generators
- 5. Process cooling optimization
- 6. FCCU high-efficiency regenerator design
- 7. Hydrogen plant design optimization
- 8. Sulfur plant design optimization
- 9. System optimization (process integration/pinch analysis)
- 10. Crude oil feed (crude slate) constraints
- 11. EPA Energy Star[®] certification
- 12.40 CFR Part 63 Subpart DDDDD

The following strategies are found technically feasible to effectively reduce GHG emissions at oil refineries:

For boilers

- 1. Burner replacement/upgrades
- 2. Tuning
- 3. System modeling and optimization
- 4. Air leakage reduction/maintenance
- 5. Instrumentation and controls (particularly air:fuel ratio)
- 6. System insulation
- 7. Condensate system maintenance and improved recovery
- 8. Steam trap maintenance
- 9. Air/BFW preheaters/economizers

For heaters

- 10. Burner maintenance
- 11. Combustion air instrumentation and controls; particularly air:fuel ratio
- 12. Optimization, including heat exchange network design minimizing pump power requirements
- 13. Scaling reduction maintenance
- 14. Air preheaters/economizers
- 15. Heat transfer system upgrades (finned or dimpled tubes)

Others

- 16. Flaring limits
- 17. Flare gas recovery
- 18. Flare design and operation specifications
- 19. Coker blowdown pressure limitations
- 20. Inclusion of fuel gas components in LDAR programs
- 21. EnMS
- 22. Benchmarking
- 23. Participation in DOE ITPs
- 24. Participation in utility efficiency programs

RACT determinations on an equipment-specific basis are impractical for the Agencies due to the diversity and inter-relatedness of the sources and the complexity of the potential RACT rule. Based on the agency review, a facility-wide approach is expected to achieve GHG reductions of at least as much as implementation of equipment-based standards. Utilizing a facility-wide approach is generally expected to reduce the average cost of compliance because facilities can evaluate the entire plant and select those projects that are most economical and appropriate for their situation.

Many control strategies that reduced GHG emissions at oil refineries were deemed potential redesigns of the refining processes. It is not appropriate for a regulatory agency to impose such redesigns as RACT requirements. However, the redesign strategies hold the largest potential for GHG reductions across the industry because they are associated with the energy demand side of the process, and fundamentally, energy demand accounts for all energy use within a facility. A facility-wide approach allows for the use of redesign projects

to meet the overall objective of meeting industry benchmarks and/or reducing GHG emissions.

Section 8: Proposed RACT

A large number and diverse range of technically feasible equipment-specific options are identified in this determination. The Agencies also identified a complex network of equipment and processes from which GHG reductions could be realized. Therefore, the Agencies focused on identifying an approach that requires facilities to apply reasonably available technology and work practice standards to achieve GHG reductions, while providing facilities with the flexibility necessary to meet the requirement and recognizing those facilities that are already implementing these efficiency measures.

The Agencies propose that the GHG RACT for the five Washington oil refineries be a dual-path process as follows:

- A refinery may demonstrate reasonably available energy efficiency performance by scoring in the top 50th percentile of similar sized US refineries, or
- A refinery must implement projects or work practices to achieve GHG emission reductions that cumulatively add up to 10% of the baseline-year facility GHG emissions, with those reductions allowed to occur over approximately a 10-year period, whichever path is completed first

The Agencies propose to use the Solomon EII[®] scoring system for the oil refineries as the benchmark demonstration of an investment in energy efficiency measures at the facility. Specifically, if a facility is among the top performing half (i.e., top 50%) of US similar-sized refineries, according to the Solomon EII[®] score, the facility has demonstrated compliance with GHG RACT.

For a facility that does not meet the energy efficiency benchmark of the top 50th percentile, the required GHG reduction is calculated as 10% of the total facility GHG emissions in the baseline year of 2010. The 2010 baseline year was chosen because it is the first year that the federal GHG reporting program was in place, providing a consistent calculation of refinery GHG emissions. An alternative year of 2011 may be used as the baseline emissions year in the event that 2010 is not representative of typical facility operation due to extended process outages (i.e., greater than 30 days).

Based on information from the refineries either received under normal reporting requirements to the Agencies or specific to this rulemaking, the baseline year for each refinery on the GHG emission reduction path, is:

- BP 2010
- Phillips 66 2010
- Shell 2010
- Tesoro 2011
- US Oil 2011

The baseline year for the Tesoro and US Oil refineries is 2011; while the baseline year for the BP, Phillips 66, and Shell refineries is 2010. Tesoro was shut down for approximately 6 months after a refinery fire that occurred in April 2010, and US Oil underwent a major turnaround in 2010, shutting down for approximately 5 weeks in 2010. If GHG emissions reductions projects undertaken by a refinery result in an EII[®] score that meets the 50th percentile performance benchmark, the facility can submit that demonstration at any time during the 10-year completion period. Once the refinery has demonstrated that it has achieved the benchmark, the 10% emission reduction is no longer an applicable requirement.

8.1 Setting the RACT Performance Bar

WAC 173-400 defines "reasonably available control technology (RACT)" as "the lowest emission limit that a particular source or source category is capable of meeting by the application of control technology that is reasonably available considering technological and economic feasibility. RACT is determined on a case-by-case basis for an individual source or source category taking into account the impact of the source upon air quality, the availability of additional controls, the emission reduction to be achieved by additional controls, the impact of additional controls on air quality, and the capital and operating costs of the additional controls. RACT requirements for any source or source category shall be adopted only after notice and opportunity for comment are afforded."

In very general terms, the performance goal of a given pollutant RACT rule is that when cost-effective control technology is applied to units that are large enough to impact regional air quality, the average air quality of that region is maintained within the NAAQS, excluding other sources. This GHG RACT determination is fundamentally different from previous RACT determinations in many respects, including the following:

- There are no GHG NAAQS against which to measure progress. Therefore, two of the critical steps prescribed in the determination process (the impact of the source on air quality and the impact of additional controls on air quality) are unavailable. The practical implication of having no NAAQS and a global impact pollutant is that a defined emission rate (or emission limit) is of limited use in modeling exercises to determine impact. Because the GHG emissions from Washington refineries are such a small percentage of the global total of GHG emissions, the emissions from the Washington refineries could all else remaining equal shift upward or downward over a broad range without appreciably changing the global atmospheric concentration of CO₂. Therefore, the focus of this determination shifted from establishing an emission limit that would address an existing air quality concern to identifying and requiring the installation of technologically available control strategies.
- GHG emissions reductions are a result of efficiency improvement measures analogous to pollution prevention, not control device installations. The breadth and depth of the potential projects at the refineries makes it impractical for the Agencies to assess capital and operating costs specific to individual strategies. For each

facility, a detailed, specialized understanding of the process units and operating conditions is essential to undertake these types of project assessments.

• All efficiency improvement projects at refineries identified by the Agencies have a payback period in which not only the operating costs of the project are recovered, but also the initial capital expense. Such a scenario is not the case with criteria pollutant RACT determinations that set a cost/ton of pollutant controlled threshold.

Simply put, critical approaches and rationales established in traditional criteria pollutant RACT determinations utilize concepts that are not practically available here.

The Agencies considered the use of the Solomon CWB[™] metric developed for California. However, this approach was rejected because the Solomon CWB[™] metric was not developed for the purpose of devising emission limits, rather it provides a calculation method for carbon emissions allowances, and therefore, would require substantial specialized review and modification by Solomon Associates - essentially developing a new product. The Agencies found that development of a new metric was beyond the available resources and scope of this GHG RACT rulemaking. Further, the existing Solomon EII[®] product (which is available) was determined to be appropriate. The California CWB factors are largely an adaptation of the EII[®] standard energy, and the data used as basis was collected by Solomon in 2006 from worldwide participating refineries.

A unit-by-unit, strategy-by-strategy approach was rejected by the Agencies because it would require a facility-by-facility RACT determination rather than a rulemaking activity. Based on the information the Agencies have at this time, such an approach would not be possible due to the breadth and depth of specialized knowledge required for each facility.

Based in large part on these findings, the Agencies have concluded that it is necessary to implement GHG RACT differently than in previous criteria pollutant RACT determinations while maintaining fidelity with the underlying RACT statute in Washington. The goal of this RACT determination can be restated as: to define a reasonably efficient refinery operation in Washington State in the 2010-2012 timeframe. The proposed RACT defines a reasonably efficient refinery as a refinery that demonstrates an energy efficiency performance comparable to or above the 50% percentile of similar-sized US refineries or GHG emissions reductions through the implementation of reasonably available technology (including work practice standards) that cumulatively amount to 10% of the facility overall emissions, whichever milestone is met first.

