Worksheet for Technical Review of Working Draft of Proposed Permit

Company Name:	**Minor Source Air General Permit**	**AI #: 158873**		**TEMPO Activity No:**	**PER20080001**
Facility Name:	**Crude Oil and Natural Gas Production**	**Remarks Submitted by:**	**See below.**		
Permit Writer:	**Bryan D. Johnston**	**Permit Writer Email address:**	**bryan.johnston@la.gov**		

Instructions

Permit Reference – Indicate specific portion(s) of the permit to which the remark relates (i.e. "Specific Condition 120", or "Section II Air Permit Briefing Sheet", etc.).

Remarks – Explain the basis for each remark. Provide regulatory citations where possible. If the remark is made due to an error or omission in the permit application this must be noted and the revised information ***must be submitted.*** Revised information may be submitted separately from this worksheet. Please be aware that revised information must be submitted in writing and certified by the Responsible Official, and if necessary, by a Professional Engineer licensed in Louisiana. *Please Note:* New or additional equipment, processes or operating conditions not addressed in the original permit application will be addressed on a case-by-case basis. The Department reserves the right to address such changes in a separate permit action.

DEQ Response – ***DO NOT COMPLETE THIS SECTION.*** This section will be completed by Air Permits Division of DEQ, included in the proposed permit package and made available for public review during the public comment period.

- Additional rows may be added as necessary.
- Completed Form shall be emailed to the Permit writer in MS Word compatible format within the deadline specified in the email notification.

Comment Number	Permit Reference	Remark Submitted by:	Remarks	Air Permits Division Response (for official use only)
1	Cover Letter	Richard Metcalf	The term of the permit should be clarified to indicate that the ten (10) year authorization period apply to each facility authorized under the General Permit. This can be accomplished with a permit shield in the event of a delay in re-authorization of a new general permit. The cover should also note the permit may be extended by the Department beyond 10 years.	It is the permit itself that will have a life of 10 years. Regarding the possibility of extending the life of the permit beyond 10 years, R.S. 30:2023(A) states: All permits, registrations, variances, and licenses granted for any activity covered by this Chapter shall have, as a matter of law, a term of not more than ten years, unless otherwise specified by rule or regulation for all facilities of a particular class or category, or unless a period of greater than ten years was specified when the existing permit, registration, variance, or license was granted, or specified in the permit, registration,

				variance, or license. At the end of the term the department may in accordance with rules and regulations extend or reissue a permit, registration, variance, or license for another term of up to ten years. However, Section XII (formerly Section XIV) of the general permit indicates that if the permit is not reissued or replaced prior to its expiration date, it shall be administratively continued and remain in force and effect for permittees that were covered prior to its expiration. Any permittee who was granted coverage prior to the expiration date will automatically remain covered by the continued permit until the earlier of: 1. reissuance or replacement of this permit, at which time the permittee must comply with the requirements for obtaining coverage under the new permit; 2. issuance of a site-specific permit to the facility; or 3. a formal permit decision by LDEQ not to reissue this general permit, at which time the permittee must seek coverage under a site-specific permit. This approach is analogous to that employed by LPDES general permits.
2	Cover Letter	Alan Gradet	The term of the permit should be clarified to indicate that the ten (10) year authorization period apply to each facility authorized under the General Permit. This can be accomplished with a permit shield in the event of a delay in re-authorization of the General Permit rules.	See Response to Comment 1.
3	Section II	Richard Metcalf	What is the rationale for Exclusion 5 for facilities in Calcasieu and Pointe Coupee subject to LAC 33:III.2115?	LAC 33:III.2115 applies to all waste gas streams located at facilities that have the potential to emit 25 TPY or more of VOC in the parishes of Ascension, East Baton Rouge, Iberville, Livingston, and West Baton Rouge; 50 TPY or more of VOC in the parishes of Calcasieu and Pointe Coupee; or 100 TPY or more of VOC in any other parish. Based on the maximum facility-wide emissions authorized by the general permit, only waste gas streams located at facilities in Calcasieu Parish

				and Pointe Coupee Parish could be subject to the rule. Given that LAC 33:III.2115 does not apply to waste gas streams that must comply with a control requirement, meet an exemption, or are below an applicability threshold specified in another section of Chapter 21, or to those that are required by another federal or state regulation to implement controls that reduce VOC to a more stringent standard than would be required by this section, LDEQ does not believe that this exclusion will prohibit a significant number of otherwise eligible facilities from obtaining coverage under this permit.
4	Section II	Thomas LaSalle	The term 'Midstream' & associated SIC Code does not seem to fit with this permit and it is suggested that they be removed. [SICC 1389 is for contract services].	In the oil and gas industry, the term "midstream" is often applied to operations which compress and/or process natural gas between the producing property and a natural gas processing plant or sales gas pipeline compressor station. "Midstream" facilities are not normally classified under Standard Industrial Classification Code (SICC) 1311 – Crude Petroleum and Natural Gas. This category includes exploration for crude petroleum and natural gas; drilling, completing, and equipping wells; operation of separators, emulsion breakers, desilting equipment, and field gathering lines for crude petroleum; and all other activities in the preparation of oil and gas **up to the point of shipment from the producing property**. Nor are such facilities classified under SICC 4922 – Natural Gas Transmission, a category commonly associated with facilities regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). "Midstream" facilities are not regulated by FERC. Owners and operators of "midstream" facilities sometimes use SICC 1389 – Oil and Gas Field Services, Not Elsewhere Classified, a component of which is "compressing natural gas at the field on a contract basis." It is LDEQ's intent for "midstream" facilities to be eligible for coverage

