

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ, agency, commission) proposes an amendment to §55.201.

Background and Summary of the Factual Basis for the Proposed Rule

In *Massachusetts v. EPA* (549 U.S. 497 (2007)) the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that greenhouse gases (GHGs) fit within the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA or Act) definition of air pollutant. This ruling gave United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) the authority to regulate GHGs from new motor vehicles and engines if EPA made a finding under FCAA, §202(a) that six key taken in combination endanger both public health and welfare, and that combined emissions of GHGs from new motor vehicles and engines contribute to pollution that endangers public health and welfare. EPA issued its "Endangerment Finding" for GHGs On December 15, 2009 (Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act, Final Rule, as published in the December 15, 2009, issue of the *Federal Register* (74 FR 66496)). Based on the Endangerment Finding, EPA subsequently adopted new emissions standards for motor vehicles (the "Tailpipe Rule" as published in the May 7, 2010, issue of the *Federal Register* (75 FR 25324)). The rule established standards for light-duty motor vehicles to improve fuel economy thereby reducing emissions of GHGs. The standards were effective January 2, 2011. EPA also reconsidered its interpretation of the timing of applicability of Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) under the FCAA (the "Timing Rule" as published in the April 2, 2010, issue of the *Federal Register* (75 FR 17004)). EPA's

interpretation of the FCAA is that PSD requirements for stationary sources of GHGs take effect when the first national rule subjects GHGs to regulation under the Act. EPA determined that once GHGs were actually being controlled under any part of the Act they were subject to regulation under the PSD program. Specifically, EPA took the position that beginning on January 2, 2011, GHG control requirements would be required under the PSD and Title V permitting programs because national standards for GHGs under the Tailpipe Rule were effective on January 2, 2011.

EPA's regulation of GHGs under the FCAA presented substantial difficulties for the EPA and states, particularly with regard to the PSD program. For instance, the most common of the GHGs, carbon dioxide (CO₂), is emitted in quantities that dwarf the Act's major source thresholds for program applicability. As a result, under EPA's Timing Rule, PSD requirements could have expanded from approximately 500 issued permits annually to more than 81,000 nationwide, as published in the June 3, 2010, issue of the *Federal Register* (75 FR 31514, 31537 and 31538). To avoid this result, EPA excluded much of this new construction activity from the PSD program by altering the Act's statutory emission rate applicability thresholds for GHGs. This "Tailoring Rule," as published in the June 3, 2010, issue of the *Federal Register* (75 FR 31514) newly defined the statutory term "subject to regulation" and established higher GHGs emission thresholds for applicability of PSD and Title V permitting than specified in the FCAA. The Tailoring Rule also phased in permitting requirements in a multi-stepped process.

Before the *Massachusetts* decision in 2007, EPA took the position that GHGs are not regulated under the FCAA, and GHGs unquestionably were not regulated when EPA approved Texas' State Implementation Plan (SIP) in 1992. Texas has had an approved SIP since 1972, as published in the May 31, 1972, issue of the *Federal Register* (37 FR 10842). In 1983, Texas was delegated authority to implement the PSD program, as published in the February 9, 1983, issue of the *Federal Register* (48 FR 6023). Following this delegation, Texas submitted several SIP revisions to enable it to administer the PSD program (collectively the "PSD SIP submission"). EPA approved Texas' PSD SIP in 1992, granting the state full authority to implement the PSD program, as published in the June 24, 1992, issue of the *Federal Register* (57 FR 28093).

The Texas PSD SIP submission and approval proceedings produced a well-developed record on how Texas would address the applicability of newly-regulated pollutants under the PSD program. During the SIP submission process, Texas consistently explained to EPA that the PSD provisions in the SIP are not prospective rulemaking, and do not incorporate future EPA interpretations of the Act or its regulations.

EPA's GHGs regulations created practical difficulties about how EPA could apply its Tailoring Rule in states with approved SIPs. In August 2010, Texas advised EPA that it could not retroactively reinterpret its SIP to cover GHGs, which were not regulated at the

time Texas' SIP was approved in 1992 and were, in fact, a composite pollutant defined for the first time in the Tailoring Rule. Texas also explained that the PSD program only encompassed National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) pollutants, but confirmed as a regulatory matter that the approved PSD program encompasses all federally regulated new source review (NSR) pollutants, including any pollutant that otherwise is subject to regulation under the FCAA, as stated in 30 TAC §116.12(14)(D).

