September 2, 2010

MR CARL E EDLUND PE
DIRECTOR MULTIMEDIA PLANNING AND PERMITTING DIVISION
US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 6
1445 ROSS AVE STE 1200
DALLAS TX 75202-5766

Re: Executive Director’s Response to EPA Objection

Minor Revision
Permit Number: 01555
Diamond Shamrock Refining Company, L.P.
Valero McKee Refinery
Sunray, Moore County
Regulated Entity Number: RN100210517
Customer Reference Number: CN600124861

Dear Mr. Edlund:

On June 4, 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6 Office signed a letter identifying objections to the issuance of the proposed federal operating permit for the above referenced site. In accordance with Title 30 Texas Administrative Code § 122.350 (30 TAC § 122.350), the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) may not issue the permit until the objections are resolved. In addition, the letter identifies certain additional concerns. The TCEQ understands that the additional concerns are provided for information only, and do not need to be resolved in order to issue the permit.

The TCEQ has completed the technical review of your objections and offers the enclosed responses to facilitate resolution of the objections. In addition, the attached responses to the objections describe the changes, if applicable, that have been made to the revised proposed permit and supporting statement of basis (SOB). The revised proposed permit and SOB are attached for your review.
Consistent with 30 TAC §122.350, please provide an indication of your acceptance or assessment of the responses and resolutions to the objections as soon as possible. After receipt of your acceptance to the responses and resolutions to the objections, TCEQ will issue the proposed permit. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. Please contact Ms. Angie Eastman at (512) 239-5945 if you have any questions concerning this matter.

Sincerely,

Steve Hagle, P.E., Director
Air Permits Division
Office of Permitting and Registration
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

SH/AE/aw

cc: Mr. Kevin Jeanes, Environmental Engineer, Diamond Shamrock Refining Company, L.P., Sunray
Mr. John Deemer, Environmental Manager, Diamond Shamrock Refining Company, L.P., Sunray
Ms. Nancy White, P.E., Senior Environmental Specialist, Sage Environmental Consulting, L.P., Austin
Air Section Manager, Region 1 - Amarillo

Enclosures: TCEQ Executive Director’s Response to EPA Objection
Proposed Permit
Statement of Basis

Project Number: 14428
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO EPA OBJECTION

Permit Number O1555

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Executive Director provides this Response to EPA's Objection to the minor revision of the Federal Operating Permit (FOP) for Diamond Shamrock Refining Company, L.P., Valero McKee Refinery, Permit No. O1555, Moore County, Texas.

BACKGROUND

Procedural Background

The Texas Operating Permit Program requires that owners and operators of sites subject to 30 Tex. Admin. Code (TAC) Chapter 122 obtain a FOP that contains all applicable requirements to facilitate compliance and improve enforcement. The FOP does not authorize construction or modifications to facilities, and it does not authorize emission increases. To construct or modify a facility, the responsible party must have the appropriate new source review authorization. If the site is subject to 30 TAC Chapter 122, the owner or operator must submit a timely FOP application for the site and ultimately must obtain the FOP to operate. Diamond Shamrock Refining Company, L.P., applied to the TCEQ for a minor revision of the FOP for the Valero McKee Refinery located in Sunray, Moore County on November 16, 2009. The public comment period started on April 20, 2010 and ended on May 20, 2010. During the concurrent EPA review period, TCEQ received an objection to the permit from EPA on June 4, 2010.

In accordance with state and federal rules, the permit minor revision may not be issued until TCEQ resolves EPA's objections.

Description of Site

Diamond Shamrock Refining Company, L.P. owns and operates the Valero McKee Refinery, located at Approximately 15 miles Northeast of Dumas, Texas in Sunray, Moore Texas 79086. The Valero McKee Refinery processes crude oil to produce typical petroleum refinery products such as blended gasoline, diesel, kerosene, jet fuels, asphalt, etc. The Valero McKee Refinery Title V Permit No. O1555 contains requirements for all of the production units sources associated with processing crude oil to produce typical petroleum refinery products.

