Ms. Ellen Garvey
Air Pollution Control Officer
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, California 94109

Re: Proposed Major Facility Review Permits

Dear Ms. Garvey:

The purpose of this letter is to provide our comments on the ten (10) proposed Bay Area Air Quality Management District (District) Major Facility Review (MFR) Permits received by EPA on November 15, 1996. Based on our review of the proposed MFR permits and the supporting applications, EPA formally objects, pursuant to our authority under 40 Code of Federal Regulation §70.8(c) (see also District Regulation 2, Rule 6, §411.1), to the issuance of all ten proposed permits on the basis of the inappropriate minor permit modification language. Additionally, we object to the issuance of eight of the permits on the basis that they do not fully meet the periodic monitoring requirements of §70.6(a)(3)(i).

EPA first raised these two important concerns in a meeting with Janet Stromberg of your staff on November 27, 1996. During the meeting, we also requested that the District provide the permit applications to aid in our permit review. On December 18, 1996 EPA requested, and the District agreed to, an extension of our comment period to no later than February 1, 1997 because we had not received all of the requested permit applications. Finally, during a January 23, 1997 conference call, we informed Ms. Stromberg that the two issues were grounds for objection to the permits, and we discussed whether these issues could be resolved prior to the end of our comment period. Ms. Stromberg indicated that the District would not be able to resolve these issues during the comment period. This position was confirmed in subsequent conversations with you and with William de Boisblanc. As a result, EPA is now objecting to the permits under §70.8(c), which gives the District 90 days to revise and submit a proposed permit in response to EPA's objection. In the following paragraphs, we discuss the reasons for our objection and provide a description of the changes that the District must make to address our objection.

<u>Minor Permit Modification Procedure</u>

All ten proposed permits contain minor permit modification language that is not allowed by District Rules and Regulations or federal law. The minor permit modification procedure listed in the Standard Conditions of each proposed permit would among other things remove EPA's 45-day review for all minor permit modifications as well as removing EPA's ability to object to permit revisions below certain de minimis levels. The entire proposed procedure is in direct conflict with 40 CFR Part 70, and with District Rules and Regulations. This procedure must be removed from the proposed permits, and replaced with the legally binding procedure for permit modifications according to Part 70 and the District's approved Part 70 program.

Specifically, the proposed procedure conflicts with 40 CFR §70.8(e), which provides in pertinent part, that: "no State program may provide that a Part 70 permit (including a permit

renewal or modification) will issue until affected States and EPA have had an opportunity to review the proposed permit as required under this section." The proposed procedure also conflicts with District Regulation 2-6-414.2, which states that "The APCO shall act on the proposed minor modification within 90 days of receipt of an application or 15 days after the end of EPA's 45-day review period, whichever is later, or with the consent of the applicant for such longer period as may be agreed upon." This is consistent with the minor permit modification procedures in §70.7(e)(2)(iv), which states "The permitting authority may not issue a final permit modification until after EPA's 45-day review period or until EPA has notified the permitting authority that EPA will not object to issuance of the permit modification, whichever is first...."

The minor permit modification procedures in the District's proposed permits are similar to those included in the August 31, 1995 Federal Register proposing revisions to Part 70 (60 FR 45530). As these revisions have not been promulgated, the current Part 70 minor permit modification procedures, which require EPA review and provide for EPA objection, remain in effect and may not be relaxed. Permit language based on proposed federal rules does not supersede the federal rules promulgated under the Clean Air Act nor does it supersede the District's own rule.

During our discussions with the District, we were informed that new state legislation may affect the timeframes allowed for issuing permit modifications. If this legislation limits the District's authority to allow for 45-day EPA review and EPA objection, then it is possible that a revised Attorney General's opinion evaluating the District's authority to implement Part 70 may be required pursuant to 40 CFR §70.4(b)(3).

Because the proposed minor permit modification procedures are clearly inconsistent with EPA and District rules, we must object to all permits containing these modified procedures. To respond to the objection, the proposed minor permit modification language must be removed from the permits. In practice, EPA may be able to complete its review in less than 45 days in certain instances. However, EPA will not agree to be bound to a shorter time period than the 45 days provided in Part 70.