The proposed efficiency performance and GHG emissions reductions can be achieved by implementing control strategies that have been demonstrated in practice. The proposed RACT provides the flexibility to choose from any control strategy, including but not limited to those listed in this determination that can be implemented over a 10-year period. The proposed 10-year compliance period allows facilities to manage the capital costs of compliance by allowing planning time over approximately two turn-around cycles. The implementation of projects during planned turnarounds also avoids emissions associated with additional equipment shutdowns. The facility boundary for the efficiency performance of GHG reductions is defined as the refinery fence line.

8.2 Basis for Benchmark Demonstration of Compliance

The Agencies believe that the investment in equipment and resources necessary to achieve a reasonably efficient process should be encouraged at any and all times during the proposed 10-year phase-in period. It is also reasonable to allow facilities to use operational demonstrations for the years prior to the RACT rule issuance, potentially back to 2006; the Energy Star Program inception year establishing the performance benchmarks.

The Agencies propose to use the Solomon EII[®] scoring system as the measurement and demonstration of energy efficiency at the refineries. If a facility is within the top 50% of the Solomon EII[®] scores of all similar-sized US refineries as established in the EPA Energy Star Program, the facility has demonstrated that it is a reasonably efficient refinery. The Agencies' review of the California CWB documentation (Solomon, 2013) found that the proposed RACT is consistent with the California GHG Program. The Solomon EII[®] score reflects an individual facility's energy intensity. To be in the top 50% of similar-sized US refineries, a facility is presumed to have implemented procedures that maintain equipment efficiency and already invested in basic capital projects to improve energy efficiency. Energy costs are estimated to account for approximately 60% of non-feedstock operating expenses in the average refinery. Therefore, minimizing these costs is essential to the refinery's competitive operation. It is reasonable to assume that refineries motivated to improve energy efficiency will choose to implement the most cost-effective, low-capital projects first, followed by moderate- and then high-capital projects. However, in general, refineries do not undertake large-capital investment projects for energy efficiency gains alone; rather, larger investments are driven by other goals, such as capacity or yield increases, with efficiency gains being a corollary benefit.

Thus, facilities that are already performing in the top half of their peer group have a narrowing scope of potential efficiency improvements available, and those energy efficiency projects that are available are likely to require increasingly greater capital expense to accomplish.

For facilities in the lower half of US refinery EII[®] performance, the scope of potential energy efficiency improvements and associated GHG emissions reductions is broad and includes basic equipment upgrades and no-to-low-cost operational improvements. This approach is generally considered to be on the level of RACT.

A potential criticism of a benchmarking approach is that there is no guarantee that a refinery that demonstrates compliance with this approach has implemented *all* reasonably available energy efficiency measures. Based on the information reviewed in this determination, the Agencies believe that the proposed benchmark reflects the implementation of reasonably available technology and work practices specific to any given Washington refinery. The implementation of all possible control technologies is not a typical outcome of any RACT determination. For any RACT evaluation, the process is designed to identify the best control option, weighing its cost, effectiveness, and other impacts.

Any facility has the ability to improve its Solomon $\text{EII}^{\$}$ score by investing in the equipment and practices necessary to improve efficiency (Hileman, 2001). An improvement in a facility's Solomon $\text{EII}^{\$}$ score indicates improved energy efficiency and a reduction in CO_2e emissions based on that facility's production. One particular advantage of Solomon $\text{EII}^{\$}$ is that 90% of US refineries already subscribe to the service and would thus incur no additional cost for monitoring and compliance demonstration.

The Agencies propose using US refineries nationwide as the comparison group because they are subject to similar regulations and represent a reasonably large number of facilities for comparison. US refineries also experience similar energy prices, overall economic climates, and fuels markets. The global refinery pool was rejected as the comparison group for two primary reasons: a wide range of energy prices directly influence the economics of efficiency and fuel market product specifications and prices vary significantly on a global scale. In addition, refineries around the world are also subject to different environmental and labor regulations. A more local supply region (i.e., PADD 5) was also rejected as a potential facility pool because of the relatively small number of facilities available for comparison. There are 32 operating refineries in PADD 5 versus 139 nationwide according to EIA (2013).

Energy Star[®] certification for level-of-efficiency performance (i.e., top 25th percentile of the Solomon EII[®]) was rejected as a compliance demonstration because it would set a bar that is beyond the expectation of RACT. Press releases for facilities receiving Energy Star[®] certification provide an indication of the types of projects that were undertaken to achieve certification, including the following:

- Phillips 66 (formerly ConocoPhillips) set a corporate-level energy reduction goal of 10% between 2007 and 2012. The Billings, Montana, refinery press release credited common energy efficiency measures applied to an uncommon extent and noted the installation of a new cogeneration facility (Johnson, 2007). The press release for the Bayway refinery in Linden, New Jersey, reported that the refinery improved its energy efficiency by 11% between 2002 and 2012 by strategically managing energy consumption and making cost-effective improvements to the plant, such as replacing a large crude oil unit furnace, replacing the sulfur recovery plant, and upgrading various energy recovery systems (Phillips, 2013).
- In 2002, Marathon set a goal of a 10% energy efficiency improvement in 10 years. The Canton refinery surpassed the 10-year goal within 5 years by improving insulation and installing new heat exchangers (Energy Star[®] 2013).
- The ExxonMobil Baton Rouge refinery improved its energy efficiency by 12% between 2000 and 2007 using its global EnMS. Projects undertaken included heat exchanger monitoring, steam trap and steam leak repair programs, and upgraded furnace air pre-heaters (ExxonMobil, 2008).

Specifically, the installation of new cogeneration, and replacement crude oil furnaces and sulfur plants have been determined to be beyond RACT because they are process redesigns. The Agencies did not receive specific cost information for these projects because they occurred outside of Washington State. Air preheaters and heat exchanger upgrades might

be RACT-level projects, depending on the efficiency of the existing equipment at any given refinery. The levels of efficiency improvement (10 to 12%) reported here are demonstrated in 5 to 7 years.

A component of the Energy Star[®] Program is included in this RACT proposal. Energy Star[®] uses categories of similar-sized refineries for the calculation of the 25% performance goal. The size categories provide a fair comparison of operations because the EII[®] statistic is affected by economies of scale in refining. For example, larger refineries with multiple processing trains have significantly more opportunities for heat exchanger networks. The Agencies propose that the RACT performance demonstration use the refinery size categories already established in the Energy Star[®] Program to serve as EII[®] benchmark categories that can be fairly assessed for varying refinery capacities. Energy Star[®] also provides an established data set, which is still in use in that program's benchmarking, from 2006 participating refineries for use in setting the benchmark performance levels. The Agencies considered the use of alternate year's data (post-2006). Because the 2006 benchmark performances have been compared to more current years' data sets and found to be consistent by Solomon Associates, it is reasonable to continue to use the 2006 data-based benchmarks. The Agencies did not seek a specific explanation as to why the performance benchmarks have not changed. However, the use of the 2006 data set may set a high benchmark because the US refinery utilization rate was 89.7% versus 86.4% in 2010 (EIA 2013). Crude throughput and utilization have a significant effect on the EII statistic because refinery operations run the most efficiently at full capacity. Incremental efficiency improvements brought online at refineries between 2006 and 2010 may be outweighed by capacity utilization. The Agencies chose the EII[®] statistic because it has been used by another governmental program and it is reflective of facility efficiency.

The California CWB factors are also based on 2006 data (Solomon, 2013). Therefore, the proposed GHG RACT energy efficiency benchmark method is not in conflict with the California Program.

The Agencies determined that it is appropriate to set a stable performance benchmark for the duration of the proposed rule, in contrast to calculating a new 50th percentile performance benchmark on an interim basis (such as once every two years). A single benchmark established at the outset of the program provides certainty as to the demonstration of compliance.

There may be perceived drawbacks to using the Solomon EII[®] benchmark. The system is proprietary and considered to be highly sensitive commercially. Neither the basis data nor the calculation methodology are available to the public for review. However, the integrity of the global business of Solomon weighs against compromising the calculation, and the data submitted to Solomon is under the direction of a licensed professional engineer who is held to strict ethical standards that are similar to those established for responsible official certification under the Title V program. The data that are provided to Solomon can be reviewed by the Agencies. Furthermore, the Agencies have not been able to identify a comparable alternative to the Solomon EII[®] benchmark. Although the EII[®] benchmark is

widely used, Solomon also has a number of other efficiency-based indexing products available to the refining industry. Solomon works through the local or regional industry association, and conveys ownership of the methodology to the industry association for working with regulators for legislation. After the official transfer of ownership, the industry association may work directly with regulators for modifying the content of the methodologies as needed. Among those products are alternatives that may be acceptable or better-suited to the proposed method for RACT determination. However, if proposed by the refinery sector, the use of an alternate index would require additional review.

