ALAMEDA COUNTY
Scott Haggerty
Greg Harper
(Vice-Chairperson)
Mary King
Ben C. Tarver

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
Paul L. Cooper
Mark DeSaulnier
Gayle Uilkema

MARIN COUNTY
Harold C. Brown, Jr.

NAPA COUNTY
Vince Ferriole

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY
Susan Leal
Mabel Teng

SAN MATEO COUNTY
Jerry Hill
Michael D. Nevin
(Secretary)

SANTA CLARA COUNTY
Randy Attaway
Don Gage
Trixie Johnson
Gillian Moran

SOLANO COUNTY
William Carroll

SONOMA COUNTY
James Harberson
(Chairperson)
Patricia Hilligoss

Ellen Garvey
Air Pollution Control Officer

Enclosure #1

EPA General Comments and District Responses on the Proposed Permits for Cardinal Cogen, Site # A1629 and Calpine Gilroy Cogen, L.P., Site # B1180

EPA Comment #1

Subsumed Requirements Language. The last two sentences under Section IX.B. of the permit,

> *"Enforcement actions and litigation may not be initiated against the source or group of sources covered by this shield based on the "subsumed" regulatory and/or statutory provisions cited."*

is not completely accurate, and should be deleted. This statement is only true as long as the source remains in compliance with the associated permit conditions in the Title V permit. If the associated (streamlined) requirements in the Title V permit are violated, however, enforcement action may be taken both for the streamlined limits and the subsumed limits.

BAAQMD Response

The point of subsuming requirements via a permit shield, is to relieve facilities of the burden to perform duplicative and/or overlapping monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting when there is more than one applicable emission limit, each with its own compliance methods. In the development of White Paper #2, EPA made it clear that it believed certain compliance-related activities could be subsumed, but that multiple emission limits could not. EPA has asserted that all applicable emission limits must remain enforceable, even though the specific monitoring recordkeeping and reporting requirements need not.

EPA did not assert that, on principal, the monitoring for the most stringent emission limit necessarily must also assure compliance with all less stringent limits. This was an important point in the negotiations for White Paper #2. This is because in some cases, the monitor may be calibrated for a span that includes the most stringent limit, but cannot measure emissions an order of magnitude higher. If it happens that monitoring showing a violation of the most stringent limit also shows a violation of a less stringent limit, an enforcement action may proceed for both violations.

The District's method of implementing this policy is to include only subsumed monitoring, reporting and recordkeeping requirements in the permit shield. We do not list emission limits in a permit shield, because they remain enforceable. All the applicable emission limits appear on Tables in Section IV, Source Specific Applicable Requirements. Also, because of streamlining, there will necessarily be emission limits shown on the Tables in Section VII, Applicable Limits and Compliance Methods, that do not have corresponding applicable monitoring requirements. This is consistent with the policy set forth in White paper #2. EPA's Credible Evidence policy also supports the District's approach.

EPA Comment #2

General Applicable Requirements -- In Section III. General Requirements, the second and third sentence of the first paragraph states: "These requirements apply in a general manner to the facility and/or to sources exempt from the requirement to obtain a District Permit to Operate. The District has determined that these requirements would not be violated under normal, routine operations, and that no additional periodic monitoring or reporting to demonstrate compliance is warranted." EPA feels that these statements may be too broad, and we have concerns that certain insignificant emission units (IEUs) may actually violate standards under normal, routine operations. It may be inappropriate to conclude, without some additional analysis, that any IEU does not require additional monitoring to assure compliance. As a result, there may be exempt sources that have significant emissions which may need monitoring.

For example, the District's permit exemption list (Regulation 2 Rule 1) exempts equipment that may have emissions as high as 150 lb/day (27.4 tpy). EPA is concerned that internal combustion engines and certain other exempt sources subject to the generally applicable requirement in Table III may have potentially high emissions and/or a greater likelihood of violating the emission standards. Therefore monitoring may need to be considered for some of these units to ensure they meet all of the applicable requirements. For example, on its exempt equipment list, Calpine includes internal combustion equipment which is exempt under District regulation 2-1-115. Cardinal includes internal combustion engines which are exempt under regulation 1-110.2. The District should evaluate whether these units have the potential to violate generally applicable requirements, and either provide a demonstration that this is not the case, or include appropriate monitoring in the title V permit. No evaluation is necessary for many units on the list, for example, fire protection systems which are either not subject to, or would clearly have no potential to violate, generally applicable requirements.