Periodic Monitoring

The second basis for our objection is that with the exception of Acme Fiberglass and Western Fiberglass, the proposed permits do not contain periodic monitoring as required in the permit content provisions of both the District's and EPA's operating permit rules. District Regulation 2-6-409.2 states, in part: "Where the applicable requirement does not require periodic monitoring or testing, the permit shall contain periodic monitoring sufficient to yield reliable data from the relevant time periods that is representative of the source's compliance with the permit." The District regulation is based on 40 CFR §70.6(a)(3)(i)(B), and on Sections 503 and 504 of the Clean Air Act, which require that Part 70 permits contain "conditions as are necessary to assure compliance with applicable requirements," and "monitoring, compliance certification, and reporting requirements to assure compliance with the permit terms and conditions."

Eight of the Districts proposed permits fail to include monitoring that assures compliance with all applicable emission limitations. Three of the permits, U.S. Pipe and Foundry, City of

Sunnyvale Water Pollution Control, and City of Santa Rosa Wastewater Treatment Plant, do not contain any monitoring requirements. The remaining five permits lack monitoring for many applicable emission limits. For example, in the General Chemical permit, there are at least eight emission limits applying to one or more units for which no monitoring is required. Only two of the ten permits (Acme Fiberglass and Western Fiberglass) include monitoring for each unit-specific applicable requirement.

To respond to this objection, the revised permits must include periodic monitoring sufficient to yield reliable data from the relevant time period that are representative of the source's compliance with the permit. The District may work with the individual sources to determine appropriate monitoring that meets the requirements of District Regulation 2-6-409.2.

Enclosed you will find other important comments on the proposed permits. In addition to providing general comments applicable to all ten permits, we have also provided specific comments for several of the permits reviewed. Please note that, to the extent that they are applicable, these comments should be applied to the remaining permits as well.

We expect that the District will revise and resubmit these MFR permits within 90 days. As you are aware, 40 CFR 70.8(c)(4) provides that if the District fails within 90 days to revise and resubmit a proposed permit in response to EPA's objection, EPA will issue or deny the permit. We are committed to working with you to resolve these issues; please let us know if we can provide any assistance to you and your staff. If you have any questions concerning our comments, please contact Matt Haber at (415) 744-1254.

Sincerely,

David P. Howekamp
Director
Air Division

Enclosure

cc: Rodney M. Helfrich, U.S. Pipe and Foundry
Thomas Brafford, General Chemical
Benjamin Zamora, Acme Fiberglass
Kurt Haunschild, East Bay MUD
James Chen, Union Sanitary
James Parker, Fleischmanns Yeast
Helen Farnham, City of Sunnyvale
Alan Bahl, Universal Foods
Scott Stinebaugh, City of Santa Rosa
Michael Lewis, Western Fiberglass

Enclosure
U.S. EPA Comments on
BAAQMD Major Facility Review Permits

I. General Comments Applicable to All Proposed Permits

1. Standard Conditions Section.

a. Administrative Requirements. The dates in the parentheses should be clarified (i.e., adopted by District on .... or approved by EPA on....). Also, many of these dates may be incorrect. For example, the date listed with SIP Regulation 1 (3/17/82) may not be correct since several of these provisions were approved into the SIP prior to 1982, and for Regulation 2, Rule 1, EPAs approved version dates back to 1981. Please make sure that these dates actually match the dates for the SIP-approved versions .

b. Conditions to Implement Regulation 2, Rule 6, Major Facility Review. The first condition paraphrases District Regulations 2-6-404.2 and 409.6. The permit should instead use the same language as the rules. In the second condition, the origin and authority should cite 2-6-307 rather than 2-6-409.7. The seventh condition under this heading should read "the permit holder shall supply <u>within 30 days</u> any information..." The eighth condition would be more accurate if it mentioned that confidential material handled by EPA will be subject to 40 CFR Part 2.

c. Records. The 5-year record retention requirement in §70.6(a)(3)(ii)(B), while applied correctly in the Standard Conditions, is inconsistently applied throughout many of the permits. For example, in General Chemical's permit, Section V.A., Conditions #7606 #5, #13215 #4, #12051 #3, and several other conditions specifically require that records be kept for 2 years or 24 months. While the Standard Condition requires that all records be kept 5 years, these frequent references to shorter record retention periods throughout the permit are confusing. If the District wishes to specify record retention requirements throughout the permit, 5 years should be consistently specified. The origin and authority in these cases should reference both the rule with the shorter record retention requirement and the Part 70 or District rule 5-year requirement. The 5-year requirement supersedes, and assures compliance with, any shorter record retention requirements.