8.3 Efficiency Benchmark Compliance Demonstration

The procedure for demonstrating compliance with the benchmark standard is proposed as follows:

- 1. A facility interested in obtaining certification would provide baseline year data to Solomon using the appropriate forms certified by a professional engineer.
- Solomon would perform the EII[®] calculations and provide certification to the facility, which could then be forwarded to the Agencies. The certifying letter would include statements that the facility had demonstrated energy efficiency performance in the top 50% of similar-sized US refineries.

The certification from Solomon ensures that the facility has been compared using a set target EII[®]. The EII[®] target will be calculated by Solomon for each refinery size category using 2006 data from participating US refineries. These performance targets will be held for the duration of this program, inasmuch as it would be inappropriate to recalculate performance targets at later dates under this rule because it could result in a moving RACT standard. RACT standards are determined at a point in time and are reviewed periodically to determine if the standard should be updated. The approach of designating a performance target year is consistent with RACT policy. In addition, in discussions with Solomon technical experts, the Agencies have learned that the performance thresholds of the Energy Star[®] program have been stable for the past 6 to 8 years.

This type of system is also in place in California for Phase 1 of the cap-and-trade regulation to determine initial carbon allocations. The EII[®] is submitted to CARB as the basis for GHG allocations.

As a whole, Washington State refineries implement more efficiency measures on boilers and heaters than reported by other US refineries (see Section 6 of this determination). Based on this information, the Agencies expect that some (and possibly all) Washington State refineries will demonstrate above-average energy performance within the first few years of this program. However, demonstrations have not been provided by the Washington State refineries to the Agencies at this time. Therefore, the Agencies do not know if the proposed RACT has been met by any of the Washington State refineries.

8.4 Basis for GHG Reduction Goal

Publications and reports reviewed by the Agencies have provided a basis for estimating potential efficiency improvements in oil refineries.

The CARB *Energy Efficiency and Co-Benefits Assessment of Large Industrial Sources Refinery Sector Public Report* (CARB, 2013), which was released June 6, 2013, summarized the data provided by the State of California refineries pursuant to the CARB regulation. The baseline year for the assessment was 2009, during which the refineries reported total CO₂e emissions of 31.4 MMT. In the assessment phase, the 12 California refineries identified more than 400 energy efficiency improvement projects that, once implemented, are projected to reduce GHG emissions by 2.8-MMT CO₂e per year. Although no specific goal was stipulated for the process, on their first round of review, the refineries identified approximately 9% CO₂e emission reductions. The projects were considered economically feasible by the facilities and many (80%) of the projects have already been completed, although there was no regulatory requirement to do so. The rule allowed for projects completed prior to the baseline year to be included. Most of the completed projects occurred between 2006 and 2011.

The Canadian Industry Program for Energy Conservation produced an Energy Consumption Benchmark Guide (Nyboer and Rivers, 2002) that summarized the Canadian refining industry, indicated the variation of efficiencies and energy intensities, provided a benchmark comparison, and provided some general actions to improve efficiencies for the 21 operating oil refineries in Canada. The refiners cooperatively made a commitment to reduce the energy intensity (based on the Solomon EII[®] score) of production by at least 1% per year from 1995 to 2000. The commitment was met and extended to 2004. The Canadian Fuels Association (2013) reported a resulting decrease in CO_2 emissions of 20% between the 1990 base year and 2010.

In a 2008 *Hydrocarbon Processing* report (Spoor, 2008), refineries were estimated to have 10 to 15% GHG reductions readily available, with project payback periods of 2 to 3 years. The report pointed to the use of benchmarking to identify potential areas of improvement and noted that efficiency improvements typically fall into three categories (similar to the areas described in Section 3 of this report): fired heater efficiency, power generation efficiency, and energy integration.

In 2010, *Hydrocarbon Engineering* published a report (Mertens and Skelland, 2010) that estimated that the carbon reductions achievable with a payback period of less than 4 years (excluding cogeneration) was approximately 15%. Cogeneration was estimated at an additional 7% of potential emission reductions, depending on the site location and whether the application was new construction or a retrofit.

EPA's refining white paper (EPA, 2010) provides equipment-specific emissions reduction estimates. A sum of the total reduction potential for the various units listed far exceeds a 10% overall GHG emissions reduction.

In 2006, DOE published a paper (DOE, 2006) that included the following statement: "According to experts working in the field of petroleum refining and energy management, the plant-wide refinery energy savings potential is usually found to be around 30%." The report reviewed the top five energy-intensive refining processes (i.e., crude distillation, fluidized catalytic cracking, catalytic hydrotreating, catalytic reforming, and alkylation) and estimated that available potential energy savings for those processes to be 23 to 54%.

As part of this rulemaking process, the Agencies requested information from the Washington state refineries regarding large (defined in the request as on the order of 1% GHG reduction) projects completed since 2006. All five refineries provided responses to the request. Four of the five refineries responded that efficiency projects had been completed; listing approximately 30 projects identified as confidential business information including both large and small projects that have resulted in approximately 400,000 tons of total GHG emission reductions. The ambiguity in the project numbers reported here result from project descriptions submitted that appear to have occurred prior to 2006 or to have yet to be completed. One facility responded that it had no projects to report. The Agencies did not request or receive adequate information to independently determine average payback periods or assess other economic details for the projects reported. Project information for a subset of responses included (again as confidential business information) general project costs ranging from less than \$100,000 to \$25 million and payback periods ranging from less than one month to more than 12 years. The Agencies did not request information regarding efficiency projects completed prior to 2006. Projects completed prior to 2006 were not considered because they occurred prior to the Solomon efficiency standard year (2006).

The Agencies considered allowing for emissions reductions for projects prior to the 2010 baseline period. However, allowing for projects completed prior to 2010 was rejected because the calculation method for emissions reductions would have to modify the baseline data to include the original emissions to avoid "double counting" the reductions against the 2010 baseline. Further, any efficiency improvements made prior to the baseline year would be reflected in the energy efficiency performance of the facility.

Based on the literature reviewed during this RACT process and the published GHG reductions (from 9 to 20%) demonstrated by oil refineries in Canada, California, and Europe, an average GHG reduction goal of 10% is achievable at a reasonable cost assuming that refineries have not already implemented the identified efficiency measures. For those facilities needing assistance in finding efficiency projects, this RACT review identified participation in DOE's ITP and the energy assessment in the Boiler MACT regulation as likely resources.

The 10% GHG reduction is proposed as a goal over a 10-year timeframe. The Agencies expect that GHG reduction projects that involve capital expenditure will need sufficient time for planning (both engineering and financial), as well as implementation. The 10-year phase-in timeframe has been established to accommodate two major turnaround cycles. The industry's average turnaround cycle ranges between 3 and 5 years. There are also shorter, more frequent maintenance events and partial shutdowns during interim periods at

most facilities, making equipment available for "quick fix" energy projects. Therefore, a facility's plan to comply with the proposed RACT rule is expected to include procedural reviews and maintenance activities in the near-term (i.e., within the plant manager's authority) followed by the review, prioritization, and funding of energy efficiency projects that require higher capital investment (i.e., approval by corporate management). This approach will allow facilities to schedule projects with minimum downtime.

8.5 GHG Reduction Compliance Demonstration

The baseline year GHG emissions for facilities on the emission reduction compliance path will be determined from data submitted through the EPA GHG reporting program, which has consistent reporting calculation and format requirements.

Emissions generated by means of onsite cogeneration electrical power production must be treated separate from this RACT regulation. Cogeneration will increase GHG emissions from the facility offsetting greater emissions at the power plant where the purchased power would otherwise have been generated. On a global basis, therefore, correctly sized and operated cogeneration systems improve energy efficiency and reduce GHG emissions. This should be encouraged, and proper credit should be given to those facilities that do so.

One option is to evaluate projects similar to current air quality permitting practices, in which existing emissions are compared with projected post-project emissions, including upstream and downstream emission effects. For some projects, the monitoring of emissions would need to continue for a period of time after project completion to ensure that the implemented change resulted in an emissions reduction and is sustainable. For projects that have ongoing requirements, such as steam trap maintenance programs, certification that the program is in place might be sufficient for reporting.

Allowances for electrification upgrades (e.g., the replacement of a steam turbine with an electric motor) should also be provided for situations in which the upgrade improves efficiency. However, it would be inappropriate to credit 100% of the GHG emissions for a given project because power production would generate GHG at another facility. Thus, the power plant GHGs should be subtracted from the refinery credit for onsite emissions reductions. Electrical power is provided to the Washington State refineries by several sources (as presented in Table 8-1), with each facility reporting the carbon intensity of power generation.

		Carbon intensity (bs CO₂e/kWh)
Facility	Power Provider	20102011	2011
US Oil	Tacoma Power (PUD)	0.6 (NWPCC ^a)	Not reported
Shell ^b	Onsite cogeneration via PSE	0.43	0.43
Tesoro	PSE	1.03	0.87
Phillips 66	Whatcom County PUD	0.6 (NWPCC)	Not reported
BP	PSE	1.03	0.87

Table 8-1 Carbon Intensity for Local Power Providers

^a NWPCC = Northwest Power and Conservation Council.