BAAQMD Response

EPA 's final action on the District's Title V program addressed the District's exemption list in Rule 2-1 as an interim approval issue. This approach acknowledged the tremendous effort it would take for the District to initiate implementation of a new Title V program. It put a priority on getting started over fixing all outstanding issues first. The District is aware that the exemption list needs to be revisited in order to obtain full approval of the Title V program. This effort is already underway. For the present, we intend to implement the program as currently structured under the terms of its interim approval by EPA.

The text cited above from Section III. General Requirements, was the result of negotiations between EPA and District staff on March 5, 1997. It has already been approved and included in the ten permits issued in 1997.

There are thousands of pieces of exempt equipment at permitted facilities in the Bay Area. If necessary, the District will revise its exemption list to ensure inclusion of equipment with significant emissions. However, we will not perform detailed evaluations of exempt equipment for the permits. The drain on resources would not be justifiable.

EPA Comment #3

Administrative - There is not a facility description section in the permit. As discussed with Mr. Steve Hill, EPA suggests that the permit could be improved by adding a facility description section versus only having that information/description in the application. This missing of information makes the permit less clear, and more difficult to use.

BAAQMD Response

The cover page on the permits indicates: 1) the type of facility (primary activity), 2) the primary SIC, and 3) the product. This is identical to the type of facility information included in the District's previously issued Title V permits. It is consistent with the requirements of the District's program requirements and with the requirements of 40 CFR Part 70.

Enclosure #2

EPA Comments and District Responses on the Proposed Permit for Site #A1629, Cardinal Cogen

EPA Comment #1

Permit Shield -- Section IX. Permit Shield, Table IX-A-1, for the four boilers, states that the requirements of NSPS Subpart Dc, Standards of Performance for Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units, are not applicable because the boilers were built before June 9, 1989. However a unit for which construction, modification, or reconstruction occurs after June 9, 1989, would become subject to the requirements of NSPS Subpart Dc. Please change the language in this table to accommodate this possibility.

BAAQMD Response

The final permit has been revised per EPA recommendation.

EPA Comment #2

Monitoring -- In Section VII-A, S1-4, Boilers, EPA recommends that a periodic EPA Reference Method 9 or other approved EPA test method for opacity be included to ensure compliance with the general opacity standard. As agreed, please revise the permit to provide for some additional monitoring for opacity for when the unit(s) fire on fuel oil. We suggest the following language:

> *"For all non-emergency oil firing, the permittee shall be required to have a Visible Emission Evaluation (VEE) performed during the start-up of the boiler and or turbine on fuel oil, and thereafter on a weekly basis. The VEE period shall be a minimum of six (6) minutes unless any one reading is greater than the visible emission limit, then the observation shall be a minimum of 60 minutes or until a violation of the emissions limit has been documented. A VEE shall not be required while the boiler fires on natural gas.*

In addition, we request that you add monitoring for emergency situations that may continue for extended periods of time. We recognize that the source may not be able to conduct monitoring immediately after an emergency occurs, and this can be considered in developing the permit condition:

> *"For emergency oil firing, the permittee shall be required to have a Visible Emission Evaluation (VEE) performed within 72 hours of the start-up of the boiler and/or turbine on fuel oil, and thereafter on a weekly basis. The VEE period shall be a minimum of six (6) minutes unless any one reading is greater than the visible emission limit, then the observation shall be a minimum of 60 minutes, or until a violation of the emissions limit has been documented. A VEE shall not be required while the boiler fires on natural gas.*

BAAQMD Response

Considering the intermittent operation of these boilers and the boilers' low potential to emit, the District will not require additional monitoring for visible emissions.

EPA Comment #3

Applicable Emission Limits & Compliance Monitoring Requirements -- Table VII-B, S-6 Turbine and in Table VII-C, S-8, Duct Burner, states that the monitoring frequency for fuel oil usage limitation of 520 mmcf is "N" or no monitoring. However, the PSD permit part IX.G.4 requires continuous monitoring, and is shown in Table VII-A, S1-4, Boilers on page 35. The monitoring frequency in Tables VII-B and VII-C do not seem to suggest the appropriate monitoring. Mr. Steve Hill agreed that this was most likely an error. Please clarify that continuous monitoring is required and revise the tables accordingly.