d. Monitoring Reports. Standard permit conditions must include the requirement for prompt reporting of non-compliance, as described in the Manual of Procedures (MOP) Vol. II Part 3, Section 4.7, to be consistent with §70.6(a)(3)(iii)(B). The MOP requires reporting non-compliance within 10 days of discovery and requires a written report be submitted within 30 days.

e. Compliance Certification. The compliance certification language is incomplete for all permits because it does not include the detailed annual compliance certification requirements outlined in the last paragraph of Section 4.5 of the MOP. Please cite MOP

Section 4.5 and include the full language in the permit in order to clarify the source's obligation to provide certain information in the annual compliance certification.

f. The District Rules require each permit to include a schedule of compliance under Regulation 2-6-409.10. Further, Volume II, Part 3, Section 4.5 of the MOP also states that the permit will require the plant to submit a progress report at least every six months if the plant has a compliance schedule that obligates the plant to take some action. Please include this requirement in all permits as required by your rules and cite MOP Section 4.5 and Regulation 2-6-409.10. Two examples of permits that are apparently lacking compliance schedules and semi-annual progress report requirements are U.S. Pipe and Foundry and Acme Fiberglass, which each listed non-complying emission units in their permit applications. Neither of these proposed permits, however, include a compliance schedule. The permits must contain these elements as required by the approved Title V program to ensure sources are aware of their compliance obligations.

g. The standard permit conditions for acid rain provisions are not included. While none of these sources are acid rain sources, please note for the future that these standard terms and conditions will have to be included for acid rain sources, as required by §§70.6(a)(1)(ii) and (a)(4) and District Regulation 2-6-409.15**.**

h. The District did not include permit conditions for sources subject to the requirements under 112(r). The following language could be used to meet this applicable requirement. When the owner or operator knows the source is already subject to Part 68 provisions, the permit language should be:

> This stationary source, as defined in 40 CFR §68.3, is subject to 40 CFR Part 68. This stationary source shall submit a risk management plan (RMP) by the date specified in §68.10. This stationary source shall certify compliance with the requirements of Part 68 as part of the annual compliance certification as required by 40 CFR Part 70.

When the source owner or operator believes the source could be subject to the rule in the future or wants flexibility to preclude a permit reopening, the permit language should be:

> Should this stationary source, as defined in 40 CFR §68.3, become subject to Part 68, then the owner or operator shall submit a risk management plan (RMP) by the date specified in §68.10 and shall certify compliance with the requirements of Part 68 as part of the annual compliance certification as required by 40 CFR Part 70.

2. Generally Applicable Emissions Requirements Section:

a. EPA recommends changing the heading for Part III of all permits to ~~General~~ <u>Plant Wide</u> Applicable ~~Emission~~ Requirements because the generally applicable requirements listed include other requirements in addition to emission requirements.

b. The introductory paragraph for this section states that the conditions would not be violated under normal, routine operations and that no additional periodic monitoring or reporting to demonstrate compliance is warranted. EPA believes that some of the generally applicable requirements As discussed in our cover letter, EPA objects to the lack of periodic monitoring for the unit specific requirements - not the generally applicable requirements described here. may need periodic monitoring. Please provide, as required by §70.6(a)(3)(i), periodic monitoring requirements sufficient to yield reliable data from the relevant time period that are representative of the source's compliance with the permit. Alternatively, as discussed in EPAs White Paper Number 2 for Improved Implementation of the Part 70 Operating Permits Program (White Paper 2" dated March 5, 1996), the District could show that the establishment of a regular program of monitoring would not significantly enhance the ability of the permit to assure compliance with generally applicable requirements.

c. Table III (as well as Tables IV, VI, and VII of the permit) heavily relies on summaries and cross-referencing. There are several issues regarding the extent to which the District uses tables and cross-referencing in the permit. White Paper 2 provides guidance on the extent to which use of this technique would be appropriate in a Title V permit. While cross-referencing may be a useful tool for writing concise permit conditions which incorporate lengthy test methods or monitoring procedures by reference, the permit content requirements of §70.6 must still be met. One of the primary benefits of a Title V permit is that all applicable requirements are incorporated into one document enabling a source to easily determine its regulatory obligations. White Paper 2 states that "Permitting authorities should therefore balance the streamlining benefits achieved through use of incorporation by reference with the need to issue comprehensive, unambiguous permits useful to all affected parties, including those engaged in field inspections." We are concerned that, because of the extent to which the District uses cross-referencing, the permit is not a stand-alone document that a source or inspector could use to determine the actual requirements that a source must comply with on a daily basis. Under White Paper 2, it was intended that, to meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act and Part 70, the emission limits for each unit covered by the permit be given in full. Additionally, emission limits and other requirements should not be paraphrased, because of the potential for creating dual requirements. In order to meet the requirements of Part 70, the District must include in Tables III, IV, VI and VII, at a minimum, the full language for each emission limit, including averaging time and other information necessary to understand the limit. Where the SIP-approved and District rule emission limits differ, both emission limits must be given in full. In order for the full benefits of Title V to be realized, we encourage the District to state day-to-day requirements in the permit, and to limit cross-referencing to requirements such as monitoring procedures and protocols where the source's ability to comply and everyone's ability to comprehend is not hindered by lack of complete information in the permit.