				under this general permit.
5	Section II	Thomas LaSalle	It is suggested that SICC 4923 and/or 4924 be allowed under this permit, especially if they are no more than gas transmission facilities NOT associated with the underground storage of natural gas. Equipment at gas transmission sites usually only include gas compressors and perhaps drip tank(s) used to store the minimal amount of condensate which may separate out of the gas streams prior to and through the gas compression process. [scrubber vessels are used to get fluids out of the gas streams prior to compression and must dump these fluids somewhere]. One stopping point may be the fact that this occurs 'after custody transfer'; however, as long as tanks are less than 471-bbls then Kb would not apply.	LDEQ anticipates that the overwhelming majority of facilities eligible for coverage under this general permit will be classified under SICC 1311 or, as explained in Response to Comment 4, perhaps SICC 1389. Further, permit applicants seldom classify their operation under SICC 4923 or SICC 4924. However, LDEQ will reconsider this matter if it is determined that exclusion of SIC Codes 4922, 4923, and 4924 limits use of the general permit to any appreciable extent.
6	Section II Facilities Excluded from Coverage	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest that the permit allow Coverage for Facilities subject to Chapter 59 or 40 CFR 68. The rest of the permit seems to dedicate a lot of effort to identify and offer coverage of 'gas plants'. However, MOST gas plants will be subject to Chap. 59 and Part 68 so the permit should not let either of these Chapters prevent coverage.	Facilities using Joule-Thomson (J-T) equipment as part of a "forced" process are eligible for coverage under this general permit. LDEQ seeks the regulated community's input regarding whether or not LAC 33:III.Chapter 59 and 40 CFR 68 would be applicable to such facilities. LDEQ will reconsider this matter if it is determined that the provisions of these rules would apply.
7	Section II Facilities Excluded from Coverage	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest item 3 be replaced with statement that serves to excluded any site subject to K, Ka or Kb. The current specific conditions don't seem to address requirements under NSPS - K, Ka or Kb and it was not noted where the permit excluded K, Ka, Kb tanks from coverage.	Section V.F (formerly Section VI.F) of the general permit specifies that: Except as noted below, each storage vessel located *prior to* lease custody transfer containing any material *other than* crude oil, condensate, or produced water shall have a capacity less than or equal to 19,800 gallons; each vessel storing crude oil, condensate, or produced water shall have a capacity less than or equal to 420,000 gallons. Except as noted below, each storage vessels located *after* lease custody transfer shall have a capacity less than or equal to 19,800 gallons. Storage vessels storing a liquid with a *maximum true vapor pressure* less than 0.5 psia are eligible for coverage under this general permit. In this way, storage vessels subject to 40 CFR 60 Subpart K, Ka, or Kb are excluded from coverage under the general permit.

8	Section II Facilities Excluded from Coverage	Will Ward	In the section titled, "Facilities Excluded from Coverage", #3 excludes facilities subject to Chemical Accident Prevention. This seems to contradict the inclusion of facilities that are subject to Subpart KKK. The only facilities I'm aware of in the E & P industry that typically fall under Subpart KKK also require Risk Management Plans under the Chemical Accident Prevention Rules. These are cases where a JT or Refrigeration Plant is present and the produced Natural Gas Liquids are stored on site in a pressurized tank.	See Response to Comment 6.
9	Section III Final Paragraph	Richard Metcalf	This appears to be new language that we are not familiar with. Traditional GC 17, insignificant activities, etc. emissions are not covered in the potential to emit. The rationale for this should be clearly stated in the SOB.	Because the general permit itself does not establish mass emissions limitations for individual sources, LDEQ believes it is best to point out that all sources of emissions at a facility should be evaluated to ensure that maximum facility-wide emissions authorized by the general permit are not exceeded.
10	Section III	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest the permit use language more general when referring to Non attainment parishes RATHER than listing the parishes specifically. This will accommodate any change of attainment status thru the life of the permit without having to revise the General Permit.	LDEQ agrees that it would be prudent to address the possibility of a parish outside of the Baton Rouge Nonattainment Area being designated as a "serious" or "severe" ozone nonattainment area during the term of the permit. "Marginal" and "moderate" classifications do not result in a reduction of the major source threshold (it remains at 100 TPY). The following will be added to the permit: If, during the term of the permit, any parish outside of the Baton Rouge Nonattainment Area is designated as a "serious" or "severe" ozone nonattainment area, the owner or operator of a facility located in any such parish: 1. may retain this permit and comply with the limits applicable to facilities located in the Baton Rouge Nonattainment Area; or 2. if the facility cannot comply or the owner or operator chooses not to comply with limits applicable to facilities located in the Baton Rouge Nonattainment Area, the owner or operator shall apply for an "individual" site-specific air permit no later than 90 days after the effective date of the "serious" or "severe" nonattainment designation.
11	Section III	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest that first sentence of last paragraph read: 'The above limitation shall include AGGREGATE emissions from all ....those from activities that may occur at the facility on an	The change will be made.

			infrequent & routine basis, such as pigging operations.	
12	Section III	Will Ward	The benzene and formaldehyde thresholds seem low at 4 tpy and 3 tpy respectfully considering the major source threshold for HAP's is 10 tpy. Many E & P compressor stations with large lean burn engines will not qualify for this permit due to formaldehyde. These are the very sites where compressor swaps and equipment modifications are most frequent. Please consider increasing these thresholds to 5 tpy.	The primary purpose of establishing reduced limits for benzene and formaldehyde is to ensure that emissions of these pollutants do not result in exceedances of their respective Ambient Air Standards (AAS). Considering the restrictions set forth in Section VII (formerly Section VIII) of the general permit, LDEQ agrees that it is unnecessary to establish lower limits for benzene and formaldehyde in Section III. It will be necessary, however, to amend Section VII (formerly Section VIII) to address formaldehyde.
13	Section III	Alan Gradet	The Statement of Basis document that accompanies the proposed rule offers no explanation for the reduction in the allowable benzene emission to 4 tons per year. The major sources of benzene emissions from oil and gas production are glycol dehydrators, amine treating units, and storage tanks. The emissions from glycol dehydrators and storage tanks are already controlled by other provisions in the proposed General Permit rule. El Paso recognizes that there may be a benefit to the public by reducing benzene emissions in general; however, we suggest it is important to define this benefit given the fact that this emission threshold is lower than the equivalent federal threshold. Similarly, a justification should be provided for reducing the allowable formaldehyde emission to 3 tons per year. The major sources of formaldehyde at oil and gas production facilities are internal combustion engines. The US EPA has proposed amendments to 40CFR63 Subpart ZZZZ that will control formaldehyde emissions from these sources. Implementation of this federal rule is expected to provide adequate environmental and public health protection. It is also important to note that compliance with that rule will be staged to allow time for stakeholders and testing companies to mobilize the necessary resources for formaldehyde emission tests.	See Response to Comment 12.
14	Section IV	Richard Metcalf Alan Gradet	A single application for contiguous facilities should sufficient as long as all emission sources are addressed and the site diagrams clearly display the contiguity. This is especially feasible since the total emissions from the contiguous facilities are aggregated.	Because facilities in the crude oil and natural gas production sector are bought and sold with some regularity, LDEQ prefers that a separate application be submitted for each facility in a contiguous grouping.
15	Section IV	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest second paragraph read: A separate application, for Authorization to Operate, should be submitted for each facility...	LDEQ will clarify that is it not necessary for each facility in a contiguous grouping to be covered