Following promulgation of the Tailoring Rule, EPA issued a proposed "Finding of Substantial Inadequacy and SIP Call," as published in the September 2, 2010, issue of the *Federal Register* (75 FR 53892). This action proposed finding the SIPs of 13 states, including Texas', "substantially inadequate" because these SIPs did not apply PSD requirements to GHGs-emitting sources. EPA proposed to require these states (through their SIP-approved PSD programs) to regulate GHGs as defined in the Tailoring Rule. EPA also proposed a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) that would apply specifically to states that did not or could not agree to reinterpret their SIPs to impose the Tailoring Rule and did not meet SIP submission deadlines. EPA finalized its GHG SIP Call in the December 12, 2010, issue of the *Federal Register* (75 FR 77698) and required Texas to submit revisions to its SIP by December 1, 2011.

EPA published an interim final rule partially disapproving Texas' SIP; imposing the GHGs FIP effective as of its date of publication, as published in the December 30, 2010, issue of

the *Federal Register* (75 FR 82430). EPA stated that FCAA, §110(k)(6) authorized it to change its previous approval of Texas' PSD SIP into a partial approval and partial disapproval. EPA's basis was that it had erroneously approved Texas' PSD SIP submission because the SIP did not appropriately address the applicability of newly-regulated pollutants to the PSD program in the future. EPA further stated that its action was independent of the GHG SIP Call because that action was aimed at a narrower issue of applicability to GHGs, whereas its decision retroactively disapproving Texas' PSD SIP submission was addressed to Texas' purported failure to address, or assure the legal authority for, application of PSD to all pollutants newly subject to regulation. EPA published the final rule retroactively disapproving Texas' PSD SIP in part and promulgating the FIP as published in the May 3, 2011, issue of the *Federal Register* (76 FR 25178).

The effect of EPA's FIP is that major source preconstruction permitting authority is divided between two authorities - EPA for GHGs and the state of Texas for all other pollutants. Currently, major construction projects and expansions in Texas that require PSD permits must file applications with both EPA Region 6 (for GHGs) and TCEQ (for all non-GHG pollutants).

House Bill (HB) 788, 83rd Legislature, 2013, added new Texas Health and Safety Code (THSC), §382.05102. The new section grants TCEQ authority to authorize emissions of

GHGs consistent with THSC, §382.051, to the extent required under federal law. THSC, §382.05102 directs the commission to adopt implementing rules, including a procedure to transition GHG PSD applications currently under EPA review to the TCEQ. Upon adoption, the rules must be submitted to EPA for review and approval into the Texas SIP. THSC, §382.05102 excludes permitting processes for GHGs from the contested case hearing procedures in THSC, Chapter 382; Texas Water Code, Chapter 5; and Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001. THSC, §382.05102 also requires that the commission repeal the rules adopted under this authority and submit a SIP revision to EPA, if (at a future date) GHG emissions are no longer required to be authorized under federal law.

The commission is initiating this rulemaking to fulfill the directive from the legislature. The legislature found that "in the interest of the continued vitality and economic prosperity of the state, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, because of its technical expertise and experience in processing air quality permit applications, is the preferred authority for emissions of {GHGs}."

Texas has challenged in federal court EPA's GHG regulations as well as EPA's SIP Call and FIP. Implementation of HB 788 through this rulemaking is not adverse to Texas' claims in its ongoing challenges to EPA's actions regarding GHGs generally or relating to the SIP. The commission's action to conduct rulemaking for submittal and approval by EPA is consistent with Texas' position that state law does not give EPA the authority to

automatically change state regulations.

Concurrently with this proposal, the commission is proposing new and amended rules to 30 TAC Chapters 39 (Public Notice), 101 (General Air Quality Rules), 106 (Permits by Rule), 116 (Control of Air Pollution by Permits for New Construction or Modification), and 122 (Federal Operating Permits Program) to implement HB 788. Except where specifically noted, all proposed changes to Chapters 39, 55, 101, 106, 116, and 122 are necessary to achieve the goal of implementation of HB 788, obtaining SIP approval of certain rules, and rescission of the FIP.