The following responses follow the references used in EPA’s objection letter.

EPA OBJECTION: Objection to the Incorporation of Flexible Permit into the Title V permit. The New Source Review (NSR) Authorization References table in the draft Title V permit incorporates by reference Flexible Permit No. 9708, issued on October 1, 2004, with two amendments and two revisions pending. Flexible permits are issued pursuant to 30 TAC Chapter 116, Subchapter G; however, those provisions have not been approved, pursuant to Section 110 of the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), 40 U.S.C. §7410, as a part of the applicable implementation plan for the State of Texas (Texas SIP). Therefore, pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(1), EPA must object to the issuance of this Title V permit because the terms and
conditions of the incorporated flexible permit cannot be determined to be in compliance with the applicable requirements of the Texas SIP. The failure to have submitted information necessary to make this determination constitutes an additional basis for this objection, pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(ii). In order to respond to this objection, additional information must be provided by the applicant showing how the emissions authorized by the flexible permit meet the air permitting requirements of the federally-approved provisions of the Texas SIP. Furthermore, the Title V permit must include an additional condition specifically requiring the source to prepare and submit to TCEQ a written analysis of any future change/modification to ensure that minor and/or major new source review requirements under the federally-approved Texas SIP have not been triggered. Finally, the terms and conditions of flexible permits based upon the requirements of 30 TAC Chapter 116, Subchapter F must be identified as State-only terms and conditions, pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.6(b)(2).

TCEQ RESPONSE: As a preliminary matter, the ED believes that resolution of EPA concerns regarding flexible permits is a common objective for both TCEQ and the EPA. The concerns discussed below regarding the use of the Title V permitting process to challenge independent flexible permits on a case-by-case basis does not diminish the importance of reaching an expeditious resolution to the NSR flexible permit issue. The ED recognizes the flexible permit rules, located in 30 TAC Chapter 116, Subchapter G, and submitted to EPA in 1994, have been disapproved, effective August 16, 2010. However, the Texas federal operating permit (FOP) program is EPA-approved. TCEQ reviews applications and issues FOPs according to EPA-approved program rules found in 30 Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Chapter 122. The Texas Operating Permit Program was granted full approval on December 6, 2001 (66 FR 63318), and subsequent rule changes were approved on March 30, 2005 (70 FR 16163). The application procedures, found in 30 TAC § 122.132(a) require an applicant to provide any information required by the ED to determine applicability of, or to codify any “applicable requirement.” In order for the ED to issue an FOP, the permit must contain all applicable requirements for each emission unit (30 TAC § 122.142). “Applicable requirement” is specifically defined in 30 TAC § 122.10(2)(h) to include all requirements of 30 TAC Chapter 116 and any term and condition of any preconstruction permit. As a Chapter 116 preconstruction authorization, flexible permits are applicable requirements, and shall be included in applications and Texas issued FOPs, in compliance with Texas’s approved program. According to the EPA review procedures of Chapter 122, EPA may only object to issuance of any proposed permit which is not in compliance with the applicable requirements or requirements of this chapter. Therefore, this objection is not valid under the program EPA has approved in Texas because the applicant provided information as to the applicable Chapter 116 requirements, including flexible permits, and the ED has included these requirements in the draft FOP. EPA objections to individual permits issued under an EPA approved operating permit program are not appropriate for concerns that relate to programmatic elements.

The ED disagrees with the allegation that the failure of the applicant to have submitted information necessary to make a determination of whether they were in compliance with the SIP constitutes an additional basis for this objection, pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(3)(ii).
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Section 70.8(c)(3)(ii) is premised on the permitting authority not “submitting any information necessary [for EPA] to review adequately the proposed permit.” The ED has provided all information requested by EPA, when asked, including NSR permits and other supporting information. The flexible permit applications, technical reviews, and flexible permits clearly do not allow sources to utilize the flexible permit authorization mechanism to circumvent major NSR permitting requirements. Specifically, 30 TAC Chapter 116 requires that all new major sources or major modifications be authorized through nonattainment or PSD permitting under Subchapter B, Divisions 5 and 6.

