November 30, 2007

Mr. Doug Thompson
Climate Change Reporting Section
California Air Resource Board
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95812

**RE: Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Rule**

Dear Mr. Thompson,

We would like to express our appreciation to you, the management, and your staff for doing a commendable job in preparing a very well defined Rule for Mandatory Reporting of GHG emissions within a short period of time, while considering public input and keeping the reporting consistent with internationally accepted reporting methodologies. You made an exceptional effort to consider and when possible include the public input and organize ample number of workshops, technical meetings, and meetings requested by public.

We would like to make few minor comments regarding the final proposed Rule:

1) Per 95102(A)(47): the definition for combustion sources seems too narrow – only a boiler is mentioned as an external combustion source – we recommend to expand the combustion sources definition to: "Combustion source" means a stationary fuel fired internal combustion engine, turbine or any external combustion device such as boiler, heater, dryer, furnace, flare, ect.
2) Per 95103(a)(9): +/- 2 % uncertainty requirement for fuel activity measurement device appears too low to be applied across the board. For example often the individual gas meters do not adjust for temperature and pressure so for a company that has a Gas Company gas-meter and a number of individual – device specific gas-meters, the sum of all individual gas meters is usually more than +/- 2% different form the Gas Company meter reading and the typical practice is that the difference is added to the individual meter readings based on the usage of each individual gas meter. We realize that the overall emissions have to be reported to +/-5% accuracy. However, how crucial is it to uphold +/-2 % accuracy for

Compliance Assessments & Plans
Environmental Audits
Recordkeeping & Reporting
Air Quality Permitting
Emissions Assessment & Inventory
Air Toxics & NESHAPS Compliance
AB2588 Toxics Compliance
Health Risk Assessment & Modeling
Title V Permitting & Compliance
RECLAIM Compliance & Reporting
SCAQMD Variances
Violation Responses
Fugitive Emissions Monitoring
Form R Reporting
Storm Water Compliance
Industrial Waste Water Compliance
Risk Management Plans
Hazardous Materials Management
Waste Management
Hazardous Waste Minimization
Contingency & Emergency Planning
Risk Management
Training
Regulatory Management
Compliance Software

8840 Warner Ave
Suite 304
Fountain Valley, CA 92708
714.596.8836
fax 714.596.8837
www.ecotek.com

every measuring device, as long as all fuel usage is reported? Could we impose individual measuring device accuracy only for bigger sources or sources with fuel usage greater than a specified threshold, to avoid having facilities aggregate their emission sources only due to this requirement?

3) Per 95110(C)(2) typo "assumed" is listed twice on the third line.
4) Per 95115(a)(2)(A): Although fuel consumption by fuel type is required to be reported in scf, gallons or metric tons, if there is no installed devices for direct measurement of fuel consumption and the facility is reporting consumption based on recorded fuel purchase or sales invoices and inventory for the beginning and end of the reporting year million Btu are allowed as measurement unit. We are concerned that as written may be misleading and propose to add, that if facilities purchase invoices are available only in millions Btu, then prior to reporting, the fuel usage has to be converted to scf, gallons of metric tons based on higher heating values provided by supplier, measured by facility, or offered as default by the ARB.
5) We are concerned about the requirement that a facility can decide to switch from fuel consumption methodology to CEMS only one time and only if decided by 2010. Considering that the ARB is committed to collect the best available data, we think that switching to more accurate/device specific approach should not be limited, but rather allowed. For example a facility reported data based on default emission factor, assessed emissions, and available financial resources decides to switch to an ARB approved source test, then later to CEMS. This should improve the quality of the data reported if it were allowed. We therefore, suggest that switching to more accurate reporting methodology should always be allowed but perhaps with prior ARB approval and a statement of methodology change in the report itself. Additionally, will the new facilities operating after 2010; have at least 2 years to decide to switch to CEMS with current proposed rule?
6) We understand that due to time constrains this suggestion might be difficult to incorporated at the time. Nevertheless, we hope that the ARB will soon consider the consolidation of GHG, criteria, and toxic emissions reporting to streamline and improve the data quality for all 3 reporting programs.

Thank you for considering our comments and suggestions and for your openness to taking comments during rule development process. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (714) 596-8836 x 304 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Natasha Meskal

President