Proposed Amendments to Chapters 39 and 55

The commission proposes changes to two chapters regarding public participation. The proposed amendments to Chapters 39 and 55 are distinguishable from current public participation rules and the Texas SIP. First, PSD GHG permit applications would not be subject to an opportunity to request a contested case hearing or reconsideration of the executive director's decision. Second, based on EPA's interpretation of its PSD rules, no air quality analysis is required for GHG permits. Therefore, when no such analysis is required, none will be prepared by the commission and available for public comment.

HB 788 specifically excludes PSD GHG permit applications from the requirements relating to a contested case hearing. Requests for reconsideration were added by HB 801 (76th

Legislature, 1999) as an alternative to the opportunity to request a contested case hearing. However, this remedy is not independent of the right to request a contested case hearing. Absent a right to request a contested case hearing, there is no independent right to request reconsideration of the executive director's decision. The commission interprets HB 788 to require that all other HB 801 requirements, discussed later in this preamble, apply to GHG permit applications.

In addition, although HB 788 does not specify that PSD GHG permit applications are exempt from requests for the commission to reconsider the executive director's preliminary decision, the legislative history of the bill provides that the intent of HB 788 is to shorten the time to obtain a permit by simplifying the permit process. Requests for reconsideration and contested case hearing are interim administrative remedies which add time to the process, and are not part of EPA's procedural mechanisms.

The majority of the existing public participation and notice requirements in Chapters 39 and 55, which implement both federal and state law, will apply to the PSD GHG applications. Many of these requirements were clarified in or added by HB 801. The Chapter 39 amendments are proposed as revisions to the SIP, but the Chapter 55 amendment is not required for the SIP. The public participation and notice requirements include newspaper publication of Notice of Receipt of Application and Intent to Obtain Permit and Notice of Application and Preliminary Decision, each with particular language;

sign posting; alternate language newspaper publication and sign posting (where applicable); placement of a copy of the application, the executive director's preliminary decision (draft permit), and preliminary determination summary in a public place for review and copying; providing opportunity for and mandatory attendance at a public meeting (which is mandatory when requested by a member of the public for any PSD permit application or by a legislator who represents the general area where the facility is or is proposed to be located); and notice to certain affected agencies and representatives, including EPA Region 6, local air pollution control agencies with jurisdiction, the chief executives of the city and county where the source is or would be located, and any State or Federal Land Manager, and Indian Governing Body. In addition, the executive director's draft permit and preliminary decision, and preliminary determination summary are available electronically on the commission's Web site at the time of publication of the Notice of Application and Preliminary Decision. Finally, the executive director is required to respond to comments submitted by preparing a Response to Comments, which is mailed to commenters and posted on the commission's Web site, with the executive director's decision. Some of these requirements and procedures were changed in rulemaking and described in the preamble adopted June 2, 2010. Background information regarding the commission's public participation rules for PSD permits can be found in the preamble adopting new and amended rules as published in the June 18, 2010, issue of the *Texas Register* (35 TexReg 5198 - 5255, 5274 - 5277, and 5344 - 5348).

Any PSD GHG permit issued by the executive director will be subject to the Motion to Overturn Process in §50.139, or, if issued by the commission, will be subject to a Motion for Rehearing. Both of these administrative remedies are subject to appeal to Texas District Court for persons who participated in the steps of the administrative process by submitting comments and filing the appropriate challenge with the commission. As discussed in the preamble for the most recent rule amendments regarding public participation for air quality permit applications, as published in the June 18, 2010 issue of the *Texas Register* (35 TexReg 5198), access to judicial review for air quality permits is governed by THSC, §382.032. Generally, a person must comply with the requirement to exhaust the available administrative remedies prior to filing suit in district court. In addition, EPA has approved the Texas Title V Operating Permit Program, which required the submission of a Texas Attorney General opinion regarding sufficient access to courts, in compliance with Article III of the United States Constitution. The Attorney General Opinion specifically states that "{a}ny provisions of State law that limit access to judicial review do not exceed the corresponding limits on judicial review imposed by the standing requirement of Article III of the United States Constitution." The state statutory authority cited in support of the Texas Title V Operating Permit Program includes THSC, §382.032, which is the underlying authority for the appeal of Texas' air quality permit actions, including the PSD permitting program. Therefore, the Texas Attorney General statement regarding equivalence of judicial review based on THSC, §382.032 in accordance with Article III of the United

States Constitution is also applicable for every action of the commission subject to the Texas Clean Air Act (TCAA), including PSD permit decisions.