The ED also disagrees that additional information must be provided by the applicant showing how the emissions authorized by the flexible permit meet the air permitting requirements of the federally-approved provisions of the Texas SIP. The flexible permit application, technical review, and flexible permit documentation demonstrates that the emissions authorized by the flexible permits meet the air permitting requirements of the federally approved provisions of the SIP regarding requirements for impacts review, emission measurement, BACT, NSPS, NESHAP, MACT, performance demonstration, modeling or ambient monitoring if required, MECT applicability, and nonattainment or PSD permitting if applicable. Texas submitted the initial flexible permit rule for EPA review and action in 1994. EPA’s delay in acting on the flexible permit rules, the approval of the state’s federal operating permit program and confusion regarding whether the approved federal operating permit program provided federal enforceability for flexible permits, resulted in a very long period of detrimental reliance on this permit mechanism by regulated entities and TCEQ.

Notwithstanding the pending final disapproval of the flexible permit rules in 30 TAC Chapter 116, Subchapter G, the flexible permit review requirements are parallel to the SIP-approved 30 TAC Chapter 116, Subchapter B permit review and no substantive differences in significant permit elements exist. Indeed, the technical review of the flexible permit No. 49131 application provides information regarding how Subchapter B requirements in § 116.111 are met, including: compliance with the SIP approved Subchapter B rules and review requirements, unit-specific limits based on BACT review at the time of the permit issuance, demonstrations that each emission unit and the facility covered by Permit Nos. 9708 and PSDTX861M2 meets all applicable NSPS, NESHAP requirements, and air dispersion modeling conducted by applicant. The flexible permit and technical review are enclosed with this response. Diamond Shamrock may separately submit to EPA additional information showing compliance with the Subchapter B requirements. Additionally, the ED does not agree that it is appropriate, necessary or legally required under either 40 CFR Part 70 or the EPA approved federal operating permit program in Texas to require a condition in the operating permit to require a source to prepare and submit a written analysis of any future change/modification to ensure that minor and/or major NSR requirements under the SIP have not been triggered. The federally approved SIP already requires this analysis as part of any future NSR review. See 30 TAC Chapter 116, Subchapter B, Divisions 5 and 6. Minor NSR applicability requirements are adequately specified in the permit and commission rules governing NSR permits; thus, the applicant is currently subject to the requirements to demonstrate, upon any future change, when minor or major NSR requirements will apply.
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However, the ED recognizes that some companies are in negotiations with EPA to include a special term and condition in the draft FOP requiring that they submit an application to reissue a permit, through the SIP-approved amendment, alteration, or renewal process, with a deadline for application submittal, and specific information to EPA and TCEQ for review prior to public notice. If Diamond Shamrock agrees to such a process, the TCEQ will work with Diamond Shamrock to change the draft permit appropriately.

Finally, the flexible permit terms and conditions are not appropriate to be identified as state-only in the FOP. The EPA approved definition of a “state-only requirement” in 30 TAC § 122.10(28) is “any requirement governing the emission of air pollutants from stationary sources that may be codified in the permit at the discretion of the ED. State-only requirements shall not include any requirement required under the Federal Clean Air Act or under any applicable requirement.” Therefore, the EPA approved program provides the ED with discretion to determine which requirements must be identified as “state-only” and explicitly prohibits anything defined as an “applicable requirement” from being “state-only.” Since flexible permits issued in 30 TAC Chapter 116 are “applicable requirements,” they may not be included as “state-only” requirements. Instead, they are applicable requirements which are subject to public notice, affected state review, notice and comment hearings, EPA review, public petition, recordkeeping requirements, compliance demonstration and certification requirements, and appropriate periodic or compliance assurance monitoring requirements. “State-only” requirements are specifically not required to meet requirements that are specific to 40 CFR Part 70. See 122.143(18). As stated previously, the flexible permit terms and conditions comply with SIP approved permit rules and assure compliance with future applicable NSR requirements. Again, with regard to flexible permits, the TCEQ will continue its dialogue with EPA to achieve the mutual goal of NSR permits issued under SIP approved rules.