d. Tables III, IV, and V. The language heading for these tables, in most cases, does not make it clear that the purpose of the tables is to list requirements which apply to these sources. The table should include practically enforceable language, to the effect that the requirements listed in the table apply to the source, and that the source must comply with

these requirements. The language "The permit holder shall comply with the applicable requirements specified in the BAAQMD and SIP Rules and Regulations cited below," which is included with some of the tables, should be expended and included for all tables as follows: "The permit holder shall comply with all applicable requirements, including those specified in the BAAQMD and SIP Rules and Regulations and other federal requirements cited below."

e. The permit does not clearly identify the terms and conditions of the permit which are not federally enforceable. The column titled SIP-approved/FE is confusing because a requirement (e.g., NSPS) may be federally enforceable without having been approved into the SIP. EPA recommends separate columns for designating SIP and federally enforceable conditions.

f. All applicable requirements must be included in the permit. If a rule is listed, but the correct SIP-approval date is not listed, then in effect, the applicable requirement has not been listed. We are concerned that, in addition to failing to explicitly include the full emission limit (see comment I.2.c., above), the District has frequently given the incorrect date of each rule's SIP approval. Taken together, this means that the permits fail to list all applicable requirements. For example, in Table III, the District has identified the rules "General Provisions and Definitions," "Air Pollution Episode Plan," and "Open Burning" as "SIP approved/FE," which is correct. However, the dates in the parenthesis next to these rules are not the SIP approval dates. In another example, in Acme Fiberglass' permit, the dates given in Table III are mostly inaccurate, for example:

BAAQMD Regulation 1	Approved various dates between '80-'82, not 11/3/93 as cited.
BAAQMD Regulation 4	Approved 2/7/89, not 3/20/91 as cited.
BAAQMD Regulation 5	Approved various dates (6/2/80, 7/30/81, 6/22/81, 8/6/82, 10/27/83), not 11/2/94 as cited.
BAAQMD Regulation 6	Approved various dates (6/2/80, 7/10/80, 10/27/83), not 12/19/90 as cited.

g. The permit citations for origin and authority are not consistently included for each permit condition, as required under §70.6(a)(1)(i). For example, General Chemical's permit, V.A. Condition #7934, #1, lists "basis: cumulative increase" as the origin and authority. Presumably, the origin is District permit # 7934. However, Part 70 requires that the "authority" of the condition, rather than the "basis" be listed.

3. Applicable Requirements Section

a. For all permits please change the title of Section IV, "Applicable Requirements," to read, Unit-Specific Applicable Requirements. See also comments I.2.c. and I.2.d. above.

4. Applicable Emission Limits & Compliance Monitoring Requirements Section

a. Cross-referencing for compliance monitoring requirements. Please note that, in addition to the emission limits (see comment I.2.c.), Part 70 also requires that clear requirements for monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting be included in the permit:

> "...section 504(c) requires each permit to 'set forth inspection, entry, monitoring, compliance certification, and reporting requirements to assure compliance with the permit terms and conditions.' Analogous provisions are contained in §§70.6(a)(1) and (3). The EPA interprets these provisions to place limits on the type of information that may be referenced in permits. Although this material may be incorporated into the permit by reference, that may only be done to the extent that its manner of application is clear."

Please insure that the monitoring and recordkeeping requirements in the permit provide enough detail so that the permit will be a comprehensive, stand-alone document which will allow the source and other parties to determine the actual requirements that a source must comply with on a daily basis.

b. Where "P" is listed for periodic monitoring under "Monitoring Frequency," please also specify the frequency (e.g., daily, weekly, monthly) at which the monitoring must take place.