Section Discussion

The proposed amendment to §55.201(i)(3)(C) would provide that an application for an air quality permit under Chapter 116, Subchapter B, Division 6 that would authorize only emissions of GHGs (as defined in proposed amendments to 30 TAC §101.1) is a type of application that is not subject to contested case hearing. This proposed amendment is consistent with HB 788 and the corresponding statute in THSC, §382.05102(d). Existing subparagraph (C) would be re-lettered as subparagraph (D).

Fiscal Note: Costs to State and Local Government

Nina Chamness, Analyst in the Strategic Planning and Assessment Section, has determined that for the first five-year period the proposed rule is in effect, no significant fiscal implications are anticipated for the agency or for other units of state or local government as a result of administration or enforcement of the proposed rule. The proposed rule pertains to the public notice requirements for GHG emissions under the PSD air permit program.

The proposed rule would amend Chapter 55 to implement the notice requirements of HB 788, 83rd Legislature, 2013, and are part of a larger rulemaking involving Chapters 39,

101, 106, 116, and 122. This fiscal note only addresses the proposed rule for Chapter 55.

HB 788 exempts GHG PSD air permits from the requirements of a contested case hearing. The proposed rule adds new language in Chapter 55 to specify that applications for a PSD permit to authorize GHGs would not be subject to a contested case hearing. The proposed rule would tend to result in a faster permit issuance for those applicants who otherwise might have had a permit delayed by a contested case hearing.

The proposed rule is not expected to have fiscal implications for state agencies or local government entities that do not participate in the types of activities that require a PSD permit. If a local government or state agency is required to have a PSD permit for GHG emissions, then that governmental entity could experience cost benefits from not having to participate in a contested case hearing in that the lack of a hearing will tend to result in faster permit issuance for permit applicants who otherwise might have had their permit delayed by a contested case hearing. Because no GHG PSD permits have been issued, affected entities will not experience any cost savings.

Public Benefits and Costs

Ms. Chamness also determined that for each year of the first five years the proposed rule is in effect, the public benefit anticipated from the changes seen in the proposed rule will be compliance with state law and an efficient GHG PSD permitting process.

The proposed rule is not expected to have a direct fiscal impact on individuals but may have cost benefits for large businesses that require a PSD permit for GHG emissions as the proposed rule may result in faster GHG PSD permit issuance times for permit applicants who otherwise might have had their permit delayed by a contested case hearing.

By not specifying that a GHG PSD permit is subject to a contested case hearing, the permitting process is expected to become shorter, less burdensome, and less costly for an applicant. However, determining the significance of any savings from not being subject to a contested case hearing is case-specific and depends upon a variety of factors including the savings generated by not having to pay consultants, attorneys, or experts to defend a permit.

Small Business and Micro-Business Assessment

No adverse fiscal implications are anticipated for small or micro-businesses as a result of the administration or implementation of the proposed rule during the first five years the proposed rule is in effect. Small businesses should experience the same types of cost benefits as a large business (if they become subject GHG PSD permit requirements) because the proposed rule would exempt a small business from a contested case hearing and provide for a shorter permitting process.

Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

The commission has reviewed this proposed rulemaking and determined that a small business regulatory flexibility analysis is not required because the proposed rule is required to comply with state law and does not adversely affect a small or micro-business in a material way for the first five years that the proposed rule is in effect.

Local Employment Impact Statement

The commission has reviewed this proposed rulemaking and determined that a local employment impact statement is not required because the proposed rule does not adversely affect a local economy in a material way for the first five years that the proposed rule is in effect.

Draft Regulatory Impact Analysis Determination

The commission reviewed the proposed rulemaking in light of the regulatory impact analysis requirements of Texas Government Code, §2001.0225, and determined that the rulemaking does not meet the definition of a major environmental rule as defined in that statute, and in addition, if it did meet the definition, would not be subject to the requirement to prepare a regulatory impact analysis.