^b Shell produces power at the facility cogeneration plant, sells the power to PSE, and buys back the refinery load. Thus the cogeneration carbon intensity is appropriate for the Shell refinery because it is essentially producing its own power.

The calculated emissions reduction at the refinery will correlate with the associated increase in emissions from the power provider when electrical equipment is used to replace directfired or steam-driven units. No credit is provided for electrical upgrades to electrical equipment. Those projects have separate economic incentives through the power providers, as described in Section 6.

8.6 Overlap with Existing Rules

During the initial information gathering meetings as part of this RACT analysis, the use of the Boiler MACT was suggested as a GHG RACT strategy. Although the Boiler MACT rule requires an efficiency review of the units subject to the regulation, it does not require any follow-up action on items identified during the review.

In examining the list of actions that the boiler MACT efficiency review would likely identify, it is evident that the efficiency measures under consideration would also generate emission reductions/efficiency improvements, meeting the proposed RACT rule. Therefore, the two programs are not in conflict and would be mutually beneficial for GHG reductions. The state-wide RACT rule could set priorities, thresholds, and deadlines for the implementation of the projects identified by the Boiler MACT. However, the Agencies determined that such an approach is not warranted given the proposed RACT determination.

Similarly, the 40 CFR Part 60 Subpart Ja provisions were presented during initial stakeholder meetings. The flare gas recovery provisions of that rule further the overall efficiency of the facility and generate GHG emission reductions that will also contribute to the goals of the proposed RACT rule.

8.7 Economic Analysis

In a traditional RACT determination that includes an emission unit-by-unit and pollutant-bypollutant review, the total capital investment and annual costs for control measures are included. The cost estimates are based on specific equipment installations, including heat and material balances (i.e., flowsheet calculations). The economic analysis for the proposed GHG RACT differs from the standard air pollutant analysis in several ways:

- Instead of identifying the specific control devices to be applied to emission units, the Agencies identified numerous possible solutions that the facilities might implement (including process redesigns) to accomplish the efficiency reduction goal of 10%.
- This flexibility in strategies to reduce GHG emissions does not lend itself to the traditional flowsheet analysis and calculation of cost/ton that is typical for the RACT economics analysis.
- Energy efficiency projects typically reduce operational costs sufficiently that the facility not only recovers all the annual operating costs of the equipment or work practices but also recoups the initial capital investment.
- Almost all energy efficiency projects provide additional benefits, including reductions in water use, waste generation, and criteria air pollutant emissions.

The flexible compliance strategy proposed in this RACT analysis also compounds the complexity of the possible compliance option costs. The Agencies did not develop any cost or emission change information for the unit specific controls that could be implemented. Evaluating the cost impacts of these changes requires plant specific information beyond what has been acquired by the Agencies. Examples of information on unit specific costs for actions like burner replacements in heaters, construction of new boilers, or changes to major process units may be found in Ecology's Best Available Retrofit Technology evaluations that are publicly available online at

<u>http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/air/globalwarm_RegHaze/BART/BARTInformation.html or</u> <u>Prevention of Significant Deterioration permit application materials</u>. There are many changes, such as optimization projects, installation of computerized controls to replace manual controls, improvements or changes to equipment maintenance practices, or heat exchanger upgrades which do not include emission increases subject to NSR permitting.

However, there are overarching general concepts that can be applied to provide economic perspective.

Industry literature indicates that improved maintenance programs and basic equipment upgrades typically fall into a 2-to-4-year payback period. The cost of energy is the predominant factor in the payback analysis for energy efficiency projects. DOE projects energy prices for the US and provides those projections on the EIA website (EIA, 2012). As shown in Figure 8-1, in general, electricity prices are predicted to be stable through 2025, while natural gas and refinery product prices are predicted to rise.



Source: EIA (2012)

Figure 8-1 DOE Energy Price Projections from 2010 to 2025

Natural gas prices peaked in 2008 and fell through 2012. Looking forward, the projections show a moderately rising natural gas prices and commensurate electricity prices. The price of petroleum products is also projected to continue on a rising trend. Based on these trends, energy efficiency projects implemented in the future could pay for themselves more quickly than did those implemented during the period from 2008 to 2010, when a number of the California projects were undertaken (see more discussion below).

The Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPCC) February 2013 regional wholesale power price forecast (NWPCC, 2013) indicates that power prices in the area are likely to increase slightly over the next several years, with the primary caveat being natural gas prices. Fossil fuel-based power in the states that comprise the NWPCC's northwest region (Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana) comes primarily from coal, which is expected to be phased out and surpassed by natural gas in approximately 2021. Therefore, natural gas prices will heavily influence the cost of power in the region. This forecast is generally consistent with DOE projections.

The California Energy Assessment Rule required that facilities submit cost information with all identified improvement projects. The 2013 CARB report includes the total one-time capital costs, annual costs, and annual savings for the approximately 400 energy efficiency improvement projects identified in the refinery sector. The 400 projects represent a

potential reduction of 2.8 MMT of GHG emissions annually (approximately 9% of the reported 2009 total GHG emissions from the state's 12 oil refineries). The total estimated one-time costs for all of these projects (except for those identified as "Not Implementing") were estimated to be approximately \$2.6 billion, with annual costs of about \$17 million. These projects would also result in a net aggregate annual savings of approximately \$200 million. The 2013 CARB report does acknowledge that these estimates are preliminary and are not based on detailed engineering and cost analyses, which would be required to accurately estimate emission reductions, costs, and timing of the projects.

The information summarized for each of the 12 refineries included in the 2013 CARB assessment report is varied. Specific details regarding the extent of the individual projects were not made available in order to protect CBI. However, CARB did provide some general findings in their web presentation of the report to the public on July 9, 2013:

- The greatest opportunities for efficiency improvements were in the refinery processors, boilers, and other thermal equipment groups.
- Process changes, equipment upgrades, and new technologies were consistently cited as contributing to the greatest emission improvements for these equipment groups and others.

An article in *Hydrocarbon Engineering* (Zhu et al., 2011) reported on projects undertaken by UOP LLC for a number of refinery units, with payback periods of less than 3 years. One example of an integrated project involved 24 equipment modifications at a cost of \$36 million that had a combined pay-back period of 10.7 years (the pay-back periods for all but one project were less than 3 years), resulting in a 17% energy reduction. The article demonstrated the ability of low-capital-cost projects to improve efficiency and generate savings that could be used to fund higher-capital-cost projects and speculated that by building on previous projects, even more efficiency could be gained to provide additional savings.

The US government provides a social cost of carbon (SCC) estimate to allow agencies to incorporate the social benefits of reducing CO_2 emissions into a cost-benefit analysis of regulatory actions that impact cumulative global emissions (US Government, 2013). The SCC is an estimate of the monetized damages associated with incremental increases in carbon emissions in a given year. The 2013 US Government report provided 5-year SCC estimates for varying discount rates as presented in Table 8-2.

	Estimated 20	Social Cost 07 Dollars by	per metric to y Discount Ra	n of CO_2 in ate
Year	5.0% Avg.	3.0% Avg.	2.5% Avg.	3.0% 95 ^{th a}
2010	11	33	52	90
2015	12	38	58	109
2020	12	43	65	129
2025	14	48	70	144

Table 8-2 Social Cost of CO² per metric ton CO² in 2007 dollars

This column estimates the SCC across all three models used in the study at a 3% discount rate. It is included to represent the higher-than-expected impacts from temperature change further out in the SCC distribution.

Table 8-3 estimates the projected 10% emissions reduction from the 2010 baseline year for the Washington State refineries. The Tesoro refinery was shut down for approximately 6 months during 2010 due to a unit fire; and the US Oil facility underwent a facility turnaround in 2010, shutting down for approximately 5 weeks. Therefore, Tesoro and US Oil will have to use a different baseline year. The reductions included in Table 8-3 for both of these refineries are from 2011, rather than 2010. The Shell facility produces electricity from the cogeneration plant. The Agencies propose that cogeneration be handled separately; thus, GHG from electricity production is excluded from the baseline year and calculation of the 10% reduction for Shell. Efficiency gains realized through reduced electric demand should be considered analogous to the other facilities.

Table 8-3 Estimated CO2 Emission Reductions from2010 Baseline and Social Benefit Calculation

Facility	10% Reduction (mtons/yr CO₂e)	Social Benefit Calculation (2013 dollars) ^a
BP	253,674	\$12,298,096
Phillips 66	88,073	\$ 4,269,774
Shell	157,833 ^b	\$ 7,651,758
Tesoro	116,467 ^c	\$ 5,646,296
US Oil	14,712 ^c	\$ 713,218
Total	630,758	\$30,579,143

^a Using the 3.0% average SCC and applying published consumer price index rates (Sahr, 2013).