EPA OBJECTION: Objection to the incorporation by reference of PSD Permit. The New Source Review Authorization References table of the draft Title V permit incorporates PSDTX861M1, issued on July 29, 2003, by reference. EPA has discussed the issue of incorporation by reference in White Paper Number 2 for Improved Implementation of the Part 70 Operating Permits Program (March 5, 1996)(White Paper 2). As EPA explained in White Paper 2, incorporation by reference may be useful in many instances, though it is important to exercise care to balance the use of incorporation by reference with the obligation to issue permits that are clear and meaningful to all affected parties, including those who must comply with or enforce their conditions. Id. at 34-38. See also In the Matter of Tesoro Refining and Marketing, Petition No. IX-2004-6 at 8 (March 15, 2005)(Tesoro Order). As EPA noted in the Tesoro Order, EPA’s expectations for what requirements may be referenced and for the necessary level of detail are guided by Sections 504(a) and (c) of the CAA and corresponding provisions at 40 CFR § 70.6(a)(1) and (3). Id. Generally, EPA expects that Title V permits will explicitly state all emission limitations and operational requirements for all applicable emission units at a facility. Id. We note that TCEQ’s use of incorporation by reference for emissions limitations from minor NSR permits and Permits by Rule is currently acceptable. See 88 Fed. Reg. 63318, 63324 (Dec. 6, 2001); see also, Public Citizen v. EPA, 343 F.3d 449, at 460-61 (5th Cir. 2003)
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(upholding EPA’s approval of TCEQ’s use of incorporation by reference for emissions limitations from minor NSR permits and Permits by Rule). In approving Texas’ limited use of incorporation by reference of emissions limitations from minor NSR permits and Permits by Rule, EPA balanced the streamlining benefits of incorporation by reference against the value of a more detailed Title V permit and found Texas’ approach for minor NSR permits and Permits by Rule acceptable. See Public Citizen, 343 F.3d at 460-461. EPA’s decision approving this use of IBP in Texas’ program was limited to, and specific to, minor NSR permits and Permits by Rule in Texas. EPA noted the unique challenge Texas faced in integrating requirements from these permits into Title V permits. See 66 Fed. Reg. at 63,326; 60 Fed. Reg. at 30,039; 59 Fed. Reg. 44572, 44574. EPA did not approve (and does not approve of) TCEQ’s use of incorporation by reference of emissions limitations for other requirements. See In the matter of Premcor Refining Group, Inc., Petition No. VI-2007-02 at 5 and In the Matter of CITGO Refining and Chemicals Co., Petition No. VI-2007-01 at 11. Pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(1), EPA objects to the issuance of the Title V permit because it incorporates by reference the major New Source Review permit PSDTX861M1 and fails to include emission limitations and standards as necessary to assure compliance with all applicable requirements. See 40 CFR§ 70.6(a)(1). In response to this objection, TCEQ must include the emission limitations and standards, including any operational requirements as specific provisions in the body of the Title V permit, or, alternatively, conditions may be added to the Title V permit that reference the specific permit condition(s) for each individual applicable emission limitation term and condition, for individual emission points, form PSD TX861M1 as necessary to ensure compliance with all applicable requirements contained therein and physically attach a copy of PSD-TX-861M1 to the Title V permit.