				under this general permit. It is necessary, however, for each facility to be covered by an air permit.
16	Section V.A.	Richard Metcalf	It is unclear whether the limits apply to "manufacture/reconstruction" of the engine itself or the construction of the facility. Engines in the oilfield are portable and often move from facility to facility. These limits could eliminate the use of many older engines from use at a location even though the facility NOx limit is not exceeded. This needs clarification. The statement of basis was silent on the rational. We recognize that these are the limits for areas subject to Chapter 22.	LDEQ has reconsidered this aspect of the permit. Based on the information provided that suggests the relocation of existing engines amongst multiple facilities is a common practice within the industry, LDEQ acknowledges that the requirement in question may significantly limit use of the general permit. Therefore, this requirement will be removed.
17	Section V.A	Will Ward	There needs to be some clarification on page 4 of the General Permit in the table that contains the Emission Limits for Natural Gas Compressors. Rich burn engines over 300 hp will require controls to meet 2.0 g/hp-hr. In the specific conditions section, this is located in the Chapter 22 regulations for non-attainment parishes. Is the intent for this threshold to be statewide to qualify for a general permit or is this control requirement limited to the non-attainment parishes?	See Response to Comment 16.
18	Section V.B. - Methodology	Richard Metcalf Alan Gradet	The methodology seems to preclude the use of E&P Tanks as a calculation method for high rates and gravity. Why could you not use E&P Tanks for higher rates and gravity, particularly if you are using site specific data? E&P Tanks is an EPA approved method for calculating those. The language of this section should also be changed to clearly indicate that all existing facilities with a throughput less than 100 Bbl/day or an API gravity less than 40° can use the alternate methods as per http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/Default.aspx?tabid=2291.	LDEQ has reconsidered this aspect of the permit. For purposes of this permit, the alternative calculation methods described on the webpage noted are acceptable for 1.) new fields or facilities not yet in production for which testing cannot be performed; and 2.) existing vessels that do not meet the definition of "storage vessel with the potential for flash emissions." "Storage vessel with the potential for flash emissions" will be defined in the SOB as any storage vessel that contains a hydrocarbon liquid with a stock tank GOR equal to or greater than 0.31 cubic meters per liter and an API gravity equal to or greater than 40 degrees and an actual annual average hydrocarbon liquid throughput equal to or greater than 79,500 liters [500 barrels] per day. This definition mirrors that set forth in 40 CFR 63.761.
19	Section V.B. - Methodology	Thomas LaSalle	Appear to have a typo in second paragraph. Appears that between items one and two it should read 'OR' rather than 'AND'.	"And" seems to convey the intent of the passage, that both "new fields or facilities not yet in production" **and** "existing ..." may use the alternative calculation methods described.
20	Section V.B. - Methodology	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest that under item two when allowing an 'exemption' of sorts for an API gravity of less than 40 degrees that the permit	See Response to Comment 18.

			should also require the site to have a throughput of less than 500-BBLD to coincide with NESHAP - HH. Otherwise, you could have a site that produces an infinite amount of oil that does not have to utilize the more stringent measures of estimating flash emissions if the API gravity is just under 40.	
21	Section V.B. – Control Requirements	Richard Metcalf Alan Gradet	The language of this section should be changed to read "25 tons or more per year of VOC in the flash gas" and "aggregated facility VOC in the flash emissions".	LDEQ agrees. Clarification will be added to the permit.
22	Section VI. A.1.2.3	Richard Metcalf	These are all conditions that apply only to SIC 1321 facilities and are already precluded per Section II. In the last paragraph it seems to imply that a compressor cannot be downstream of a J-T unit. Since the J-T unit requires a pressure drop, a compressor may be needed to boost the pressure back up to pipeline requirements.	Use of compressors associated with J-T equipment and intended to aid in the removal of condensates from the gas stream or to move the liquids or remaining gas from the process may constitute "extraction of natural gas liquids" and subject this portion of the process to the requirements of 40 CFR 60 Subpart KKK. See applicability determination from Jeff KenKnight of EPA to Randy Poteet of ConocoPhillips dated November 11, 2004, concerning the Alpine Central Processing Facility. Use of a compressor downstream of J-T equipment to boost the pressure of gas to pipeline specifications does not appear to trigger to requirements of Subpart KKK.
23	Section VI. A.3	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest this item be revised to read ...the owner does not comply by routing emissions to a control device OTHER THAN A FLARE. It does not seem like it would take much more effort to include NSPS requirements for Control Flares	Facilities using J-T equipment as part of a "forced" process are eligible for coverage under this general permit, provided: *** 3. where Subpart KKK is applicable, the owner does not comply by routing emissions to a control device. Owner or operators subject to the provisions of Subpart KKK are required to comply with the requirements of §§60.482-1 (a), (b), and (d) and §60.482-2 through §60.482-10 (of 40 CFR 60, Subpart VV), except as provided in §60.633. In Subpart VV, control devices are mentioned at 40 CFR 60.482-2(d)(1)(ii) & (f), §60.482-3(b)(2) & (h), §60.482-4(c), and §60.482-5(b)(4)(iii). In the oil and gas industry, LDEQ does not believe it is typical for pumps in light liquid service, compressors, pressure relief devices in gas/vapor service, and sampling connection systems to

				comply with Subpart KKK by adhering to one of the aforementioned provisions.
24	Section VI. A.3	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest that last line of last paragraph read: This process does. not trigger ANY REQUIREMENTS OF 40 CFR 60 Subpart KKK.	The change will be made.
25	Section VI.B.	Richard Metcalf Alan Gradet	This should be amended to clarify that Amine sweetening units in both CO_2 and H_2S removal service are covered by the General Permit	LDEQ will clarify that amine sweetening units primarily used to remove CO_2 from a produced gas stream are eligible for coverage under the general permit.
26	Section VI.D.	Richard Metcalf Alan Gradet	The requirement for control of emissions from triethylene glycol (TEG) dehydration units should apply only to those units with an annual average flowrate greater than or equal to 85,000 standard cubic feet (~ 3 MMscf) or the actual average benzene emissions are greater than or equal to 0.90 megagrams per year (~ 1 TPY). We also suggest that this requirement apply to TEG dehydration units constructed after the effective date of the General Permit rules. Many small dehydrators are in use solely to dry gas used as fuel for other process components such as compressor engines. Alternatively, we request justification for requiring controls on small TEG dehydration units. Also, we suggest that larger TEG dehydration units (e.g. greater than 3MMscfd or with uncontrolled benzene emission greater than 1 TPY) that comply with 40CFR 63 Subpart HH by controlling benzene emissions should be eligible for the General Permit.	Based on the cost information provided in Comment 32 and the possibility that such requirement may significantly discourage use of the general permit, this requirement will be removed from the permit.
27	Section VI.D.	Richard Metcalf	The SOB has three good definitions Glycol Dehydration Units and the two distinct vents. However, in the permit and specific requirements there is a continual reference to the "Glycol Dehydrator Still Column Vent" and none to the process vent. As a point of clarity, it could be beneficial to use the terms as defined in the SOB.	LDEQ agrees. The permit will be revised to use the term "glycol dehydration unit process vent" as defined in the SOB.
28	Section VI.D.	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest that 1st paragraph on page six use an underline or italicize for the word ACTUAL as this concept has caused some confusion in recent past with the air permitting department.	This provision reflects the text of 40 CFR 63.772(b)(1) & (2), which specify how to determine the actual flowrate of natural gas and how actual average benzene emissions shall be made.
29	Section VI.D.1 & 2	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest that actual sampling/testing ONLY be required for units processing over 3-MMSCFD. The permit will require closed loop control devices (actual benzene emissions would be nominal) to greatly reduce benzene emissions. Furthermore, NESHAP- HH is not concerned with units processing less than 3-MMSCFD.	Because the provision requiring the still column vent to be controlled by means of a condenser and non-condensables to be routed to the reboiler firebox, a flare, or other combustion device (applying to glycol dehydration units for which construction commenced after the effective date of the general permit) will be removed, the site-specific wet gas analysis requirement will remain unchanged.
30	Section VI.D.1	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest that a statement of clarification be added. Specifically,	The change will be made.