A major environmental rule means a rule, the specific intent of which is to protect the environment or reduce risks to human health from environmental exposure, and that may

adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, or the public health and safety of the state or a sector of the state. The specific intent of this proposed rulemaking, as discussed elsewhere in this preamble, is to implement HB 788 by amending §55.201 to add an exemption from requests for contested case hearing for applications for PSD GHG permits.

Additionally, even if the rule met the definition of a major environmental rule, the rulemaking does not meet any of the four applicability criteria for requiring a regulatory impact analysis for a major environmental rule, which are listed in Texas Government Code, §2001.0225(a). Texas Government Code, §2001.0225, applies only to a major environmental rule, the result of which is to: 1) exceed a standard set by federal law, unless the rule is specifically required by state law; 2) exceed an express requirement of state law, unless the rule is specifically required by federal law; 3) exceed a requirement of a delegation agreement or contract between the state and an agency or representative of the federal government to implement a state and federal program; or 4) adopt a rule solely under the general powers of the agency instead of under a specific state law.

The proposed amendment was not developed solely under the general powers of the agency, but is authorized by specific sections of THSC, Chapter 382 (also known as the TCAA), and the Texas Water Code, which are cited in the Statutory Authority section of this preamble, and is specifically required by state law. The specific intent of this proposed

rulemaking, as discussed elsewhere in this preamble, is to implement HB 788 by amending §55.201 to add an exemption from requests for contested case hearing for applications for PSD GHG permits. Further, the proposed amendment does not exceed a standard set by federal law or exceed a requirement of a delegation agreement or contract between the state and an agency or representative of the federal government to implement a state and federal program. Therefore, this proposed rulemaking is not subject to the regulatory analysis provisions of Texas Government Code, §2001.0225(b).

Written comments on the draft regulatory impact analysis determination may be submitted to the contact person at the address listed under the Submittal of Comments section of this preamble.

Takings Impact Assessment

Under Texas Government Code, §2007.002(5), taking means a governmental action that affects private real property, in whole or in part or temporarily or permanently, in a manner that requires the governmental entity to compensate the private real property owner as provided by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution or Texas Constitution §17 or §19, Article I; or a governmental action that affects an owner's private real property that is the subject of the governmental action, in whole or in part or temporarily or permanently, in a manner that restricts or limits the owner's right to the property that would otherwise exist in the absence of the governmental

action; and is the producing cause of a reduction of at least 25% in the market value of the affected private real property, determined by comparing the market value of the property as if the governmental action is not in effect and the market value of the property determined as if the governmental action is in effect.

The commission completed a takings impact analysis for the proposed rulemaking under Texas Government Code, §2007.043. The primary purpose of this proposed rulemaking, as discussed elsewhere in this preamble, is to implement HB 788 by amending the rule to add an exemption from requests for contested case hearing for applications for PSD GHG permits.

The proposed rule will not create any additional burden on private real property. The proposed rule will not affect private real property in a manner that would require compensation to private real property owners under the United States Constitution or the Texas Constitution. The proposal also will not affect private real property in a manner that restricts or limits an owner's right to the property that would otherwise exist in the absence of the governmental action. Therefore, the proposed rulemaking will not cause a taking under Texas Government Code, Chapter 2007.

Consistency with the Coastal Management Program

The commission determined that this rulemaking relates to an action or actions subject to

the Texas Coastal Management Program (CMP) in accordance with the Coastal Coordination Act of 1991, as amended (Texas Natural Resources Code, §§33.201 *et seq.*) and the commission rules in 30 TAC Chapter 281, Subchapter B, concerning Consistency with the CMP. As required by §281.45(a)(3) and 31 TAC §505.11(b)(2), relating to Actions and Rules Subject to the Coastal Management Program, commission rules governing air pollutant emissions must be consistent with the applicable goals and policies of the CMP. The commission reviewed this rulemaking for consistency with the CMP goals and policies in accordance with the rules of the Coastal Coordination Advisory Committee and determined that the rulemaking is consistent with the applicable CMP goals and policies. The commission reviewed this rulemaking for consistency with the CMP goals and policies in accordance with the rules of the Coastal Coordination Advisory Committee and determined that the rulemaking is consistent with the applicable CMP goals and policies. The CMP goal applicable to this rulemaking is the goal to protect, preserve, and enhance the diversity, quality, quantity, functions, and values of coastal natural resource areas (31 TAC §501.12(l)). The proposed rule updates a procedural requirement that governs the submittal of air quality PSD GHG permit applications. The CMP policy applicable to this rulemaking is the policy that commission rules comply with federal regulations in 40 Code of Federal Regulations to protect and enhance air quality in the coastal areas (31 TAC §501.14(q)). Therefore, in accordance with 31 TAC §505.22(e), the commission affirms that this rulemaking is consistent with CMP goals and policies.