TCEQ RESPONSE: In response to EPA’s objection, the ED has revised permit No.01555 to include, in a new Appendix B of the permit, a copy of Permit Nos. 9708 and PSDTX861M2 and its/their corresponding terms and conditions, and emission limitations. With regard to IBR of major NSR, the ED respectfully disagrees with EPA’s interpretation of its approval of Texas’s operating permit program on this issue. The ED recognizes that respective agency staff are actively involved in continuing, extensive discussions on how to resolve this issue; namely, how much detail of the underlying major NSR authorization should be reiterated in the face of the Title V permit. The federally approved operating permit program for Texas has allowed for applicable requirements to be incorporated by reference into the FOP since 1996. See Final Interim Approval, 61 Fed. Reg. 32693, June 25, 1996; Final Full Approval, 66 Fed. Reg. 63318, December 6, 2001; and Final Approval of Resolution of Deficiency, 70 Fed. Reg. 16134, March 30, 2005. Title 30 TAC §122.142 states that the operating permit shall contain the specific regulatory citations in each applicable requirement identifying the emission limitations and standards. Additionally, EPA discussed the use of incorporation by reference in the preamble to the final Part 70 rule, discussing the requirements of § 70.6, Permit Content, stating:
Section 70.6(a)(1)(i) requires that the permit reference the authority for each term and condition of the permit. Including in the permit legal citations to provisions of the Act is critical in defining the scope of the permit shield, since the permit shield, if granted, extends to the provisions of the Act included in the permit. Including the legal citations in the permit will also ensure that the permittee, the permitting authority, EPA, and the public all have a common understanding of the applicable requirements included in the permit. *This requirement is satisfied by citation to the State regulations or statutes which make up the SIP or implement a delegated program. See 57 Fed. Reg. 32250, 32275 July 21, 1992, emphasis added.*

In comments on the proposed final interim approval of the operating permit program, in 1995, the commission (then-TNRCC) proposed to include a standardized permit provision that incorporated by reference all preconstruction authorizations, both major and minor, to resolve the EPA identified deficiency of Texas’ failure to include minor NSR as an applicable requirement. In the June 25, 1996 Final Interim Approval, EPA directed, “the State must be quite clear in any standardized permit provision that all of its *major ‘preconstruction authorizations* including permits, standard permits, flexible permit, special permits, or special exemptions’ are incorporated by reference into the operating permit as *if fully set forth therein and therefore enforceable under regulation XII (the Texas Operating Permit Regulation) as well as regulation VI (the Texas preconstruction permit regulation).” *(61 Fed. Reg. at 32695, emphasis added.)* Given this explicit direction in EPA’s 1996 final interim approval of the Texas program, TCEQ understood that the standardized permit provision for preconstruction authorizations incorporated all NSR authorizations by reference, including major NSR.

As a result of Texas’ initial exclusion of minor NSR as an applicable requirement of the Texas Operating Permit program, and EPA’s final interim approval of a program that provided for a phase-in of minor NSR requirements using incorporation by reference, EPA was sued by various environmental groups. *See Public Citizen, Inc. v. U.S. E.P.A., 343 F.3d 449 (5th Cir. 2003).* The petitioner’s brief raised several issues, including the use of incorporation by reference of minor NSR, because the exclusion of minor NSR as an applicable requirement was a program deficiency identified by EPA. The petitioner’s brief acknowledges that Texas’ Operating Permit program incorporates all preconstruction authorizations by reference, through use of a table entitled “Preconstruction Authorization References”. The Petitioner’s brief includes an example of this table, which clearly contains sections for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), nonattainment (NA), 30 TAC Chapter 116 Permits, Special Permits and Other Authorizations, and Permits by Rule under 30 TAC Chapter 106. *See Brief of Petitioners, p. 30.* The brief goes on to discuss the sample permit, Permit No. O-00108, which documents “six different minor NSR authorizations and one PSD permit” requiring one to look at each of the underlying permits in addition to the Title V permit. The Department of Justice (DOJ), in its reply brief for EPA, responded to this allegation of improper use of IBR in the context of the specific
allegation - whether “EPA reasonably determined that Texas corrected the interim deficiency related to minor new source review”, answering unequivocally “yes”. “Nothing in the statute or regulations prohibits incorporation of applicable requirements by reference. The Title V and Part 70 provisions addressing the content of Title V permits specify what Title V permits ‘shall include,’ but do not speak to how the enumerated items must be included.” See, Brief of Respondents, pp. 25-26. The Court did not distinguish between minor and major NSR when concluding that IBR is permissible under both the CAA and Part 70.