5. Other General Comments

a. The proposed permit seems to interchangeably designate a facility as a "Plant" or "Site". We suggest using only one term consistently.

b. It would be helpful if the District would provide, along with the proposed permit, an engineering analysis to document decisions made in drafting the permit, such as why alternative operating scenarios and permit shield requests in the application were not addressed. Also, documentation will normally be required if the permit incorporates streamlining. Additionally, documentation is useful in showing how periodic monitoring was selected. For example, in San Joaquin's permit templates, they have included an analysis showing whether or not, for each requirement, periodic monitoring is required, and if so, the basis for the monitoring they have selected.

c. EPA recommends numbering the standard conditions and the conditions listed in the Tables to make it easier to refer to the requirements.

d. In order to be practically enforceable, all permit conditions must require compliance by the owner or operator rather than the emissions units. For example, condition numbers 2274.5 and 2274.6 in U.S. Pipe and Foundry's permit must refer to the owner/operator of the facility rather than a specific emissions unit or control device.

II. Facility Specific Comments

U.S. Pipe and Foundry

1. Periodic Monitoring:

   a. The monitoring requirement for S-4 (Ductile Treating) SO_2 emissions identified in the permit is not clear. On page 24 of the permit under section VI (Applicable Emission Limits and Compliance Monitoring Requirements) Table VI-B, the monitoring requirement citation identifies condition #1783, Part 2 as the applicable requirement to ensure compliance with the 150 lb/day SO_2 emission limit. Condition #1783, Part 2 (page 20 and page 10), however, states S-4 Ductile Treating Station shall be abated by A-10 whenever S-4 is charged with molten iron. EPA is concerned that the requirement to abate S-4 with A-10 (baghouse) will not ensure compliance with the 150 lb/day SO_2 limit for S-4 in permit condition #1783, Part 1. To be consistent with your MOP Section 4.6 Monitoring Requirements, and §70.6(a)(3)(B), please add a monitoring requirement to ensure compliance with the 150 lb/day SO_2 limit for S-4.

   b. For S-1 (Cupola) and S-4 (Ductile Treating Station) the sulfur content in the fuel does not have a periodic monitoring requirement to ensure that the sulfur content of the fuel is limited to 0.5%. We are particularly concerned about this limit because, in its permit application, U.S. Pipe and Foundry estimated its SO_2 emissions from S-1 based on a fuel sulfur content of 0.62%. As stated in comment II.1.a. above, please include a periodic monitoring requirement, such as vendor certification, to ensure the fuel sulfur content does not exceed 0.5% as required by District Regulation 9-1-304.

   c. The applicable requirements section of the permit for S-4 does not list a requirement for fuel sulfur content under District Regulation 9-1-304. This requirement is listed in the compliance section for S-4 under table VI-B. Please add this applicable requirement in table IV-B (page 10).

2. Alternative Operating Scenarios in the permit application are not identified in the permit. The application for U.S. Pipe and Foundry identifies two different alternative operating scenarios (calcium carbide desulfurization and alternative fuel LPG combustion) that are not identified in the permit. If the source could operate under these scenarios under their current permits, the District should include appropriate conditions allowing the source to operate in the manner described in their application. This is consistent with District Regulation 2-6-409.11, which states that the District shall include terms and conditions for reasonably anticipated operating scenarios.

3. U.S. Pipe and Foundry has identified two sources (S-40 and S-41) that were not in compliance at the time of the permit application. We could not determine, based on the Part 70 permit, whether the non-complying units identified by U.S. Pipe and Foundry in its application have since come into compliance. The Part 70 permit includes the emission units and lists applicable requirements and several applicable source specific

permit conditions but does not include a compliance schedule and require submittal of progress reports as required by Part 70 and District Regulation 2-6-409.10.

4. Under the Records section of the Standard Conditions, please change the date of entry to the date of issuance.

5. The designation "N/S" is used in Tables VI-A-D, G-H. Please define in the permit what N/S means.

6. In the "Applicable Requirements" paragraph (Section IV), the second sentence incorrectly cites "Part VII, Permit Conditions." This cite should read "Part V." Note this comment also applies to Fleischmann's Yeast and East Bay Municipal Utility District.

East Bay Municipal Utility District

1. Under the Operating Parameters in Table II-B, specify that the number of odor complaints received must be fewer than 5 per month, as specified under Condition #2409.

2. Note that there is a typographical error under Condition #911.1. This condition should read "user" rather than "used."

3. Public Notice. The public notice documents attached to your November 14, 1996 letter list the same mailing address for two different sources: EBMUD and Universal Foods.