			add a sentence after the first complete sentence to read as follow: SAMPLES CAN BE COLLECTED FROM THE GLYCOL CONTACT TOWER, PROVIDED THAT THE SAMPLING POINT IS PRIOR TO THE CONTACT OF GAS WITH THE GLYCOL. These records...	
31	Section VI.D.2	Will Ward	Section VI.D.2 states that all dehys constructed after the effective date of this permit shall be controlled by a condenser, with the noncondensables then being routed to fire box, flare, etc., regardless of the emissions limits or reboiler size. It seems like an unnecessary expense for a company to be required to control a small dehy that is only treating gas to power other equipment on site. This stipulation should be taken out since the first part of this section requires controls for TEG dehydrators that process over 3 MMSCF/day or have over 1 tpy of benzene emissions.	See Response to Comment 32. The requirements for TEG dehydration units are intended only to ensure covered units are exempt from the control requirements of 40 CFR 63, Subpart HH.
32	Section VI.D.2	Jonathan Beam	After considering exactly what this means, I don't believe this general permit will alleviate any of the overwhelming burden put on DEQ by the increase oil and gas permitting that has resulted in lieu of Haynesville Shale operations. Section VI, Subpart D, Bullet 2 excludes any new location with well-site dehydration if a condenser is not currently part of the operating scenario. I have in hand multiple shale gas analyses where any hydrocarbon greater than ethane are not even being detected, therefore, from an operational standpoint, a condenser would not even be considered for operation b/c there is nothing to condense. From a GlyCalc perspective, very little VOC emissions are hypothetically emitted when very little VOC's are found in the gas stream. From an operational standpoint, my superiors would never even hesitate getting a permit if the options were to either permit (about 2000 dollars) or install a condenser (about 35000 dollars). Therefore, this general permit would be of little use to Chesapeake Energy. I believe that this qualifier will prevent the general permit from being applicable to very many sites whatsoever and will do very little to streamline the application process because very few sites will even be eligible for consideration under the general permit requirements.	Based on the cost information provided and the possibility that such requirement may significantly discourage use of the general permit, this requirement will be removed from the permit.
33	Section VI.F.	Richard Metcalf	Are the gallon limits per individual tank or for all tanks? Also, tanks storing produced water should be treated the same as tanks storing crude oil or condensate.	Capacity limits are per tank, not based on the total storage capacity of the facility. LDEQ agrees that produced water tanks should be treated the same as those storing crude oil or condensate. Section V.F (formerly VI.F) will be revised as follows:

				Except as noted below, each storage vessel located *prior to* lease custody transfer containing any material *other than* crude oil, condensate, or produced water shall have a capacity less than or equal to 19,800 gallons; each vessel storing crude oil, condensate, or produced water shall have a capacity less than or equal to 420,000 gallons. Except as noted below, each storage vessels located *after* lease custody transfer shall have a capacity less than or equal to 19,800 gallons. Storage vessels storing a liquid with a *maximum true vapor pressure* less than 0.5 psia are eligible for coverage under this general permit. See also Response to Comment 34.
34	Section VI.F.	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest that second paragraph be revised to read: All storage vessels located after lease custody transfer shall have a capacity less than or equal to 19,800 gallons OR A VAPOR PRESSURE OF LESS THAN 0.5 PSIA AT MAXIMUM STORAGE CONDITIONS. [this concept and verbiage coincides with Kb]	The change will be made.
35	Section VI.F	Alan Gradet	Produced water storage vessels larger than 19,800 Bbls should also be eligible for the General Permit. The language should read "containing any material *other than* crude oil, condensate, or produced water".	See Response to Comment 33.
36	Section VII.	Richard Metcalf Alan Gradet	In accordance with Section I.4, it is the applicant's responsibility to assure that the operation of the subject crude oil & gas production facility meets the general permit requirements and remains in compliance with those requirements. Accordingly, we see no need to delay authorization to construct and operate a new facility under the General Permit or to delay authorization to modify a facility under the General Permit. In fact, except for those facilities already authorized under the General Permit and requesting a modification under proposed Section VIII.A, the proposed General Permit authorization process is not materially different than the current Minor Source process. The permit authorization process as proposed will continue the current extended delays in Minor Source permit approvals and overuse of the LDEQ expedited permit process with no material benefit to the public, the regulated community, or the Agency. Therefore, we strongly recommend that the process of requesting authorization to construct, operate, or modify a	LDEQ will modify Section VI (formerly Section VII) of the general permit to read as follows: Where facility-wide potential emissions of the following pollutants are less than or equal to the thresholds set forth in the table below, an applicant is authorized to construct and operate under the terms and conditions of this permit fourteen (14) days after the date the application is either postmarked or hand-delivered or upon notification by LDEQ that coverage has been extended, whichever is earlier. Pollutant — Emissions (TPY) acrolein — 2.1 benzene — 1.7

			facility under the General Permit be structured to accelerate the permit review and authorization process. Here are two suggestions. Option 1. Allow the authorization to construct, operate, or modify a facility under the General Permit to be automatic upon submission of the "Application for Approval of Emissions of Air Pollutants from Minor Sources". That is, upon submission of the application, the applicant is automatically authorized to proceed with construction, operation, or modification recognizing that it is the applicant's responsibility to assure compliance with the general permit provisions and is subject to enforcement under Section I.4 of the general permit. Formal approval of the application by the Agency can follow as time and Agency staffing conditions allow. Option 2. If the above process is unacceptable to the Agency, establish a two step application process. In step one the applicant would submit an application similar to the current Regulatory Permit application for Oil & Gas Well Testing. This would allow the Agency to document the applicant's assurance that the proposed emissions comply with the general permit provisions. In return, the Agency would automatically expedite the review of the application and issuance of authorization to be no more than five (5) business days. Upon receipt of the expedited authorization, the applicant would then proceed with construction, operation, or modification. As above, Section I.4 applies and the applicant remains responsible for compliance with the general permit provisions and subject to enforcement. Within a specified time frame, the applicant would file a complete "Application for Approval of Emissions of Air Pollutants from Minor Sources" with emissions estimates and calculations based on actual production data and gas analyses from the new or modified facility. All provisions of the general permit remain in effect throughout the two step process.	formaldehyde 3.0 Authorization to construct and operate is not automatically granted if the application is materially incomplete (e.g., required information omitted, application unsigned, etc.) or if your facility is not eligible for coverage under this permit.
37	Section VII.	Richard Metcalf	A mechanism for an existing facility with an individual permit at present to request coverage under this permit should be incorporated. Since a permit application has already been reviewed, a full permit application should not be required.	LDEQ agrees that a complete permit application addressing the entire facility is generally not necessary. LDEQ will amend the general permit to specify that an application to modify a site-specific air permit (which may address only the sources being modified) may also be used to request coverage under the general permit, provided that the "General Permit Applicability Questionnaire" accompanies the application. The "General