Thus, it is the ED’s position that incorporation by reference of both major and minor NSR permits is acceptable and was fully approved by EPA. However, given EPA’s differing opinion, as reflected in the Premcor and CITGO orders, this objection, and the June 10, 2010 letter from EPA Region VI regarding this issue, the ED has revised permit No. 01555 to include, in a new Appendix B of the permit, a copy of Permit Nos. 9708 and PSDTX861M2 and its/their corresponding terms and conditions, and emission limitations, which was initially suggested by EPA as adequate to resolve this objection. Inclusion of the major NSR permits as an appendix should address EPA’s objection and ensure that the Title V permit is clear and meaningful to all affected parties. The ED will continue efforts with EPA on how to resolve IBR of major NSR on a broader, programmatic basis.

**EPA OBJECTION: Objection to Special Condition 19 for Failing to Meet Compliance Certification Requirements.** Special Condition 19 of the draft Title V permit states that the permit holder shall certify compliance with all terms and conditions. The compliance certification requirements for Title V permits are stated in 40 CFR § 70.6(c)(5) and incorporated at 30 TAC 122.146. Pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(1), EPA objects to the issuance of the Title V permit because Special Condition 19 of the draft Title V permit conflicts with the general terms and conditions reference to 30 TAC § 122.146. In response to this objection, TCEQ must amend Special Condition 19 to include all the requirements for compliance certifications, as set forth in 30 TAC § 122.146 including the identification of the methods or other means for determining the compliance status with each term and condition of the permit.

**TCEQ RESPONSE:** The ED does not agree that Special Condition 19 of the draft permit needs to be revised. Special Condition 19 of the draft permit is in compliance with the specific requirements of the EPA approved Federal Operating Permit program, as found in 30 TAC Chapter 122. Specifically, § 122.146(5), requires the annual compliance certification to include or reference the specified elements, including: the identification of each term or condition of the permit for which the permit holder is certifying compliance, the method used for determining the compliance status of each emission unit, and whether such method provides continuous or intermittent data; for emission units addressed in the permit for which no deviations have occurred over the certification period, a statement that the emission units were in continuous compliance over the certification period; for any emission unit addressed in the permit for which one or more deviations occurred over the certification period, specific information indicating the potentially intermittent compliance status of the emission unit; and the identification of all other terms and conditions of the permit for which compliance was not achieved. All permit holders
are required to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 122.146, as well as all other rules and requirements of the commission.

In addition, in 2006, EPA's Title V Task Force endorsed the 'short-form' approach used by TCEQ, as an option for compliance certification. (See Title V Task Force, Final Report to the Clean Air Act Advisory Committee, page 108 (April 2006)).

However, in order to help clarify any confusion, the term has been revised to read as follows:

The permit holder shall certify compliance in accordance with 30 TAC § 122.146. The permit holder shall comply with 30 TAC § 122.146 using at a minimum, but not limited to, the continuous or intermittent compliance method data from monitoring, recordkeeping, reporting, or testing required by the permit and any other credible evidence or information. The certification period may not exceed 12 months and the certification must be submitted within 30 days after the end of the period being certified.

