UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

December 31, 1996

OFFICE OF THE
REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. James M. Strock
Secretary for Environmental Protection
California Environmental Protection Agency
555 Capitol Mall
Suite 525
Sacramento, CA 95814

Post-it™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671	# of pages ▸ 2
To Mike Kenny	From Val Siebal
Co.	Co.
Dept.	Phone # 324-7584
Fax # 322-1603	Fax # 322-6005

Dear ~~Mr. Strock~~ Jim:

Thank you for your letter dated December 4, 1996 regarding the implementation of Title III of the Clean Air Act. The mission of the Federal air toxics program is to reduce the risks to the public health and the environment attributable to emissions of hazardous air pollutants. I believe California and EPA share the same goal of an air toxics program in California that seamlessly blends Federal and State requirements. I know that my staff and many California stakeholders have been working together on this issue on a variety of fronts, including a CAPCOA-led working group here in California and an EPA-led national effort to improve the existing regulations for approving State air toxics programs.

Most recently, on December 5, EPA Regional and Headquarters staff met with California regulatory agencies and industry groups to discuss specific concerns related to this issue. On December 6, EPA met with all of the California stakeholders (including environmental groups and other concerned parties) to discuss the broader issues associated with implementation of Title III of the Clean Air Act not only in California but across the nation.

As a result of these meetings, EPA and a set of interested stakeholders, including the California Air Resource Board, committed to joint evaluations of specific issues in example industries (beginning with the chrome plating and gasoline distribution sectors). These evaluations should provide a better understanding of how the conceptual approach outlined in the recommendations included in your letter would work in practice. As we engage in this effort, some of the factors we will be focussing on are the level of public participation the conceptual approach provides, the implementation timeliness which the approach provides, and the substance of the compliance package (monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting). The results of this work will also be instrumental in our national effort to revise the implementing regulations for Section 112(l) of the Clean Air Act which governs approval of State programs. We also believe that these discussions may be helpful in the short term for determining approvability under the current Federal regulations for these specific example industries.

Printed on Recycled Paper

We look forward to and encourage your participation in the follow-up actions to the December 5 and 6 meetings and to your continued input to the national reinvention effort. I would be pleased to meet with any stakeholders in order to further development and implementation of an air toxics program that makes sense for all Californians. Please give me a call if you would like to further discuss this matter.

Yours,

Felicia

Felicia Marcus
Regional Administrator

cc: Michael P. Kenny, Executive Officer, California Air Resources Board
Mark Boese, President, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association