				Permit Applicability Questionnaire" is an abbreviated form requesting a series of "yes/no" responses used to quickly verify eligibility for the general permit; it may be completed in a nominal amount of time.
38	Section VII	Thomas LaSalle	As stated above, it is suggested that the permit be structured such to correct the delays associated with the current air permit authorization process. This was one of the original goals of the General Permit idea. If so, this section would need to be revised to include verbiage that acknowledges that fact that an operator can construct and operate (at least for a limited time until review process can be conducted) once the certified application is received by the department.	See Response to Comment 36.
39	Section VII	Thomas LaSalle	Again, the term 'Midstream' is used here and should be removed. SICC 4923 or 4924 seem like a better fit.	See Response to Comment 5.
40	Section VII	Jonathan Beam	Section VII, Requesting Coverage Under the General Permit, appears as if it has been re-written basically re-iterating the old, fill out an application and wait for approval procedure that can be at best characterized as frustrating by those of us in this end of the oil and gas industry. I have, in the not so distant past, read a draft version of the general permit whereby the application process was streamlined by following a more aggressive approach of providing a grace period from the start up of a facility to have all the required documentation in for the air permit that would be required for that facility. In my opinion, the largest selling point of this document is the fact that due to operational changes that occur so rapidly and because often times modifications to the original design of the facility are sent to DEQ before the first application is reviewed or approved, the speed, utility, and flexibility of the application process had been greatly increased. If the application process is still a submit and wait procedure like before, I don't see how this permit has taken any strides to make oil and gas permitting more efficient or streamlined whatsoever.	See Response to Comment 36.
41	Section VIII	Richard Metcalf	We question the need for a "full" permit application when a facility is modified?	LDEQ will specify that the completed "Application for Approval of Emissions of Air Pollutants from Minor Sources" need only address the modifications effected at the facility (Section VII.A, formerly Section VIII.A) or the proposed modifications (Section VII.B, formerly Section VIII.B). LDEQ anticipates creating an abbreviated application specifically tailored to reporting modifications at facilities covered under this

				general permit.
42	Section VIII.A & B	Thomas LaSalle	Headings should be clarified to specify 'Actual Benzene' or 'Potential Benzene' - whatever the intent should be.	Section VII.A and VII.B (formerly Section VIII.A and VIII.A) have been revised in their entirety for clarity. The limit is intended to reflect *potential* emissions. **A. Modifications: Situations Where Pre-Construction Approval Is Not Required** Where facility-wide potential emissions of the following pollutants (including the planned modifications) are less than or equal to the thresholds set forth in the table below, the owner or operator may modify the facility without prior approval of LDEQ, provided that the facility remains compliant with the established eligibility conditions. Pollutant — Emissions (TPY) acrolein — 2.1 benzene — 1.7 formaldehyde — 3.0 Notwithstanding facility-wide potential emissions of the aforementioned pollutants, modifications which do not increase hourly or annual potential emissions of said pollutants may also be effected without prior approval of LDEQ. Except as specified in Subsections VII.C and VII.D, within ten (10) calendar days after effecting any modification (generally commencement of construction) to a facility authorized to operate under this general permit, the permittee shall submit a completed "Application for Approval of Emissions of Air Pollutants from Minor Sources" and the appropriate modified permit fee to the Air Permits Division. The completed "Application for Approval of Emissions of Air Pollutants from Minor Sources" need only address the modifications effected at the facility.

				B. Modifications: Situations Where Pre-Construction Approval Is Required Except as specified in Subsections VII.C or VII.D, **prior to** effecting any modification (generally commencement of construction) *not* described in Section VII.A, the permittee shall submit a completed "Application for Approval of Emissions of Air Pollutants from Minor Sources" and the appropriate modified permit fee to the Air Permits Division. The modification shall not be effected until approved by LDEQ. The completed "Application for Approval of Emissions of Air Pollutants from Minor Sources" need only address the proposed modifications.
43	Section VIII.A & B	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest the department clarify whether the '1.7-TPY' figure is the total at an existing facility prior to a modification or whether the figure applies to the facility-wide benzene total after the modification.	See Response to Comment 42.
44	Section VIII.A	Richard Metcalf	It is unclear rather this relates to the delta of change in the TPY for benzene that is allowed or, is this the PTE of the site prior to the modification.	See Response to Comment 42.
45	Section VIII.B.	Richard Metcalf Alan Gradet	This provision needs to be clarified as to whether the 1.7 TPY benzene threshold is an increase in emissions already authorized under the General Permit or a total emission threshold resulting from a modification. Regardless, as discussed above (see Section VII Requesting Coverage Under This General Permit), authorization to proceed with any modification to an existing General Permit should not be delayed because the applicant remains responsible for compliance during any permit application review process.	See Responses to Comments 42 and 36.
46	Section VIII.C	Richard Metcalf Alan Gradet	The addition or replacement of pneumatic pumps, pneumatic valves, and other fugitive emission sources are routine maintenance activities. Specific records of such changes are not routinely kept at a production location. In fact, only large common points or major field offices maintain equipment records. Since the applicant remains responsible for compliance with the overall General Permit emission limits as described in the application, it seems un-necessary to maintain records of insignificant source modifications.	LDEQ agrees in part. LDEQ will specify that records of the addition or replacement of pneumatic valves, pneumatic controllers, and fugitive components shall not be required. LDEQ will also specify that all records required by the general permit may be kept on site or at another approved location.
47	Section VIII.C	Thomas LaSalle	Allowing the addition of heater treater could add a waste gas source at a facility. Replacement-in-kind is more of an	The intention of LDEQ is to allow small sources of air emissions to be added or replaced without