BAAQMD Response

Thank you for pointing out the error in this section. The lines referring to 520 mmcf natural gas applies to the boilers and the duct burner and will be deleted from Table VII-B, S-6 Turbine. The table does contain a reference to 3,850 mmcf for the turbine alone, which is continuously monitored.

Permit condition #2878, part 11, requires fuel monitoring for the boilers. This requirement is in Table VII-A. Table VII-C, Duct Burner, will be amended to show that the District limit is assured by fuel monitoring as required in the PSD permit.

EPA Comment #4

Clarification -- In Section VI. Permit Conditions 2878, Part 16a., the sentence that states "The monthly total number of hours and Source 6 is operated..." should be revised. Please modify as follows: "The monthly total number of hours that Source 6.....".

BAAQMD Response

The permit has been revised per EPA recommendation.

EPA Comment #5

Applicable Emission Limits & Compliance Monitoring Requirements -- Table VII-B, S-6 Turbine on Page 38, states that the emission limit for NOx in PSD permit part IX.C.1 is 45 ppm @ 15% O2 averaged over 24 hours, when burning natural gas. The correct limit according to the PSD Permit Part IX.C.1 as found on Page 26, is 42 ppm @ 15% O2 averaged over 24 hours. Also, on Page 38, the information concerning the 42 ppmv @15% O2 NOx limit in the row just above this seems to be repeated. This requirement is also found on Page 36 of the same table. Please change the information in the table accordingly.

BAAQMD Response

The permit has been revised per EPA recommendation.

EPA Comment #6

Applicable Emission Limits & Compliance Monitoring Requirements -- Table VII-C, S-8, Duct Burner, lists no monitoring for the NOx emission limit of 0.2 lb NO2/mmbtu burned and states that the exemption from monitoring is found at 40 CFR 60.48b(h). However, please note that the source is already performing continuous emission monitoring (CEM) to demonstrate compliance with the NOx emission limit of 42 ppm @ 15% O2 per permit condition 2878 part 4.

Even though the NSPS does not specifically require the installation or operation of a CEM to measure NOx emissions, that does not mean that the source is not required to perform some monitoring to demonstrate compliance. Therefore, since CEMS are already being used for the 42 ppm @ 15 % O2 limit, EPA recommends using that CEM data to demonstrate compliance with the 0.2 lb/mm BTU limit. The calculation as presented in Appendix 1 of the permit evaluation is not sufficient, because it only demonstrates that the 0.2 limit is equivalent to a 58 ppm @ 3% O2 concentration. The District could use the CEM NOx and fuel usage data, and convert it to lbs/mmbtu to demonstrate compliance with the 0.2 lb NO2/mmbtu limit. The other alternative is that the District may streamline to the lower emission. Please select either method and adjust the permit accordingly.

BAAQMD Response

The District has streamlined to the lower emission limit, and therefore the NSPS monitoring has been subsumed. See response to Enclosure #1, Comment #1.

EPA Comment #7

PSD Permit Conditions -- The PSD permit section IX, special conditions, part D - performance tests states that performance tests for emissions of NOx shall be conducted for both fuels to be used, on the gas turbine operating alone and in conjunction with the duct burners, on at least an annual basis. This requirement seems to have been deleted from the permit. According to our discussion with Mr. Steve Hill, this appears to have been an oversight and will be added to the permit as necessary. Please revise accordingly.

BAAQMD Response

This requirement has been deleted at the request of the applicant since the quality control for the NOx CEM is sufficient to ensure compliance without performance tests. Also, the District checks the accuracy of the CEMs twice per year, a procedure that is similar to a source test. Note that references to a second fuel have been deleted since Cardinal Cogen is no longer allowed to burn fuel oil at the turbine or duct burner.

Please note also that since the redundant performance test requirement was from a permit condition and not from a regulation, we have the authority to remove it. It does not have to be included as an unnecessary monitoring requirement in a permit shield.

EPA Comment #8

Administrative -- As a general comment on the format of the tables in section VII applicable emission limits & compliance monitoring requirements, please note that the column entitled "pollutant" has information on operational parameters such as "hours of operation" and "fuel usage", which are not pollutants. This is somewhat confusing and we suggest revising the heading to more appropriately reflect the information contained in the rows that follow.

BAAQMD Response

In response to this comment the title of Section VII has been changed to "Applicable Limits and Compliance Monitoring Requirements" and the "Pollutant" column heading has likewise been revised.