Written comments on the consistency of this rulemaking may be submitted to the contact person at the address listed under the Submittal of Comments section of this preamble.

Effect on Sites Subject to the Federal Operating Permits Program

The proposed rule, if adopted, will not require any changes to outstanding federal operating permits.

Announcement of Hearing

The commission will hold a public hearing on this proposal in Austin on December 5, 2013, at 2:00 p.m. in Building E, Room 201S, at the commission's central office located at 12100 Park 35 Circle. The hearing is structured for the receipt of oral or written comments by interested persons. Individuals may present oral statements when called upon in order of registration. Open discussion will not be permitted during the hearing; however, commission staff members will be available to discuss the proposal 30 minutes prior to the hearing.

Persons who have special communication or other accommodation needs who are planning to attend the hearing should contact Sandy Wong, Office of Legal Services at (512) 239-1802. Requests should be made as far in advance as possible.

Submittal of Comments

Written comments may be submitted to Charlotte Horn, MC 205, Office of Legal Services, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, P.O. Box 13087, Austin, Texas 78711-3087, or faxed to (512) 239-4808. Electronic comments may be submitted at:

<http://www5.tceq.texas.gov/rules/ecomments/>. File size restrictions may apply to

comments being submitted via the eComments system. All comments should reference

Rule Project Number 2013-040-116-AI. The comment period closes December 9, 2013.

Copies of the proposed rulemaking can be obtained from the commission's Web site at

http://www.tceq.texas.gov/nav/rules/propose_adopt.html. For further information,

please contact Tasha Burns, Operational Support, Air Permits Division at (512) 239-5868.

**SUBCHAPTER F: REQUESTS FOR RECONSIDERATION OR CONTESTED
CASE HEARING**

§55.201

Statutory Authority

The amendment is proposed under Texas Water Code (TWC), §5.102, concerning General Powers, which provides the commission with the general powers to carry out its duties under the TWC; TWC, §5.103, concerning Rules, which authorizes the commission to adopt rules necessary to carry out its powers and duties under the TWC; and TWC, §5.105, concerning General Policy, which authorizes the commission by rule to establish and approve all general policy of the commission. The amendment is also proposed under Texas Health and Safety Code (THSC), §382.017, concerning Rules, which authorizes the commission to adopt rules consistent with the policy and purposes of the Texas Clean Air Act; THSC, §382.002, concerning Policy and Purpose, which establishes the commission's purpose to safeguard the state's air resources, consistent with the protection of public health, general welfare, and physical property; THSC, §382.011, concerning General Powers and Duties, which authorizes the commission to control the quality of the state's air; THSC, §382.012, concerning State Air Control Plan, which authorizes the commission to prepare and develop a general, comprehensive plan for the proper control of the state's air; THSC, §382.051, concerning Permitting Authority of Commission; Rules, which authorizes the commission to issue permits for construction of new facilities or

modifications to existing facilities that may emit air contaminants; THSC, §382.05102, which relates to the permitting authority of the commission for greenhouse gas emissions THSC, §382.0515, concerning Application for Permit, which specifies permit application requirements; THSC, §382.0518, concerning Preconstruction Permit, which authorizes the commission to issue preconstruction permits; and THSC, §382.056, concerning Notice of Intent to Obtain Permit or Permit Review; Hearing, which requires an applicant for a permit issued under THSC, §382.0518 to publish notice of intent to obtain a permit . Additional relevant sections are Texas Government Code, §2001.004, which requires state agencies to adopt procedural rules; Texas Government Code, §2001.006, which authorizes state agencies to adopt rules or take other administrative action that the agency deems necessary to implement legislation; and Texas Government Code, §2001.142, which provides a time period for presumed notification by a state agency. The amendment is also proposed under Federal Clean Air Act, 42 United States Code, §§7401, *et seq.*, which requires states to submit state implementation plan revisions that specify the manner in which the national ambient air quality standards will be achieved and maintained within each air quality control region of the state.