^b The Shell reduction calculation excludes the emissions from electricity production at the cogeneration unit.

Reduction from 2011 emissions.

The Agencies expect that the proposed benchmark compliance demonstration procedure using the Solomon EII[®] score for those facilities already implementing energy efficiency measures will bring down the overall cost of this RACT regulation. For a facility to have an

EII[®] score that is in the top 50% of scores among its peers, the facility must institute standards and procedures that maintain equipment efficiency and have already invested in basic capital projects that improve efficiency. However, those facilities that have achieved a score in the top 50% have a narrowing scope of efficiency improvement options available, and those projects are likely to require significant capital expenditure.

For facilities with scores in the lower 50% of EII[®] scores among their peers, there is a broad scope of potential actions that would result in efficiency improvements and associated GHG emissions reductions. These include procedural improvements that have a low capital cost, as well as basic equipment upgrades. The Agencies have determined that such approaches are generally on the level of RACT. The Solomon benchmarking service can be costly. However, 90% of US refinery capacity already subscribe to the service and would thus incur no additional cost for monitoring and compliance demonstration.

8.8 Rejected RACT Components

The proposed RACT structure does not include the concept of the *de minimis* emissions threshold discussed earlier in Section 3. A threshold for emissions sources is not necessary for the proposed structure and would limit options for compliance with the proposed emission reductions. The Agencies believe that the refineries should have the ability to choose any GHG emission point in order to achieve reductions that meet the proposed goal of this rule.

Emissions decreases on the part of the power provider as a result of electrical equipment upgrades (because more efficient equipment draws less power) were rejected for use as credits towards the emission reduction goal. Such emissions reductions do not occur at the refinery. Power conservation and efficiency at power plants are addressed under existing programs administered by the power providers with separate incentives. All refineries can take advantage of energy efficiency experts within their respective power providers as well as efficiency tariff funds to help offset the costs of these types of projects.

Efficiency projects completed prior to 2006 were not considered for this RACT analysis because they were assumed to be part of the facility's current operations and emissions profile. The Agencies chose to limit the timeline for historical review of efficiency and GHG reduction projects to 2006 primarily to coordinate with the efficiency index compliance option. In general, the Agencies assumed that significant efficiency projects that have already been undertaken are reflected in the facility efficiency index, and those facilities that have completed large efficiency projects likely have demonstrated performance in the top 50% of similarly sized refineries.

The Agencies did not find sufficient information to include a specific cost cut-off to be included in the rule either for gaining the EII performance threshold or to accomplish the GHG reduction, considering the range of possible solutions at any given refinery. The cost analysis for any given approach may be quite complicated. For example, integrated projects at a refinery can include a wide range of expenses, each with its own payback period influenced by implementation of the rest of the project. The Agencies expect that, as

GHG reduction projects pursuant to this regulation and for specific equipment types undergo review through the major NSR permitting program, such information will be more broadly available.

The Agencies did not pursue the use of other Solomon Associates products (such as the CWT[™] or Carbon Emissions Intensity, or index) because these metrics are not currently established for the Washington refineries and would require resources beyond those available to the Agencies in order to implement.

Most refineries do a periodic (e.g., monthly or quarterly) in-house calculation to estimate the facility's energy intensity. The use of these calculations for RACT compliance was rejected, primarily because they do not involve an independent third party who can certify the consistency of the calculations. Furthermore, the calculations are highly complex, well beyond the resources available within the Agencies to ensure reliable results.

The energy assessment audit requirements of the Boiler MACT are not aligned with the presumptions of a RACT rule and thus were rejected because they do not impose a requirement or an emission limit that is measurable. The energy assessment for units subject to Boiler MACT is expected to identify projects that would also contribute towards compliance with the proposed RACT rule. Therefore, the two programs are not in conflict and provide mutual benefit with no additional costs.

The proposed RACT standard and implementation options provide facilities with the opportunity to meet the reduction goals in the most cost-effective way while taking into consideration the specific requirements of each facility's operation.

Section 9: References

- Argus. 2013. Argus White Paper: Argus Bakken Crude Assessments. Argus Media. http://cms.argusmedia.com/Crude-Oil/~/media/ C21F9F5995164371B7D51651F950F49E.ashx. 2013.
- BAAQMD. 2012. Bay Area Air Quality Management District Regulation 12, Rules 11 (2003) and 12 (2006). http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Compliance-and-Enforcement/Refinery-Flare-Monitoring.aspx. 2012.
- Bianco, N., Litz, F., Meek K., Gasper, R. 2013. Can the U.S. Get There from Here? Using Existing Federal Laws and State Action to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions. February 2013.
- Biello, D. 2008. Cement from CO₂: A Concrete Cure for Global Warming? *Scientific American*. August 2008.
- Canadian Fuels Association. 2013. Fact Sheet: Our industry is getting greener every year. March 2013
- CARB. 2013. Energy Efficiency and Co-Benefits Assessment of Large Industrial Sources, Refinery Sector Public Report. California Air Resources Board. June 6, 2013.

CARB. 2013. Cap and Trade 2012. http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2012/capandtrade12/capandtrade12.htm. California Air Resources Board. 2013.

- Chettier, I.M. and Schwartz, J.A. 2009. The Road Ahead. EPA's Options and Obligations for Regulating Greenhouse Gases. Institute for Policy Integrity. New York University School of Law. April 2009.
- DOE. 2003. CHP Case Studies in the Pacific Northwest: 52-MW Wood-Chip Fired Steam-Turbine Generator. http://files.harc.edu/Sites/GulfCoastCHP/CaseStudies/EverettWAKimberlyClark.pdf. US Department of Energy, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. 2003
- DOE. 2006. Energy Bandwidth for Petroleum Refining Processes. Prepared by Energetics Incorporated for the US Department of Energy Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Industrial Technologies Program. October 2006.
- DOE. 2009. An Evaluation of the Extraction, Transport and Refining of Imported Crude Oils and the Impact of Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions. DOE/NETL-2009/1362. US Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory, March 2009.

DOE. 2013. Carbon Storage: NETL's Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage Database – Version 4.
http://www.netl.doe.gov/technologies/carbon_seq/global/database/index.html. US Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory. 2013.

- EFSEC. 2013. BP Cherry Point Cogeneration Project. http://www.efsec.wa.gov/bpcogen.shtml, Port Townsend Paper. Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council. 2013.
- Ecology. 2010. Cogeneration Project Prompts Comment Period for Port Townsend Paper. Washington State Department of Ecology News Release. http://www.ecy.wa.gov/news/2010news/2010-168.html, Kimberly-Clark Tacoma. July 16, 2010.
- Ecology. 2011. Guidance for Ecology Including Greenhouse Gas Emissions in SEPA Reviews. Washington State Department of Ecology. June 6, 2011.
- EIA. 2012. Refinery Capacity Report. http://www.eia.gov/petroleum/refinerycapacity/ US Energy Information Administration. June 2012.
- EIA. 2012. Energy Prices by Sector and Source. http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/aeo/tablebrowser/#release=AEO2013ER&subject=0-AEO2013ER&table=3-AEO2013ER®ion=1-0&cases=full2012-d020112c,early2013d102312a. US Energy Information Administration. 2012.
- EIA. 2013. Crude oil input qualities. US Energy Information Administration. http://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/pet_pnp_crq_dcu_nus_m.htm. 2013.

- EIA. 2013. Number and Capacity of Petroleum Refineries. US Energy Information Administration. http://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/pet_pnp_cap1_dcu_nus_a.htm. 2013.
- EIA. 2013. Projected US energy prices. http://www.eia.gov/analysis/projectiondata.cfm#annualproj. US Energy Information Administration. 2013.
- Energy Star. 2013 Energy Star Plant Profile for Ohio Refining Division Canton, Ohio. http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?fuseaction=labeled_buildings.showplantProfile&pl antprofile_id=p_35. 2013
- EPA. 2010. Available and Emerging Technologies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers. US Environmental Protection Agency. October 2010.
- EPA. 2010. Available and Emerging Technologies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Petroleum Refining Industry. US Environmental Protection Agency. October 2010.
- EPA. 2011. Comprehensive Data Collected from the Petroleum Refining Sector. US Environmental Protection Agency Technology Transfer Network Air Toxics Website. http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/petref/petrefpg.html. 2011.
- EPA. 2012. *EPA Enforcement Targets Flaring Efficiency Violations*. EPA 325-F-012-002. August 2012.
- EPA. 2013. EPA Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program. http://www.epa.gov/ghgreporting/. US Environmental Protection Agency. Accessed July 2013.
- EPA and DOE. 2005. *Energy Efficiency Improvement and Cost Saving Opportunities for Petroleum Refineries.* http://www.energystar.gov/buildings/tools-andresources/energy-efficiency-improvement-and-cost-saving-opportunities-petroleumrefineries. US Environmental Protection Agency and US Department of Energy. 2005.
- ExxonMobil. 2013. Baton Rouge Refinery receives ENERGY STAR Award. http://www.exxonmobil.com/NA-English/PA/about_where_ref_br_energystar.aspx. 2013.
- Hayes, S., N. Baum, and G. Herndon. 2013. Energy Efficiency: Is the United States Improving? American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy. http://aceee.org/whitepaper/ee-is-the-us-improving. July 2013.
- Hileman, M.J. 2001. Best Practices Determine Refinery Pacesetter Performance. *Oil & Gas Journal*. October 8, 2001.
- Johnson, C. 2007. ConocoPhillips refinery 1st to get Energy Star recognition Award says plant is using less energy for producing energy. Billings Gazette. April 12, 2007. http://www.billingsgazette.net/articles/2007/04/12/news/local/30-refinery.txt available through http://www.energystar.gov/ia/business/industry/ConnnocoPhillips_PITN_ BillingsGazette_PlantLabel2006.pdf.