			insignificant activity, but suggest that the permit NOT allow the installation of a new heater treater as most of these vessels vent their gas streams to atmosphere. Suggest that another item be added that would allow Replacement of heater treaters provided the maximum design heat rating is less than 5-MMBTU/Hr.	having to notify the department. LDEQ will clarify that only heater treaters that do not represent a source of flash gas emissions are addressed under Section VII.C (formerly Section VIII.C).
48	Section VIII.C	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest the 1st paragraph after C read: .... pneumatic pumps, pneumatic valves, pneumatic controllers, and	The change will be made.
49	Section VIII.D.	Richard Metcalf Alan Gradet	We want to insure "In-kind" exchanges of compressor engines that become subject to 40CFR63 Subpart JJJJ should be eligible for the General Permit. The emissions from these engines will remain at or below the equivalent older engines. Again, specific records of very small source changes are not routinely kept. Records are kept at common points or major field offices.	According to Section VII.D (formerly Section VIII.D), the replacement of an existing emissions unit not indentified in Section VII.C (formerly Section VIII.C) with an "in-kind" unit shall not require notification to LDEQ, provided the replacement unit is not subject to federal or state regulations not applicable to the replaced emissions unit. Thus, if a compressor engine not subject to 40 CFR 60 Subpart JJJJ is replaced with a unit that is, Section VII.D (formerly Section VIII.D) would not be appropriate. *However*, such modification should be able to be made pursuant to Section VII.A (formerly Section VIII.A) (i.e., because hourly or annual potential emissions should not increase), which does not require the "pre-approval" of LDEQ. Regarding recordkeeping, see Response to Comment 46.
50	Section VIII.D.1	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest the line read: does not result in an increase in hourly or annual potential emissions OF ANY REGULATED CRITERIA POLLUTANT.	LDEQ will add "of a regulated pollutant" to this condition.
51	Section IX	Richard Metcalf	This should be clarified to say that the operator's right to operate "under the general permit" is terminated. They can still operate under an individual permit.	LDEQ agreed with the comment. Note, however, that Section IX of the draft has been deleted in favor of revisions to Section XII (formerly Section XIII).
52	Section IX	Richard Metcalf	If the operator is not actually issued a permit, then the first line in this paragraph should read: An application to renew coverage...	LDEQ agreed with the comment. Note, however, that Section IX of the draft has been deleted in favor of revisions to Section XII (formerly Section XIII).
53	Section IX	Richard Metcalf	Don't see why the department would not require an operator to pay a fee to renew 'Authorization to Operate'.	This paragraph specified that "a fee shall not be required unless the renewal application is also associated with a modification." Note, however, that Section IX of the draft has been deleted in favor of revisions to Section XII (formerly Section XIII).
54	Section X	Richard Metcalf	A paragraph should be added describing the procedure to use	Section II specifies that prior to initiating any

			when a facility has planned modifications that would no longer qualify the facility for coverage under this permit.	modification to the facility that would prohibit it from being covered under this general permit, the permittee must request an "individual" site-specific air permit. Section VIII (formerly Section X) will be amended as follows: If, in accordance with Section II, the permittee seeks permission to effect a modification rendering the facility ineligible for coverage under this general permit, it is <u>not</u> necessary to request termination of this general permit once a site-specific permit is obtained.
55	Section XII	Richard Metcalf	This would imply that even in attainment areas if you used this permit, it would be require you to submit an annual emissions inventory regardless of potential to emit. Therefore a facility with this permit and a PTE of 10 tons/yr has to submit an emission inventory but a facility in another source category would not under Section 919. We believe some PTE threshold should be established in the permit that exempts smaller facilities from the EI requirement.	LDEQ must know what facilities are obligated to report pursuant to LAC 33:III.919. Because site-specific emissions limitations are established by the permittee's application requesting coverage under the general permit, it would be difficult to track which facilities are obligated to submit an Emissions Inventory. In the Baton Rouge Nonattainment Area (BRNA), this additional requirement would only affect facilities with potential VOC emissions of less than 10 TPY. In the adjoining parishes, this additional requirement would only affect facilities with VOC emissions less than 50 TPY. Another option is to create an analogous permit for sources located in the BRNA and in those parishes that adjoin the BRNA, except that the permit would have lower maximum facility-wide emissions for VOC (e.g., 9 TPY in the BRNA, 45 TPY in the adjoining parishes). LDEQ seeks the regulated community's input on this option.
56	Section XII	Thomas LaSalle	As commented above, seems more appropriate to go without listing specific parishes if possible in case the attainment status of a parish changes throughout the life of the permit.	LDEQ prefers to list the parishes that are current nonattainment areas and the parishes that adjoin such areas. LDEQ will clarify that if, during the term of this permit, any of the parishes identified in Section X (formerly Section XII) of the permit is re-designated as an ozone attainment area or otherwise ceases to adjoin an ozone nonattainment area, the need to

				submit an annual EI shall be dictated by LAC 33:III.919. See also Response to Comment 10.
57	Section XIII	Richard Metcalf Alan Gradet	We anticipate additional testing requirements associated with compliance with the General Permit provisions especially with regards to dehydration and better estimation of storage tank flash gas. Accordingly, it might be appropriate to allow greater flexibility in the applicants' choice of testing laboratories considering the fact that only a limited number of Louisiana laboratories are accredited for wet extended (including BTEX compounds) gas analyses and gas liberation tests.	LDEQ acknowledges the comment, but does see how adopting the suggested change would be compliant with LAC 33:I.Chapters 45 – 59.
58	Section XIII	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest the second sentence read: ...that are not accredited under this program for acceptable analytical methods to determine speciated analytes, and retesting will be required by an accredited laboratory. The inclusion of "C1-C6+" does not seem to add anything to this sentence.	The change will be made.
59	Section XIV	Richard Metcalf	We want to ensure that if DEQ decides not to reissue the permit, the facility retains coverage until the site specific individual permit is issued.	LDEQ will revise this provision as follows: 3. a formal permit decision by LDEQ not to reissue this general permit, at which time the permittee must seek coverage under a site-specific permit. In any such notice not to reissue the general permit, LDEQ will establish a deadline for the submittal of an application for a site-specific permit. LDEQ may grant additional time to submit the application upon request of the applicant. Coverage under this general permit shall continue until such time as a site-specific permit is approved. If a permittee fails to submit in a timely manner a site-specific air permit application as required by LDEQ, then the applicability of this permit to the individual permittee will be automatically terminated at the end of the day specified by LDEQ for application submittal.
60	Section XIV	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest second sentence read ...of this general permit, any permittee who was granted coverage prior to the expiration date...	The change will be made.
61	Section XIV.2	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest this item read: termination of the SITE SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION. [if this follows the intent of this section]	LDEQ has reconsidered this item and removed it from the permit.
62	Section XIV.2	Thomas LaSalle	Under 'Requirement of Site-Specific Permit' section - question comes up as to why an operator would have to submit another permit application if they were denied coverage under the general permit? Perhaps the verbiage could be revised	This provision of the permit would apply only if a facility has been previously granted coverage under the general permit (i.e., no application is