EPA Comment #9

Administrative -- EPA concurs with the suggested changes to the permit that were proposed by the District's Enforcement and Compliance Division in a letter dated March 20, 1998 from Ellen Garvey to David Howekamp (Enclosure D). The changes are summarized below:

> *1. A change to the malfunction provision in the old PSD permit to make it more similar to the breakdown provision, which deletes provision IV. Malfunction.*
>
> *2. Changing the monitoring report provision in the standard conditions of the permit to require reporting within 10 days of "occurrence" rather than with 10 days of "discovery".*
>
> *3. A clarification that day means "calendar" day.*
>
> *4. A clarification that reports of non-compliance must be submitted in writing.*

BAAQMD Response

The District concurs with changes #1, #3, and #4. The District has not proposed to change "discovery" to "occurrence."

EPA Comment #10

NOx Monitoring for Boilers -- The boilers are required to meet NOx emission limits ranging from 25-40 ppm through use of low-NOx burners and flue gas recirculation. In addition to the annual stack test, the flue gas recirculation setting should be periodically checked to assure that the controls are operating at the same levels at which they were operating during the compliance tests. We recognize that these boilers are restricted in how frequently they can operate, so we recommend that this condition be written to require monitoring only when the boilers are operating. For example, the following language could be used:

> *The acceptable settings for the fuel gas recirculations valve shall be established by testing emissions from this unit or other representative units as approved by the District. The acceptable settings shall be those for which compliance with applicable NOX and CO emissions rates have been demonstrated through testing.*
>
> *The fuel gas recirculation valve settings shall be inspected at least on a weekly basis when the units are operating.*
>
> *The permittee shall maintain records of the date and time of flue gas recirculation valve settings, and the observed setting. The records must also include a description of any corrective action taken to maintain the flue gas recirculation valve setting to within the acceptable ranges.*
>
> *If the flue gas recirculation valve setting deviates from the acceptable range, the permitting shall notify the District and take corrective action within one (1) hour after detection. If the flue gas recirculation valve settings are not corrected promptly, the permittee shall conduct an emissions test within 60 days, utilizing District-approved test methods, to demonstrate compliance with the applicable emissions limits at the observed flue gas recirculation valve settings.*

BAAQMD Response

Considering the intermittent operation of these boilers and the boilers' low potential to emit, the District will not require additional monitoring of the flue-gas recirculation.

EPA Comment #11

Fuel Monitoring -- The turbines and boilers have continuous non-resettable fuel meters, yet certain fuel use limits are designated as having no monitoring. This should be corrected.

BAAQMD Response

The permit will be amended as requested.

Enclosure #3

EPA Comments and District Response on the Proposed Permit for

Calpine Gilroy Cogen, L.P., Site # B1180

EPA Comment #1

Permit Shield -- Section IX. Permit Shield, Table IX-A-1, for the S101 and S102 Boilers, states that the requirements of NSPS Subpart Dc, Standards of Performance for Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units, are not applicable because the boilers were built before June 9, 1989. However, as you are aware, a unit for which construction, modification, or reconstruction occurs after June 9, 1989, would become subject to the requirements of NSPS Subpart Dc. Please change the language in this table to accommodate this possibility and clarify the permit.

BAAQMD Response

The final permit has been revised per EPA recommendation.

EPA Comment #2

Permit Conditions -- In Section VI. Permit Conditions, Condition #2780 Part 6a states that within two weeks of fuel oil use at S100 (Gas Turbine) or S101-102 (Boilers) the permit holder shall have source tests performed to measure TSP from the source or sources burning fuel oil. EPA is concerned that only one test is required, and it is not clear if subsequent tests are to be performed. The Permit Evaluation states that source tests will be performed to verify the particulate emission factor. After the emission factor is verified, Calpine will use the factor and recordkeeping to ensure compliance with the particulate limit of 25 tpy. However, EPA recommends at least testing once every 2 or 3 years, based on the assumption that this source may combust fuel oil a significant percentage of the time (as much as 50%). EPA acknowledges that the permit evaluation states that Calpine has permits to burn fuel oil, but has never used the permits. This statement does not preclude the need to revise the permit condition as discussed, however, the monitoring could be tailored to the frequency at which the units actually operate on fuel oil. For example, testing could be required after initial use, and then triggered after a certain number of hours of cumulative operation on fuel oil.

BAAQMD Response

This facility has never burned fuel oil, and does not expect to do so in the foreseeable future, thus we believe the addition of the proposed permit terms is unnecessary. There is a vanishingly small likelihood of a violation due to burning fuel oil.