Lattanzio, R.K. 2013. *Canadian Oil Sands: Life-Cycle Assessments of Greenhouse Gas Emissions.* Congressional Research Service. March 2013.

- MCEA. 2013. Settlement Agreement between Flint Hills Resources Pine Bend, LLC, and Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy (MCEA), and Environmental Integrity Project. http://www.environmentalintegrity.org/news_reports/documents/ FHRPineBendSettlementAgreementFINALSIGNED.pdf. April 2013.
- Mertens, J., and J. Skelland. 2010. Rising to the CO₂ Challenge Part 3. *Hydrocarbon Engineering*. March 2010.
- MIT. 2013a. Non-Power Plant Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage Projects. http://sequestration.mit.edu/tools/projects/storage_only.html. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Carbon Capture & Sequestration Technologies Energy Initiative. 2013.
- MIT. 2013b. Port Arthur Fact Sheet: Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage Project. http://sequestration.mit.edu/tools/projects/port_arthur.html. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Carbon Capture & Sequestration Technologies Energy Initiative. 2013.
- Mui, S., L. Tonachel, B. McEnaney, and E. Shope. 2010. *Emission Factors for High Carbon Intensity Crude Oils.* Natural Resources Defense Council. September 2010.
- Norman, D.K., and J. Stormon. 2007. *Feasibility of Using Geologic Formations to Sequester Carbon Dioxide (CO₂).* August 2007.
- NWCAA. 2010. BP Order of Approval to Construct No. 1064. Northwest Clean Air Agency. November 2010.
- NWPCC. 2013. Update to the Wholesale Electricity Price Forecast. Northwest Power and Conservation Council. February 2013.
- Nyboer, J. and N. Rivers. 2002. *Energy Consumption Benchmark Guide Conventional Petroleum Refining in Canada*. Canadian Industry Program for Energy Conservation. December 15, 2002.
- PCGCC. 2011. GHG New Source Performance Standards for the Power Sector: Options for EPA and the States. Pew Center on Global Climate Change. March 17, 2011.
- Petrick, M., and J. Pellegrino. 1999. *The Potential for Reducing Energy Utilization in the Refining Industry*. ANL/ESD/TM-158. Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL.
- Phillips. 2013. http://www.phillips66.com/EN/about/our-businesses/refiningmarketing/refining/bayway/Pages/062012_tworefinerieshonored.aspx. 2013.
- Platts. 2010. Platts Unveils New Bakken Price Assessment. *Downstream Today*. http://www.downstreamtoday.com/news/article.aspx?a_id=22036. April 2010.
- Sahr, Robert C. 2013. Consumer Price Index (CPI) Conversion Factors 1774 to 2012 to Convert to Estimated Dollars of 2013. Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. May 8, 2013.
- Solomon. 2013. Report on CWT-CWB for California Regulatory Support. Prepared for Western States Petroleum Association by HSB Solomon Associates LLC. Dallas, Texas. May 17, 2013.

- SCAQMD. 2009. South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1118 (2005). http://www.aqmd.gov/comply/R1118_main.htm. 2009.
- Spoor, R.M. 2008. Low-carbon refinery: Dream or Reality? *Hydrocarbon Processing*. November 2008.
- SWAPCA. 1997. Centralia Plant Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) Regulatory Order and Technical Support Document. Southwest Air Pollution Control Authority 97-2057. December 8, 1997.

US Government. 2013. *Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost* of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866. US Government Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government. http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/inforeg/social_cost_of_carbon_for_ri

Wikipedia. 2013. Adjustable Speed Drives. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adjustable-

speed_drive. 2013.

a 2013 update.pdf. May 2013.

Wikipedia. 2013. Emissions Trading. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emissions_trading. 2013.

- Wikipedia. 2013. The Nelson Complexity Index. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nelson_complexity_index. 2013.
- Worrell, E., and C. Galitsky. 2005. Energy Efficiency Improvement and Cost Saving Opportunities for Petroleum Refineries. http://www.energystar.gov/buildings/tools-andresources/energy-efficiency-improvement-and-cost-saving-opportunities-petroleumrefineries. February 2005.
- Zhu, F., G., Maher, and G. Werba. 2011. Spend Money to Make Money. *Hydrocarbon Engineering*. September 2011.

Section 10: Definitions and Acronyms

10.1 Definitions

The definitions for the terms below are consistent with those included in RCW 70.94.030 and WAC 173-400-030.

"Baseline GHG emissions" means facility-wide total emissions of GHGs during 2010 or 2011. The year of GHG emissions chosen shall not have facility-wide operations of less than 11 months.

"Carbon dioxide equivalent" or "CO₂ equivalent" or "CO₂e" means a measure for comparing CO_2 with other GHGs, based on the quantity of those gases multiplied by the appropriate global warming potential factor.

"Cogeneration" or "Cogen" means an integrated system that produces electric energy and useful thermal energy for industrial, commercial, or heating and cooling purposes through the sequential or simultaneous use of the original fuel energy. Cogeneration must involve the onsite generation of electricity and useful thermal energy and some form of waste heat recovery.

"Emissions Efficiency Benchmark" or "GHG emissions efficiency benchmark" means a performance standard that is used to evaluate GHG emissions efficiency between and among similar facilities or operations in the same industrial sector.

"Energy efficiency improvement project" means an undertaking that involves such activities as, but not limited to, improvement in maintenance or other practices, monitoring systems, specific processes, or new or improved technologies in order to increase energy efficiency at a facility.

"Greenhouse gas" or "greenhouse gases" or "GHG" means CO_2 , CH_4 , N_2O , SF_6 , HFCs, and PFCs.

"Metric ton" or "MT" or "Metric tonne" means a common international measurement for the quantity of GHG emissions, equivalent to about 2,204.6 pounds or 1.1 short tons.

"Operational control" means the authority to introduce and implement operating, environmental, health, and safety policies. In any circumstance where this authority is shared among multiple entities, the entity holding the permit to operate from the Agency or Ecology is considered to have operational control for purpose of this regulation.

"Petroleum refinery" or "refinery" means any facility engaged in producing gasoline, aromatics, kerosene, distillate fuel oils, residual fuel oils, lubricants, or other products through the distillation of petroleum or through the redistillation, cracking, rearrangement, or reforming of unfinished petroleum derivatives.

"Professional engineer" means a person who, by reason of his or her special knowledge of the mathematical and physical sciences and the principles and methods of engineering analysis and design, acquired by professional education and practical experience, is qualified to practice engineering as defined in this section, as attested by his or her current legal registration as a professional engineer in Washington State.

"Process" means an action or series of actions performed in progressive and interdependent steps by equipment within a facility to produce or aid in the production of a product, such as cement, fuel, electricity, hydrogen, or other chemicals.

"Solomon Energy Intensity Index[®]" or "Solomon EII[®]" or "EII[®]" means a petroleum refinery energy efficiency metric that compares actual energy consumption for a refinery with the "standard" energy consumption for a refinery of similar size and configuration. The "standard" energy is calculated based on an analysis of worldwide refining capacity as contained in the database maintained by Solomon Associates. The ratio of a facility's actual energy to the standard energy is multiplied by 100 to arrive at the Solomon EII[®] for a refinery. "Solomon Energy Review" means a data submittal and review conducted by a petroleum refinery and Solomon Associates. This process uses the refinery energy utilization, throughput, and output to determine the Solomon EII[®] of the refinery.