**EPA OBJECTION: Objection to Special Permit Condition 3.** Under the *Special Terms and Conditions* provisions of the draft Title V permit, Condition 3 requires stationary vents with certain flow rates comply with identified provisions of 30 TAC Chapter 111 of the Texas SIP. However, there is no identification of the specific stationary vents that are subject to these requirements. As such, this condition fails to meet the requirement of 40 CFR § 70.6(a)(1), in that the condition lacks the specificity to ensure the compliance with the applicable requirements associated with those unidentified emission units. In addition, the Statement of Basis document for the draft Title V permit does not provide the legal and factual basis for Condition 3, as required by 40 CFR § 70.7(a)(5). Pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(1), EPA objects to the issuance of the Title V permit since Conditions 3 is not in compliance with the requirements of 40 CFR § 70.6(a)(1) and 70.7(a)(5). In response to this objection, TCEQ must revise Condition 3 of the draft Title V permit to list the specific stationary vents that are subject to the specified requirements of 30 TAC Chapter 111 and provide an explanation in the Statement of Basis for the legal and factual basis for Condition 3.

**TCEQ RESPONSE:** The EPA has previously supported the practice of not listing emission units in the permit that only have site-wide or “generic” requirements. See *White Paper for Streamlined Development of Part 70 Permit Applications*, July 10, 1995. The ED documented in the draft FOP that the Chapter 111 visible emission requirements for stationary vents were site-wide requirements - applying uniformly to the units or activities at the site. Because the applicant indicated in its application that only the Chapter 111 site-wide requirements apply to these stationary vents and other sources, the applicant is not required to list these smaller units individually in the unit summary, and therefore, these emission units did not appear in the applicable requirements summary table in the draft FOP.
With regard to stationary vents, there are three basic opacity requirements in 30 TAC § 111.111 that may apply, depending upon specific applicability criteria. Stationary vents constructed on or before January 31, 1972 must meet the requirements of 30 TAC § 111.111(a)(1)(A), which states that opacity shall not exceed 30% averaged over a six-minute period. Stationary vents constructed after January 31, 1972 must meet the requirements of 30 TAC § 111.111(a)(1)(B), which states that opacity shall not exceed 20% averaged over a six-minute period. Lastly, stationary vents where a total flow rate is greater than or equal to 100,000 actual cubic feet per minute (acfm) may not exceed 15% opacity averaged over a six minute period, unless that source has an installed optical instrument capable of measuring opacity that meets specified requirements, specified in 30 TAC § 111.111(a)(1)(C). Subsection 111.111(b) merely states that any of the emission units subject to section 111.111 (for this permit area, this would include all stationary vents and gas flares) shall not include contributions from uncombined water in determining compliance with this section.

However, the ED does agree that the FOP could be revised to more clearly group stationary vents according to which opacity limit applies. The site has vents that are subject to the 30% opacity requirement of 30 TAC § 111.111(a)(1)(A) and are identified by emission point identification number (EPN) in the Applicable Summary table. All other vents at the site are subject to 20% opacity, as noted in the revised Special Condition 3, which is a site-wide term and condition, as allowed in the White Paper for Streamlined Development of Part 70 Permit Applications, July 10, 1995.

A determination of the legal and factual basis for Condition 3 was added to the Statement of Basis document for the draft Title V permit and is enclosed.

**EPA OBJECTION: Objection to the Adequacy of the Compliance Schedule in the Title V permit.** On November 2, 2005, a Consent Decree was entered in federal court resolving alleged violations of the federal Clean Air Act at several of Valero and Tesoro refineries, including the Diamond Shamrock Valero McKee Refinery. See United States v. Valero Refining Company at al, and Tesoro Refining and marketing Corporation, SA-05-CA-0569. The Consent Decree requires Valero to effect changes to its operations in accordance with an agreed upon schedule and to incorporate those changes into federally enforceable new source review permits(s) and then to seek revisions to its Title V permits(s) to incorporate the amended new source review permit(s). In addition, since the changes extend into the future, the CAA-related requirements of the Consent Decree must be included in the Title V permit and reflected in the Title V permit’s Compliance Schedule. See In the Matter of CITGO Refining and Chemicals Co., Petition VI-2007-01 at 12-14. 40 CFR § 70.6(c)(3) requires Title V permits to contain “[a] schedule of compliance consistent with § 70.5(c)(8).” In turn, 40 CFR 70.5(c)(8) requires, among other things, that compliance schedules “shall resemble and be at least as stringent as that contained in any judicial consent decree or administrative order to which the source is subject.” 40 CFR § 70.5(c)(8)(iii)(C). The Compliance Schedule in the draft Title V permit is deficient because it fails to reference all of the CAA-related requirements of the Consent Decree for actions and dates that extend into the future and it fails to include provisions that ensure that
changes required by the Consent Decree will be incorporated into federally enforceable new source review permit(s), as required by Paragraphs 291 and 292 of the Consent Decree. Pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(1), EPA must object to the issuance of this permit because the compliance schedule in the Title V permit fails to meet the requirements of 40 CFR § 70.6(c)(3) and 40 CFR § 70.5(c)(8). In response to this objection, TCEQ must revise the Title V permit to include a compliance schedule that meets the requirements of the 40 CFR § 70.6(c)(3) and 40 CFR § 70.5(c)(8).