Fleischmann's Yeast

1. The pollutants (POC and acetaldehyde) identified for all the fermenters listed in Table VI-D are not consistent with the pollutant (VOC) listed under Conditions A.1. and A.3. in Section V - Permit Conditions. Please make the requirements consistent.

2. Table VI-B for steam boiler #2 does not include the monitoring frequency for SO_2 emission compliance. Please include a monitoring frequency requirement.

Acme Fiberglass

1. Condition #12452. Pursuant to §70.6(a)(3)(ii)(B), condition A.3 must be revised to require that all records be kept on site for a period of at least 5 years. See comment I.1.c.

2. Section III - Generally Applicable Emission Requirements.

   a. District Regulation 4. If source has pre-planned abatement activities, as required by this rule, the plan should be cited or included.

   b. District Regulation 5. Note that only certain sections of this rule apply to source, so only the applicable portions of the rule should be cited.

c. District Regulation 6-301. The table should note that this section was approved into the SIP on 6/2/80.

d. District Regulations 6-305 and 6-310. Note that the exception "except temporary sandblasting and open fires" is not consistent with the SIP rule which was approved on 6/2/80.

e. Note that all applicable emission limits must be included in the permit. This was not done for several Generally Applicable requirements, including District Regulation 8-3. Also, workpractice standards must be specifically included (e.g. such as those in District Regulation 8-16.)

3. Section IV - Applicable Requirements. Table IV-A lists District Regulation 8-50-220, a non-SIP definition, as an applicable requirement. Would applicability under the SIP provision be different? If so, both would apply. This must be clarified.

4. The periodic monitoring requirements do not appear to be adequate. For example, recordkeeping does not appear to be adequate to demonstrate compliance with District Regulation 8-50-301.2.

Union Sanitary

1. For Condition #457, EPA is concerned that periodic monitoring may be necessary to assure compliance with the NOx and CO limits in conditions A.1 and A.2. The District should include appropriate periodic monitoring requirements.

2. Condition #9238, permit condition A.3 contains a BACT limit for H_2S. Similarly, permit condition A.5 contains a recordkeeping requirement for H_2S. However, there does not appear to be a corresponding monitoring requirement for H_2S. In the absence of a monitoring requirement, it does not appear that these requirements are enforceable. Please add appropriate monitoring.

3. Condition #9238, permit condition A.1 contains a limit for annual digester gas combustion. Similarly, permit condition A.5 contains a recordkeeping requirement for quantities of fuel used. However, there does not appear to be a corresponding monitoring requirement for digester gas use. In the absence of a monitoring requirement, it does not appear that these requirements are enforceable. Please add appropriate monitoring.

General Chemical Corporation

1. Under V.A. Condition #7934, Condition #1, the unit is allowed to burn Refinery Make Gas. If this gas could potentially exceed the source's fuel sulfur limits, the permit should include additional restrictions or monitoring to insure that the source's sulfur limits are met.

2. Under V.A. Condition #7606, #3, if start-up conditions are allowed by underlying rules or the source's authority to construct permit, a definition of start up consistent with the rule or authority to construct should be included in the permit.

3. Section VI - Permit shield. Section 70.6(f)(1)(ii) requires that, in order for a permit shield to be included in the permit, the permit must contain "a determination or a concise summary thereof" that the requirement is not applicable to the source. The determination included for 40 CFR §§60.82 and 60.83 is not adequate, because it is not enough that the source was constructed prior to 8/17/71. It would also have to be true that the source has not modified since then. Please confirm that the source has not modified and include this justification as part of the shield.

4. Section VII. Under "Pollutant," several blocks are left blank. As this may be confusing, the appropriate pollutant should be listed in each row of the table.

5. Table VII. The first condition contains ambient concentration limits, with no associated monitoring requirements. However, the permit states that compliance with District Regulation 9-1-309 assures compliance with this limit. This appears to indicate some streamlining of monitoring requirements. Any streamlined conditions in the permit must be accompanied by a full streamlining demonstration.

6. Table VIII. Test methods. For several test methods, the table does not indicate whether the test method is SIP-approved. Please include this information in the permit.

<u>Permits for the cities of Santa Rosa and Sunnyvale</u>

1. Both of these sources, in their applications, identify alternative operating scenarios that the District should include in the permit, if appropriate. If the scenarios listed in the applications would trigger new source review requirements, the District could process these requirements under the new source review regulations prior to, or in conjunction with, the proposed Title V permitting process.