The proposed amendment implements House Bill 788 (83rd Legislature, 2013), THSC, §§382.002, 382.011, 382.012, 382.017, 382.051, 382.05102, 382.0515, 382.0518, and 382.056; and Texas Government Code, §2001.004 and §2001.006.

§55.201. Requests for Reconsideration or Contested Case Hearing.

(a) A request for reconsideration or contested case hearing must be filed no later than 30 days after the chief clerk mails (or otherwise transmits) the executive director's decision and response to comments and provides instructions for requesting that the commission reconsider the executive director's decision or hold a contested case hearing.

(b) The following may request a contested case hearing under this chapter:

(1) the commission;

(2) the executive director;

(3) the applicant; and

(4) affected persons, when authorized by law.

(c) A request for a contested case hearing by an affected person must be in writing, must be filed with the chief clerk within the time provided by subsection (a) of this section, and may not be based on an issue that was raised solely in a public comment withdrawn by

the commenter in writing by filing a withdrawal letter with the chief clerk prior to the filing of the Executive Director's Response to Comment.

(d) A hearing request must substantially comply with the following:

(1) give the name, address, daytime telephone number, and, where possible, fax number of the person who files the request. If the request is made by a group or association, the request must identify one person by name, address, daytime telephone number, and, where possible, fax number, who shall be responsible for receiving all official communications and documents for the group;

(2) identify the person's personal justiciable interest affected by the application, including a brief, but specific, written statement explaining in plain language the requestor's location and distance relative to the proposed facility or activity that is the subject of the application and how and why the requestor believes he or she will be adversely affected by the proposed facility or activity in a manner not common to members of the general public;

(3) request a contested case hearing;

(4) list all relevant and material disputed issues of fact that were raised during the public comment period and that are the basis of the hearing request. To facilitate the commission's determination of the number and scope of issues to be referred to hearing, the requestor should, to the extent possible, specify any of the executive director's responses to comments that the requestor disputes and the factual basis of the dispute and list any disputed issues of law or policy; and

(5) provide any other information specified in the public notice of application.

(e) Any person, other than a state agency that is prohibited by law from contesting the issuance of a permit or license as set forth in §55.103 of this title [chapter] (relating to Definitions), may file a request for reconsideration of the executive director's decision. The request must be in writing and be filed by United States mail, facsimile, or hand delivery with the chief clerk within the time provided by subsection (a) of this section. The request should also contain the name, address, daytime telephone number, and, where possible, fax number of the person who files the request. The request for reconsideration must expressly state that the person is requesting reconsideration of the executive director's decision, and give reasons why the decision should be reconsidered.

(f) Documents that are filed with the chief clerk before the public comment deadline that comment on an application but do not request reconsideration or a contested case hearing shall be treated as public comment.

(g) Procedures for late filed public comments, requests for reconsideration, or contested case hearing are as follows.

(1) A request for reconsideration or contested case hearing, or public comment shall be processed under §55.209 of this title (relating to Processing Requests for Reconsideration and Contested Case Hearing) or under §55.156 of this title (relating to Public Comment Processing), respectively, if it is filed by the deadline. The chief clerk shall accept a request for reconsideration or contested case hearing, or public comment that is filed after the deadline but the chief clerk shall not process it. The chief clerk shall place the late documents in the application file.

(2) The commission may extend the time allowed to file a request for reconsideration, or a request for a contested case hearing.

(h) Any person, except the applicant, the executive director, the public interest counsel, and a state agency that is prohibited by law from contesting the issuance of a permit or license as set forth in §55.103 of this title [chapter], who was provided notice as

required under Chapter 39 of this title (relating to Public Notice) but who failed to file timely public comment, failed to file a timely hearing request, failed to participate in the public meeting held under §55.154 of this title (relating to Public Meetings), and failed to participate in the contested case hearing under Chapter 80 of this title (relating to Contested Case Hearings) may file a motion for rehearing under §50.119 of this title (relating to Notice of Commission Action, Motion for Rehearing), or §80.272 of this title (relating to Motion for Rehearing) or may file a motion to overturn the executive director's decision under §50.139 of this title (relating to Motion to Overturn Executive Director's Decision) only to the extent of the changes from the draft permit to the final permit decision.