			somewhat to state that another application MAY be required upon request by the department.	pending), not to an applicant seeking coverage under the general permit. If a facility seeking coverage under the general permit was determined not to be eligible, a separate application would not be required.
63	Section XV GC I	Thomas LaSalle	Comments for General Condition 1 are a bit confusing. Suggest comment reads: General Permit emissions limitations are set forth in Section III of the permit. Site specific emissions limits are defined in the permittee's application requesting coverage.	The comment associated with GC I will be revised as follows: Maximum facility-wide emissions authorized by this general permit are set forth in Section III of the permit. Site-specific emissions limitations are established by the permittee's application requesting coverage under this general permit. Exceedances of any limitations defined therein are addressed in General Condition III.
64A	Section XV GC III	Richard Metcalf	DEQ should specify whether it is 30 working or calendar days.	LDEQ will specify calendar days.
64B	Section XV GC III	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest second sentence under Comment for General Condition 3 read: If emissions from an emissions unit <u>or facility</u> are subsequently <u>and unexpectedly</u> determined to be greater than those disclosed in an application request for coverage, but facility-wide emissions remain .... This would make it clear that a permittee should not be allowed to circumvent the intent of the permitting process.	Section XIII (formerly Section XV), GC III already specifies that if a facility-wide emission limitation has been exceeded, a report must be submitted pursuant to General Condition XI. LDEQ will rely on the certification statement associated with the "Application for Approval of Emissions of Air Pollutants from Minor Sources" for assurance that the inputs and other parameters necessary to calculate potential emissions were determined properly based on all available information. CERTIFICATION: I certify, under provisions in Louisiana and United States law which provide criminal penalties for false statements, that based on information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, the statements and information contained in this Application for Approval of Emissions of Air Pollutants from Minor Sources, including all attachments thereto and the compliance statement above, are true, accurate, and complete.
65	Section XV GC VI	Richard Metcalf	Is this provision really necessary?	LDEQ's Office of Environmental Compliance has requested that this provision remain in the permit.
66	Section XV GC VII	Thomas LaSalle	Is General Condition VII necessary if you have General Condition III?	LDEQ believes so. GC VII specifies that any emissions testing performed for purposes of

				demonstrating compliance with the limitations set forth in GC III shall be conducted in accordance with the methods described in the Specific Requirements of the permit. Any deviation from or modification of the methods used for testing shall have prior approval from the Office of Environmental Assessment. While Section XIII (formerly Section XV), GC III clarifies that an exceedance of an emissions limitation established by the permittee's application, in the absence of an underlying federal or state standard, is not necessarily a violation of the permit, it is still important to ensure that emissions testing is performed properly. The results ensure that maximum facility-wide emissions authorized by the general permit have not been exceeded and are particularly useful in verifying compliance if reported potential emissions approach these thresholds.
67	Section XV GC XXII	Richard Metcalf	This should be rewritten to say "No person shall knowingly falsify, tamper with, or render inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained under this permit."	The change will be made.
68	Section XV GC XXVI	Richard Metcalf	The DEQ should allow at least 30 days to provide any information requested under this condition.	The comment appears to reference GC XXIV. The change will be made.
69	EQT0008 - Specific Requirement 1	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest a sentence be added as follows: "Exempt when sulphur content of all individual wellstreams handled by the amine unit is less than 4-ppmv."	40 CFR 60.647(c) requires an analysis demonstrating that each sweetening unit's design capacity is less than 2 LT/D of H_2S expressed as sulfur to certify that the unit is exempt from the control requirements of Subpart LLL. An exemption from this requirement is not provided by Subpart LLL.
70	EQT0008 – Specific Requirement 2	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest a sentence be added as follows: "On-site gas detection methodology acceptable".	This Specific Requirement has been modified to read: Record and retain at the site sufficient data to show annual potential sulfur dioxide emissions. LDEQ prefers to leave this requirement in generic form because it is anticipated that a gas analysis showing the sulfur content of the gas stream and associated calculations would be sufficient to satisfy this requirement.
71	EQT0008	Richard Metcalf	It appears the provisions of Section 1509 are omitted. We	LAC 33:III.1509 allows for an exemption for

			request the DEQ consider an exemption from 1509 if the H2S in the vent stream cannot be combusted without the addition fuel gas due to the presence of CO2.	"units emitting less than 10 tons per year as hydrogen sulfide" unless a more stringent federal or state requirement is applicable. Because Section III of the general permit limits facility-wide emissions of any TAP, including H_2S, to no more than 8 TPY, this exemption is being extended to sources covered by the permit.
72	EQT0008 Item 2	Richard Metcalf	This requirement should not be applicable if potential SO2 emissions are less than 5 tons per year.	LDEQ agrees. This information should be readily available in the permit application submitted to request coverage under the general permit. See also Response to Comment 70.
73	PCS0003	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest the permit have a separate set of conditions for flares handling off-gas from amine unit and not group those in w/2104 or 2116 flares. If this is done, there should be no need to require an operator to collect a flare gas sample for a flare that is handling gas to comply with 2104, 2116 or simply in there to control tank or waste gas streams in an effort to reduce emissions. Heat content in all of these situations will be MUCH greater than 300-BTU/scf so the exercise of confirming this value has no technical basis and is simply a regurgitation of a universal federal requirement. Please review the numerous request for alternate methodology granted by engineering for these same situations. On the other hand, a flare handling gas from an amine process is very much at risk of not meeting the 300-BTU/scf threshold with its flare gas. Please consider separating these operational situations and take off the unnecessary burden of sampling high heat content flare streams. Suggest a series of requirements be added for NSPS flares, if the permit will allow such devices as recommended above.	For flares that do not control offgas from amine regenerator vents, LDEQ will allow use of a sales gas analysis to satisfy the requirement that the heat content of flare gas is above 300 Btu/scf, provided: 1. the gas streams to the flare are sampled once to prove that they have a higher Btu value than the sales gas stream; and 2. streams to the flare are resampled after any change in process conditions that is expected to alter the heat content of the flare gas. For flares controlling offgas from amine regenerator vents, the requirement to document the heat content of the flare gas annually shall be retained. Regarding flares subject to 40 CFR 60.18, see Response to Comment 23.
74	EQT0024 – Specific Requirement 106	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest all flares have the following requirement: "Unless emergency use only, flare shall be equipped with a continuous-burn pilot flame w/dedicated fuel supply. Pilot shall be designed to ignite/combust waste gas streams to the unit. Flare must also be equipped with an automatic ignition system to assure that pilot will re-lit in less than 10-seconds in the event it is temporarily extinguished."	Such requirement would be contrary to LDEQ's longstanding approach of allowing the permittee to ensure the continuous presence of a flame either by documenting such via daily visual observations or by installing, maintaining, and operating according to manufacturer's specifications a heat sensing device to detect the continuous presence of a flame.
75	EQT0024 – Specific Requirement 109	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest that first line be revised as follows, to coincide with specific requirement 111: Ensure DESTRUCTION OF EMISSIONS TO THE FLARE STACK by documenting daily.....	LDEQ will revise the permit such that *draft* Specific Requirements 109 and 111 read consistently.
76	EQT0025	Richard Metcalf	We request that operating hours resulting from a declared	LDEQ will specify that during a state of