10.2 Acronyms

- ANS Alaska North Slope
- ANSI American National Standards Institute
- API American Petroleum Institute
- BACT best available control technology
- BART best available retrofit technology
- bbl barrel
- BFW boiler feed water
- PB BP PLC
- Btu/hr British thermal units per hour
- C_1 methane (see also CH_4)
- C₃ propane
- C₄ butane
- C₅ pentane
- C₆ hexane
- CARB California Air Resources Board
- CBI confidential business information
- CCS carbon capture and sequestration
- CFR Code of Federal Regulations
- CH_4 methane (see also C_1)
- CHP combined heat and power
- CO carbon monoxide
- CO₂ carbon dioxide
- CO_2e carbon dioxide equivalent

- CR catalytic reformer
- CTG Control Technique Guideline
- $CWT CO_2$ -weighted ton
- DOE US Department of Energy
- EAB Environmental Appeals Board
- Ecology Washington Department of Ecology
- EIA US Energy Information Administration
- EII[®] Energy Intensity Index
- EnMS energy management systems
- EOR enhanced oil recovery
- EPI Energy Performance Indicator
- EPA US Environmental Protection Agency
- ESNCR enhanced selective non-catalytic reduction
- EU European Union
- FCCU fluidized catalytic cracking unit
- FGS flue gas scrubber
- GHG greenhouse gas
- H₂S hydrogen sulfide
- HAP hazardous air pollutant
- HFC hydrofluorocarbon
- hr hour
- HRSG heat recovery steam generator
- H_2S hydrogen sulfide
- ICI Industrial Commercial Institutional
- ICR information collection request
- ISO International Organization for Standardization

- ITP Industrial Technologies Program
- kWh kilowatt hour
- lbs/hr pounds per hour
- LDAR leak detection and repair
- LPG liquified petroleum gas
- MACT maximum achievable control technology
- MIT Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- MMBtu/hr million British thermal units per hour
- MMscfd million standard cubic feet per day
- mtons/yr metric tons per year
- MMT million metric tons
- NAAQS National Ambient Air Quality Standards
- NCI Nelson Complexity Index
- NESHAPs National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
- NETL National Energy Technology Laboratory
- NO_X nitrogen oxide
- NO₂ nitrogen dioxide
- N₂O nitrous oxide
- NOC Notice of Construction
- NPDES National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
- NSPS New Source Performance Standards
- NWCAA Northwest Clean Air Agency
- NWPCC Northwest Power and Conservation Council
- PADD Petroleum Administration for Defense District
- PFC perfluorocarbon
- Phillips Phillips 66 Company

PM – particulate matter

 PM_{10} – particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 10 μm

 $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ – Particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 2.5 μm

- PRV pressure relief valve
- PSA pressure swing absorption
- PSE Puget Sound Energy
- psig pounds per square inch gauge
- PSCAA Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
- PSD Prevention of Significant Deterioration
- PTE potential to emit
- PUD public utility district
- RACT reasonably available control technology
- RCW Revised Code of Washington
- SCC social cost of carbon
- SCOT Shell Claus off-gas treating
- SEPA State Environmental Policy Act
- SF_6 sulfur hexafluoride
- Shell Shell Oil Company
- SMR steam-methane reforming
- SIC Standard Industrial Classification)
- SIP State Implementation Plan
- SO₂ sulfur dioxide
- SRU sulfur recovery unit
- TAP toxic air pollutant
- tpd tons per day

- Tesoro Tesoro Refining & Marketing Company
- tpy tons per year
- USCAA United States Federal Clean Air Act
- US Oil US Oil & Refining Company
- VFD variable frequency drive
- VOC volatile organic compound
- WAC Washington Administrative Code
- WCAA Washington State Clean Air Act
- WWTP wastewater treatment plant

APPENDICIES

Appendix A								
Washington Refinery	Boilers			Potential to En	nit (PTE)			
7/22/13 - GHG RACT I	Background			(Calculated ass	uming full lo	ad for 8760	hours per year)	
		Capacity			Methane	N ₂ O		
Boilers	Description	(MMBtu/hr)	Construction	CO ₂ (mtons)	(mtons)	(mtons)	CO2e (mtons)	CO2e (tons)
BP	UTILITY BOILER #4	80	1991	41,347	0.70	0.07	41,384	45,618
BP	UTILITY BOILER #5	363	2004	187,613	3.18	0.32	187,778	206,990
ВР	UTILITY BOILER #6	363	2007	187,613	3.18	0.32	187,778	206,990
ВР	UTILITY BOILER #7	363	2007	187,613	3.18	0.32	187,778	206,990
	Totals	1169	Total PT	E 604,186	10.24	1.02	604,718	666,588
Phillips 66	#2 BOILER 22F-1A	91	1953	47,032	0.80	0.08	47,074	51,890
Phillips 66	#3 BOILER 22F-1B	108	1953	55,819	0.95	0.09	55,868	61,584
Phillips 66	#4 BOILER 22F-1E	164	2004	84,762	1.44	0.14	84,836	93,516
Phillips 66	#1 BOILER 22F-1C	162	1996	83,728	1.42	0.14	83,802	92,376
	Totals	525	Total PT	E 271,341	4.60	0.46	271,580	299,366
Tesoro	F 751 MAIN BOILER	268	1954	138,513	2.35	0.23	138,635	152,819
Tesoro	F 752 MAIN BOILER	268	1954	138,513	2.35	0.23	138,635	152,819
Tesoro	F 753 MAIN BOILER	220	1994	113,705	1.93	0.19	113,805	125,449
	Totals	756	Total PT	E 390,731	6.62	0.66	391,075	431,087
Shell	BOILER #1 ERIE CITY	390	1958	201,568	3.42	0.34	201,745	222,386
	Totals	390	Total PT	E 201,568	3.42	0.34	201,745	222,386
IIO SN	B-4 GAS/OIL	66	1981	51,167	0.87	0.09	51,212	56,452
IIO SU	B-5 GAS	80	1985	41,347	0.70	0.07	41,384	45,618
	Totals	179	Total PT	E 92,514	1.57	0.16	92,596	102,070
Boilers: Grai	nd Total	14 3019		1,560,340	26	e C	2,518,712	2,776,405

21 310 kg/MMBtu1.00E-03 1.00E-04 *assumed natural gas CH4 and N2O factors 2204 lb/mton 2000 lb/ton 1.102 ton/mton 8760 hours 59 ~ Calculation Factors PTE Operation Rate: CO2e multi
Appendix B									
Washington I	Refinery Heaters			ď	otential to E	mit (PTE)			
7/23/13 - GHG	RACT Background			9	alculated as	suming full	load for 87	60 hours per y	ear)
		Capacity				Methane	N ₂ O	CO2e	
Facility	Description	(MMBtu/hr) (Construction	U	O ₂ (mtons)	(mtons)	(mtons)	(mtons)	CO2e (tons)
ВР	CRUDE HEATER	720	1970/1977		372,125	6.31	0.63	372,453	410,559
ВР	IHT HEATER	13	2004		6,719	0.11	0.01	6,725	7,413
ВР	NORTH VACUUM HEATER*	77	1983		39,797	0.67	0.07	39,832	43,907
ВР	SOUTH VACUUM HEATER*	207	1970/2005		106,986	1.81	0.18	107,080	118,036
ВР	#1 REFORMER HEATERS	1075	1975/2000/2007		555,603	9.42	0.94	556,093	612,987
ВР	#2 REFORMER HEATERS	330	1987		170,557	2.89	0.29	170,708	188,173
ВР	NAPTHA HDS CHARGE HEATER	110	1970		56,852	0.96	0.10	56,903	62,724
ВР	NAPHTHA HDS STRIPPER REBOILER	86	1970		44,448	0.75	0.08	44,487	49,039
ВР	1st STAGE HCR FRACTIONATOR REBOILER	198	1970/1992/2011		102,334	1.73	0.17	102,425	112,904
ВР	2nd STAGE HCR FRACTIONATOR REBOILER	183	1970/1974/2003		94,582	1.60	0.16	94,665	104,350
ВР	R-1 HYDROCRACKER REACTOR HEATER	121	1970/2006		62,538	1.06	0.11	62,593	68,997
ВР	R-4 HYDROCRACKER REACTOR HEATER	60	1970		31,010	0.53	0.05	31,038	34,213
ВР	COKER CHARGE HEATER #1 NORTH	190	1970/1999		98,200	1.66	0.17	98,286	108,342
ВР	COKER CHARGE HEATER #2 SOUTH	190	1970/1999		98,200	1.66	0.17	98,286	108,342
ВР	DIESEL HDS CHARGE HEATER	48	1970/2006		24,808	0.42	0.04	24,830	27,371
ВР	DIESEL HDS STAB REBOILER	56	1970/2006		28,943	0.49	0.05	28,969	31,932
ВР	DIESEL HDS CHARGE HEATER #2	35	2006		18,089	0.31	0.03	18,105	19,958
ВР	DIESEL HDS CHARGE HEATER #3	28	2012		14,472	0.25	0.02	14,484	15,966
ВР	REFORMING FURNACE 1401 (N H2 PLANT)	325	1970		167,973	2.85	0.28	168,121	185,322
ВР	REFORMING FURNACE 1402 (S H2 PLANT)	325	1970		167,973	2.85	0.28	168,121	185,322
ВР	SMR FURNACE #2 H2 PLANT	496	2012		256,353	4.34	0.43	256,579	282,829
Tot	als	21 4873	-	Total PTE	2,518,561	42.69	4.27	2,520,781	2,778,685
Phillips 66	CRUDE HEATER 1F-1	191	1953/1979		98,716	1.67	0.17	98,803	108,912
Phillips 66	#2 CRUDE HEATER 1F-1A	91	1972		47,032	0.80	0.08	47,074	51,890
Phillips 66	TAR SEPARATOR HEATER 4F-2	189	1953		97,683	1.66	0.17	97,769	107,772
Phillips 66	ALKYLATION HEATER 17 F-1	106	1953		54,785	0.93	0.09	54,833	60,443
Phillips 66	#2 HDF HEATER 14F-1,-2	. 70	1953		36,179	0.61	0.06	36,211	39,915
Phillips 66	#3 PRETREATER HEATER 18F-1	41	1972		21,190	0.36	0.04	21,209	23,379
Phillips 66	#3 REFORMER HEATER 18F-21-24	188	1972		97,166	1.65	0.16	97,252	107,201
Phillips 66	#3 REGEN HEATER 18F-26	26	1972		13,438	0.23	0.02	13,450	14,826
Phillips 66	(S-ZORB) FEED HEATER 38F100	40	2003		20,674	0.35	0.04	20,692	22,809
Phillips 66	DIESEL HYDROTREATER HTR. 33F-1	48	1992/1995/2001		24,808	0.42	0.04	24,830	27,371
Tot	als	10 990		Total PTE	511,672	8.67	0.87	512,123	564,518