TCEQ RESPONSE: The ED respectfully disagrees with the EPA’s interpretation of the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA), Title V, and the implementing regulation, 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 70 regarding this issue. Neither Title V of the FCAA or the implementing regulation, 40 CFR Part 70, include as part of the definition of “applicable requirement” consent decrees or other enforcement mechanisms such as Agreed Orders. As a result, the EPA approved operating permits program in Texas does not specify that consent decrees or other enforcement mechanisms are “applicable requirements.” Instead, as required in 40 CFR § 70.6(c), a schedule of compliance consistent with the requirements of 40 CFR § 70.5(c)(8) is required to be included in the permit when sources are not in compliance. For each applicable requirement, the schedule must “resemble and be at least as stringent as that contained in any judicial consent decree or administrative order to which the source is subject.” Since consent decrees are not “applicable requirements” under 30 TAC Chapter 122 or 40 C.F.R. Part 70, there is no requirement to include consent decree obligations in the Federal Operating Permit. Additionally, where a company did not admit to noncompliance in a consent decree, there is no determination that noncompliance existed upon which to require a “schedule of compliance” under either 30 TAC Chapter 122 or 40 CFR §§ 70.5(c)(8) or 70.6(c).

The specific consent decree that applies to Valero Refining, contains specific provisions regarding the incorporation of consent decree requirements into federally enforceable permits, including Title V Permits. Section XIV of the consent decree, pages 137-141 of the consent decree specifically notes that Valero Refining agreed to incorporate the emission limits and standards required by the Consent Decree (both those effective as of the date of entry of the decree and those effective established by the consent decree after entry of the decree) into federally enforceable air permits other than Title V permits, and then to file any applications necessary to incorporate the requirements of those permits into the Title V permits of the covered refineries (emphasis added). Section 293, Mechanism for Title V Incorporation, specifically requires that the incorporation of the consent decree requirements shall be in accordance with state Title V rules, including applicable administrative amendment provisions of such rules (emphasis added). The consent decree also specifically notes on page 2 of the decree that Valero Refining denies that it has violated and/or continues to violate the alleged statutory, regulatory, SIP provisions and other state and local rules, regulations and permits incorporating and implementing the noted federal requirements at issue in the consent decree. Therefore, by its own terms the consent decree does not establish that Valero Refining was or is out of compliance with respect to the noted requirements.
Since 30 TAC Chapter 122 does not include consent decree obligations as an “applicable requirement”, those obligations are not required to be included as such in Federal Operating Permits issued under the federally approved Texas program. Instead, the TCEQ has required that companies either incorporate their consent decrees by reference in their federal operating permit, or note outstanding consent decree obligations in either schedules of compliance (where a company admits that they have a noncompliance issue) or in a consent decree schedule similar to a compliance schedule. The Draft Permit has been modified to include a consent decree schedule.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS: TCEQ acknowledges the additional concerns EPA has with the Valero McKee Refinery FOP and will address these issues as appropriate.