(i) Applications for which there is no right to a contested case hearing include:

(1) a minor amendment or minor modification of a permit under Chapter 305, Subchapter D of this title (relating to Amendments, Renewals, Transfers, Corrections, Revocation, and Suspension of Permits);

(2) a Class 1 or Class 2 modification of a permit under Chapter 305, Subchapter D of this title;

(3) any air permit application for the following:

(A) initial issuance of a voluntary emission reduction permit or an electric generating facility permit;

(B) permits issued under Chapter 122 of this title (relating to Federal Operating Permits Program); [or]

(C) a permit issued under Chapter 116, Subchapter B, Division 6 of this title (relating to Prevention of Significant Deterioration Review) that would authorize only emissions of greenhouse gases as defined in §101.1 of this title (relating to Definitions); or

(D) (C)] amendment, modification, or renewal of an air application that would not result in an increase in allowable emissions and would not result in the emission of an air contaminant not previously emitted. The commission may hold a contested case hearing if the application involves a facility for which the applicant's compliance history contains violations that are unresolved and that constitute a recurring pattern of egregious conduct that demonstrates a consistent disregard for the regulatory process, including the failure to make a timely and substantial attempt to correct the violations;

(4) hazardous waste permit renewals under §305.65(a)(8) of this title
(relating to Renewal);

(5) an application, under Texas Water Code, Chapter 26, to renew or amend a
permit if:

(A) the applicant is not applying to:

(i) increase significantly the quantity of waste authorized to be
discharged; or

(ii) change materially the pattern or place of discharge;

(B) the activity to be authorized by the renewal or amended permit will
maintain or improve the quality of waste authorized to be discharged;

(C) any required opportunity for public meeting has been given;

(D) consultation and response to all timely received and significant
public comment has been given; and

(E) the applicant's compliance history for the previous five years raises no issues regarding the applicant's ability to comply with a material term of the permit;

(6) an application for a Class I injection well permit used only for the disposal of nonhazardous brine produced by a desalination operation or nonhazardous drinking water treatment residuals under Texas Water Code, §27.021, concerning Permit for Disposal of Brine From Desalination Operations or of Drinking Water Treatment Residuals in Class I Injection Wells;

(7) the issuance, amendment, renewal, suspension, revocation, or cancellation of a general permit, or the authorization for the use of an injection well under a general permit under Texas Water Code, §27.023, concerning General Permit Authorizing Use of Class I Injection Well to Inject Nonhazardous Brine from Desalination Operations or Nonhazardous Drinking Water Treatment Residuals;

(8) an application for a pre-injection unit registration under §331.17 of this title (relating to Pre-Injection Units Registration);

(9) an application for a permit, registration, license, or other type of authorization required to construct, operate, or authorize a component of the FutureGen

project as defined in §91.30 of this title (relating to Definitions), if the application was submitted on or before January 1, 2018;

(10) other types of applications where a contested case hearing request has been filed, but no opportunity for hearing is provided by law; and

(11) an application for a production area authorization that is submitted after September 1, 2007, unless the application for the production area authorization seeks:

(A) an amendment to a restoration table value in accordance with the requirements of §331.107(g) of this title (relating to Restoration);

(B) the initial establishment of monitoring wells for any area covered by the authorization, including the location, number, depth, spacing, and design of the monitoring wells, unless the executive director uses the recommendations of an independent third-party expert as provided in §331.108 of this title (relating to Independent Third-Party Experts); or

(C) an amendment to the type or amount of financial assurance required for aquifer restoration, or by Texas Water Code, §27.073, to assure that there are sufficient funds available to the state to utilize a third-party contractor for aquifer

restoration or plugging of abandoned wells in the area. Adjustments solely associated with the annual inflation rate adjustment required under §37.131 of this title (relating to Annual Inflation Adjustments to Closure Cost Estimates), or for adjustments due to decrease in the cost estimate for plugging and abandonment of wells when plugging and abandonment has been approved by the executive director in accordance with §331.144 of this title (relating to Approval of Plugging and Abandonment) are not considered an amendment to the type or amount of financial assurance required for aquifer restoration or well plugging and abandonment.