Appendix B (c	ontinued)								
		Capacity			Σ	lethane	N ₂ O	CO2e	
Facility	Description	(MMBtu/hr) (Construction	ŭ	D ₂ (mtons) (r	ntons)	(mtons)	(mtons) (CO2e (tons)
Tesoro	F 101 CRUDE HEATER-GAS/OIL*	120	1955		62,021	1.05	0.11	62,075	68,426
Tesoro	F 102 CRUDE HEATER-GAS/OIL*	120	1955		62,021	1.05	0.11	62,075	68,426
Tesoro	F 103 CRUDE HEATER-GAS/OIL*	132	1963		68,223	1.16	0.12	68,283	75,269
Tesoro	F 104 CGS HEATER	60	1972/2007		31,010	0.53	0.05	31,038	34,213
Tesoro	F 201 VACUUM FLASHER HEATER	96	1955		49,617	0.84	0.08	49,660	54,741
Tesoro	F 301 CAT CRACKER FEED HEATER	128	1955		66,156	1.12	0.11	66,214	72,988
Tesoro	F-303 CAT CRACKER START-UP HEATER (discha	II 69	1955		35,662	09.0	0.06	35,693	39,345
Tesoro	F 652 DHT HEATER	67	1961		34,628	0.59	0.06	34,659	38,205
Tesoro	F 654 CFH HEATER	15	1961		7,753	0.13	0.01	7,759	8,553
Tesoro	F 6600 NHT HEATER	65	1972		33,595	0.57	0.06	33,624	37,064
Tesoro	F 6601 NHT HEATER	68	1972		35,145	0.60	0.06	35,176	38,775
Tesoro	F 6602 BENSAT HEATER	68	1972/2011		35,145	09.0	0.06	35,176	38,775
Tesoro	F 6650 CAT REFORMER HEATER	143	1972		73,908	1.25	0.13	73,973	81,542
Tesoro	F 6651 CAT REFORMER HEATER	143	1972		73,908	1.25	0.13	73,973	81,542
Tesoro	F 6652 CAT REFORMER HEATER	. 67	1972		34,628	0.59	0.06	34,659	38,205
Tesoro	F 6653 CAT REFORMER HEATER	38	1972		19,640	0.33	0.03	19,657	21,668
Tesoro	F 6654 CAT REFORMER HEATER	32	1972		16,539	0.28	0.03	16,553	18,247
Tesoro	F 6655 CAT REFORMER HEATER	27	1972		13,955	0.24	0.02	13,967	15,396
Tota	18 18	1458		Total PTE	753,553	12.77	1.28	754,217	831,382
Shell	VPS GAS OIL HEATER 1A-F4	157	1958		81,144	1.38	0.14	81,215	89,525
Shell	VPS CHARGE HEATER 1A-F5	203	1958		104,919	1.78	0.18	105,011	115,755
Shell	VPS CHARGE HEATER 1A-F6	206	1958		106,469	1.80	0.18	106,563	117,465
Shell	VPS VACUUM TOWER HEATER 1A-F8	98	2000		50,650	0.86	0.09	50,695	55,882
Shell	DCU HEATER 15F-100	124	1983/1998		64,088	1.09	0.11	64,145	70,707
Shell	CRU 2 CHARGE HEATER 10H-101	06	1976		46,516	0.79	0.08	46,557	51,320
Shell	CRU 2 INTERHEATER 1 10H-102	70	1976		36,179	0.61	0.06	36,211	39,915
Shell	CRU 2 INTERHEATER 2 10H-103	45	1976		23,258	0.39	0.04	23,278	25,660
Shell	CRU 2 STABIL/SPLITREBOIL 10H-104	70	1976		36,179	0.61	0.06	36,211	39,915
Shell	CRU 1 CRUDE CHARGE HEATER 6D-F2	. 85	1987		43,931	0.74	0.07	43,970	48,469
Shell	CRU 1 INTERHEATER 1 6D-F3	35	1987		18,089	0.31	0.03	18,105	19,958
Shell	CRU 1 INTERHEATER 2 6D-F4	16	1987		8,269	0.14	0.01	8,277	9,124
Shell	HTU 2 REACT CHARGE HTR11H-101	65	1976		33,595	0.57	0.06	33,624	37,064
Shell	HTU 2 STRIPPER REBOILER 11H-102	190	1976/1998		98,200	1.66	0.17	98,286	108,342
Shell	HTU 2 FRACTIONATOR REBOILER 11H-103	51	1976/1998		26,359	0.45	0.04	26,382	29,081
Shell	HTU 3 REBOILER HEATER 60-F201	62	2003		32,044	0.54	0.05	32,072	35,354
Shell	HTU 1 CHARGE HEATERS-7C-F4	120	1991		62,021	1.05	0.11	62,075	68,426
Shell	HTU 1 FRACTIONAOR REBOILER 7C-F5	120	1991		62,021	1.05	0.11	62,075	68,426
Tota	18 18	1807		Total PTE	933,930	15.83	1.58	934,753	1,030,389

Appendix B (co	ontinued)								
		Capacity				Methane	N ₂ O	CO2e	
Facility	Description	(MMBtu/hr)	Construc	tion	CO ₂ (mtons)	(mtons)	(mtons)	(mtons)	CO2e (tons)
US Oil	H-3 LIGHT CRUDE HEATER		19 20	005	9,820	0.17	0.02	9,829	10,834
US Oil	H-11 LCU HEATER		106 15	<u> 195</u>	54,785	0.93	0.09	54,833	60,443
US Oil	H-201 LCVU HEATER		31 19	983	16,022	0.27	0.03	16,036	17,677
US Oil	H-202 LCVU HEATER		12 20	06	6,202	0.11	0.01	6,208	6,843
US Oil	H-801 CRU-2 A/B/C HEATER		42 19	980	21,707	0.37	0.04	21,726	23,949
US Oil	H-804		2 19	380	1,034	0.02	00.00	1,035	1,140
US Oil	H-901 DHT HEATER		18 20		9,303	0.16	0.02	9,311	10,264
US Oil	H-1101 NAPHTHA HDS HEATER		13 15	389	6,719	0.11	0.01	6,725	7,413
US OI	H-1102 CRU-1 HEATER		14 19	989	7,236	0.12	0.01	7,242	7,983
US Oil	H-1103 CRU-1 HEATER		12 19	989	6,202	0.11	0.01	6,208	6,843
US Oil	H-1104 CRU-1 HEATER		5 19	989	2,584	0.04	00.00	2,586	2,851
US Oil	H-6		16 19	388	8,269	0.14	0.01	8,277	9,124
Total	S	12	290	Total P	TE 149,884	2.54	0.25	150,016	165,364
Grand Total		79 9,4	18		4,867,599	165	17	5,384,012	5,934,857
	*Heaters operating as a team								
	Calculation Factors								
	PTE Operation Rate:			8760 hours					
	CO2e multi		-	21 3	10 kg/MMBtu				
			59	1.00E-03 1.00E-	04 *assumed na	tural gas CH	4 and N20	factors	
				2204 lb/mton					
				2000 lb/ton					
				1.102 ton/mtc	u				