EPA Comment #3

Opacity for Turbine and Boilers -- Section VI. Permit Conditions, EPA recommends that Condition #2780 Part 6a. require a periodic EPA Reference Method 9 or other approved EPA test method for opacity to ensure compliance with the general opacity standard. As agreed, please revise the permit to provide for some additional monitoring for opacity for when the unit(s) fire on fuel oil. We suggest the following language:

> *"For all non-emergency oil firing, the permittee shall be required to have a Visible Emission Evaluation (VEE) performed during the start-up of the boiler and/or turbine on fuel oil, and thereafter on a weekly basis. The VEE period shall be a minimum of six (6) minutes unless any one reading is greater than the visible emission limit, then the observation shall be a minimum of 60 minutes, or until a violation of the emissions limit has been documented. A VEE shall not be required while the boiler fires on natural gas.*

In addition, we request that you add monitoring for emergency situations that may continue for extended periods of time. We recognize that the source may not be able to conduct monitoring immediately after an emergency occurs, and this can be considered in developing the permit condition:

> *"For emergency oil firing, the permittee shall be required to have a Visible Emission Evaluation (VEE) performed within 72 hours of the start-up of the boiler and/or turbine on fuel oil, and thereafter on a weekly basis. The VEE period shall be a minimum of six (6) minutes unless any one reading is greater than the visible emission limit, then the observation shall be a minimum of 60 minutes, or until a violation of the emissions limit has been documented. A VEE shall not be required while the boiler fires on natural gas.*

BAAQMD Response

This facility has never burned fuel oil, and does not expect to do so in the foreseeable future, thus we believe the addition of the proposed permit terms is unnecessary. There is a vanishingly small likelihood of a violation due to burning fuel oil.

EPA Comment #4

Applicable Emission Limits & Compliance Monitoring Requirements -- Table VII-A, S-6 Turbine, states that the monitoring frequency for fuel oil usage limitation of 0.55 million barrels per year is on a periodic/event (P/E) basis with monitoring type listed as recordkeeping. However, Condition #2780, Part 9 on Page 18 of the permit states that the owner or operator shall install and operate a continuous monitoring system to monitor and record the fuel consumption and the ratio of steam injection to fuel fired in the turbine. The monitoring frequency in Table VII-A does not seem to require continuous monitoring, but only periodic/event monitoring. Mr. Steve Hill agreed that this was most likely an error. Please clarify that continuous monitoring is required and revise the table accordingly.

BAAQMD Response

The permit will be amended as requested. The table originally said "periodic" because the fuel oil is not normally burned at Calpine Gilroy. The table can be changed with the assumption that monitoring of fuel oil use would be continuous during fuel oil combustion.

EPA Comment #5

Applicable Emission Limits & Compliance Monitoring Requirements -- In Table VII-B, S101, S102 -Boilers on Page 32, no monitoring frequency is required for the 150 ppmv @ 3% O2 dry emission NOx limit for the boilers, and the monitoring type is listed as "records". This seems to be an error, because the table on periodic monitoring for NOx sources in the permit evaluation lists continuous emission monitoring (CEM) as the monitoring type for this limit. This problem is also repeated for the 400 ppmv CO @ 3% O2 dry limit for the boilers in Table VII-B on Page 33 of the proposed permit. The CEMS should be used to determine compliance with these limits. If the CEMS will not provide data in this emission range, then the best solution may be to streamline the multiple emission limits to the most stringent emission limit and monitoring that most assures compliance as described in White Paper 2.

BAAQMD Response

The measurement range for both the NOX and CO CEMs is 0-100 ppm. As we explain in the response to EPA's general comment #1 (see Enclosure #1) the District only subsumes duplicative or unnecessary *monitoring requirements* via a permit shield, *not emission limits*. This is because an emission limit cannot be made unenforceable. All emission limits will remain on the tables of applicable requirements. However, since the 150 ppmv NOx limit is outside the range of the CEM, there will be no specific monitoring to assure compliance with that limit.

EPA Comment #6

Administrative -- As a general comment on the format of the tables in Section VII - Applicable Emission Limits & Compliance Monitoring Requirements, please note that the column entitled "pollutant" has information on operational parameters such as "hours of operation" and "fuel usage", which are not pollutants. This format is somewhat confusing. We suggest revising the column heading to more appropriately reflect the information contained in the rows that follow.

BAAQMD Response

In response to this comment the title of Section VII has been changed to "Applicable Limits and Compliance Monitoring Requirements" and the "Pollutant" column heading has likewise been revised.

EPA Comment #7

Administrative -- EPA concurs with the suggested changes to the permit that were proposed by the District's Enforcement and Compliance Division in a letter dated March 20, 1998, from Ellen Garvey to David Howekamp (Enclosure D). The changes are summarized below:

> *1. A change to the malfunction provision in the old PSD permit to make it more similar to the breakdown provision, which deletes provision IV. Malfunction.*
>
> *2. Changing the monitoring report provision in the standard conditions of the permit to require reporting within 10 days of "occurrence" rather than with 10 days of "discovery".*
>
> *3. A clarification that day means "calendar" day.*
>
> *4. A clarification that reports of non-compliance must be submitted in writing.*

BAAQMD Response

The District concurs with changes #1, #3, and #4. The District has not proposed to change "discovery" to "occurrence."

EPA Comment #8

Compliance Demonstration. The permit evaluation does not provide a demonstration for the 300 ppm SO2 limit and the 3087 lb SO2/day limit for both the turbine and boilers. If compliance with these limits cannot be demonstrated based on the maximum fuel sulfur content and fuel use, then monitoring for these limits, based on these same parameters, should be included in the permit.

BAAQMD Response

The permit evaluation provides a demonstration that the 300 ppm SO2 limit cannot be exceeded while burning natural gas. The 300 ppm SO2 limit only applies when natural gas is burned. No further demonstration is required for this limit.

Based on the capacity factors contained in the evaluation, a maximum of 2876 lb SO2/day could be emitted when fuel oil containing 0.12% sulfur is burned; 374 lb SO2/day when natural gas is burned. However, we have recently discovered that the density of fuel oil in our database is in error. It should be 7.2 lb/gal, not 6.1 lb/gal, which is the density of gasoline. Based on this density, Calpine Gilroy could exceed the daily mass emission limit if running the turbine and both boilers on fuel oil containing 0.12% sulfur for an entire day.

Calpine Gilroy proposes to resolve this problem by determining the density and sulfur content of any fuel oil purchased, and using the information to determine how much fuel oil can be burned daily. This approach is more useful than a restriction on fuel oil burned per day since the facility may be able to purchase fuel oil containing less than 0.12% sulfur. The permit has been amended to add this monitoring requirement.

The limit does not apply during natural gas curtailment. Therefore, it will not be necessary to add additional monitoring for the burning of 0.25% S fuel oil.

The daily limit is the only limit affected by the error, since compliance with the other limits on sulfur content in fuel oil is assured by the requirement for certification of sulfur content of fuel oil.

EPA Comment #9

CO Requirements. The permit (Condition 2780, part 3) requires that 80% of the CO emissions be reduced. To confirm that this requirement continues to be met, and that any deterioration of the catalyst is corrected, the source should be required to do both inlet and outlet CO test each year when the CEMS RATA is conducted.

BAAQMD Response

Calpine Gilroy had agreed to perform an annual source test to assure compliance with the 80% CO reduction, and the source test had been inadvertently omitted from the permit. The revised permit will include this provision.

EPA Comment #10

Applicable Emission Limits & Compliance Monitoring Requirements -- Table VII-B, S-101, S102, Boilers, lists no monitoring for the NOx emission limit of 0.2 lb NO2/mmbtu burned and states that the exemption from monitoring is subsumed by the BACT condition in #2780, parts 3 and 11. While the District has provided a demonstration that the NSPS limit is less stringent than the BACT condition, and provided a permit shield, it is not clear that the NSPS emission limit has been streamlined, because it still appears in the permit. In order to clarify that this limit has been subsumed, it should be not be listed as a separate limit in the permit;; however, it should be listed as part of the origin and authority for the 40 ppmv limit to show that this more stringent limit assures compliance with the NSPS limit.

BAAQMD Response

The response to this comment is the same as the response to EPA's General Comment #1.

EPA Comment #11

Clarification -- Page 17, condition 5 should read:

> *"...The owner or operator shall maintain records on the duration of fuel oil firing, the sulfur content, and in which operating sources fuel oil firing took place..."*

Page 27, condition -- should read "...maximum steam/fuel ratio OR 83,000 lb/hr..."

BAAQMD Response

The permit has been revised per EPA's recommendation.