			emergency by the Governor not count towards the 720 hour threshold.	emergency declared by the Governor, operating time of diesel-fired internal combustion engines whose operation is typically limited to emergency situations (e.g., involuntary power curtailment, power unavailability, maintenance activity that requires the main source of power to be shut down) and required readiness testing and maintenance checks shall not count towards the 720 hour threshold triggering stack testing requirements.
77	EQT0007	Richard Metcalf	Title should also reference Rules 2103 and 2115	LDEQ will modify the permit such that specific regulations are not addressed in the title of this subject item. See also Response to Comment 73.
78	EQT0024 – Item 109	Richard Metcalf	Many facilities are not visited daily – this should be amended to allow checking on the days the facility is visited.	Another option has been provided in the permit. Consistent with Response to Comment 74, the permittee may ensure the continuous presence of a flame either by documenting such via daily visual observations or by installing, maintaining, and operating according to manufacturer's specifications a heat sensing device to detect the continuous presence of a flame.
79	FUG0002	Richard Metcalf	Not sure this facility description is allowed to be covered by the permit. If you are subject to KKK you are a natural gas processing plant SIC 1321	See Response to Comment 22.
80	EQT0003	Richard Metcalf	Should Also include Rule 2115	LDEQ is aware that many years ago, it was determined that a number of glycol dehydration unit process vents required controls in accordance with LAC 33:III.2115. Because LAC 33:III.2116 was promulgated in October 1994, and because LAC 33:III.2115 does not apply to waste gas streams that must comply with a control requirement, meet an exemption, or are below an applicability threshold specified in another section of Chapter 21, LDEQ does not believe that the exclusion of §2115 will prohibit a significant number of otherwise eligible facilities from obtaining coverage under this permit. LDEQ will reconsider this matter if public comments to the contrary are received.
81	EQT0003	Richard Metcalf	Use defined terms for title as used in SOB	LDEQ agrees. See Response to Comment 27.
82	EQT0003 Item 120	Richard Metcalf	Many facilities are not visited daily – this should be amended to allow checking on the days the facility is visited.	LDEQ will provide an alternate flare monitoring methodology in the permit; see Response to Comment 83. Should a pemittee choose not to

				install, maintain, and operate according to manufacturer's specifications a heat sensing device to detect the continuous presence of a flame, LDEQ does not see how adopting the suggested change would be compliant with LAC 33:III.2116.B.3, which requires the permittee to document "daily visual observations of the continuous presence of a flame."
83	EQT0003 Item 126	Richard Metcalf	Can an approval be built in here for granting an alternative method of complying with this requirement to monitor the presence of a flame (i.e.. using a fire eye, heat sensing device, etc.)?	Yes, LDEQ will provide an alternate flare monitoring methodology in the permit. The permittee may ensure the continuous presence of a flame either by documenting such via daily visual observations or by installing, maintaining, and operating according to manufacturer's specifications a heat sensing device to detect the continuous presence of a flame.
84	EQT 0026 Items 131 and 132	Richard Metcalf	Remove these requirements. These should go through rulemaking prior to inclusion in a permit.	*Draft* Specific Requirement 131 will be removed from the permit. See Response to Comment 32. LDEQ believes that draft Specific Requirement 131 is reasonable because it applies only to new glycol dehydration units for which the initial estimate of emissions would have been based on what the applicant believed to be a representative gas analysis. The information obtained can be used to verify VOC and TAP emission rates.
85	PCS 0005	Richard Metcalf	Monitoring is not required for SO2 and VOC, therefore the record keeping requirements should not include these parameters.	LDEQ agrees. These parameters will be removed from *draft* Specific Requirements 90, 99, 204, and 216.
86	EQT0015 – Specific Requirement 166	Thomas LaSalle	Please check wording on this one. Appears that ALL NG engines in this HP range (not just the ones modified or re-constructed), built on/after 7/1/08 but before 1/1/11, would be subject to the 1-gm standard. Additionally, it appears that the HP range spelled out should actually cover engines >25 HP (rather than >= 100HP) and < 130-HP.	It appears *draft* Specific Requirement 166 correctly reflects that portion of 40 CFR 60.4233(f)(4) that references 40 CFR 60.4233(e). According to §60.4233(f)(4): Owners and operators of stationary SI natural gas and lean burn LPG engines with a maximum engine power greater than 19 KW (25 HP), that are modified or reconstructed after June 12, 2006, must comply with the same emission standards as those specified in paragraph (d) or (e) of this section, except that such owners and operators of non-emergency engines and emergency engines greater than or equal to 130 HP must meet …

				This portion narrows the scope of engines to those between 25 and 130 horsepower (hp). However, §60.4233(e) only applies to engines greater than or equal to 100 hp. §60.4233(e) states, in part: Owners and operators of stationary SI ICE with a maximum engine power greater than or equal to 75 KW (100 HP) (except gasoline and rich burn engines that use LPG) must comply with the emission standards in Table 1 to this subpart for their stationary SI ICE.
87	EQT0015	Thomas LaSalle	Just a general comment noting that it is somewhat risky to try and specify requirements of federal emission programs - i.e. JJJJ. For example, Specific conditions 160, 162 & 164 fail to specify that engines manufactured before certain dates (i.e. 100-HP to 500-HP manufactured prior to 7/1/08) are exempt or grandfathered under JJJJ unless they were modified or re-constructed after 6/12/06. It is nice to have all conditions spelled out, so perhaps a general statement that protects the department in case there is a requirement in the permit that is misstated. Such a statement could clarify the fact that the federal program requirements will overrule the verbiage of the permit.	LDEQ acknowledges that, in some cases, the applicant will have to refer to the general applicability provisions. *Draft* Specific Requirements 160, 162, and 164 reflect 40 CFR 60.4233(e), which does not directly reference the July 1, 2008 date cited by the commenter. §60.4233(e) refers the reader to Table 1 of Subpart JJJJ. Table 1 includes references to July 1, 2008, which correspond to the applicability provisions set forth in §60.4230(a)(3)(iii) & (a)(4)(iii). Louisiana General Condition XX is intended to address discrepancies between Specific Requirements and the underlying federal or state regulation. Associated with each Specific Requirement in the permit shall be a citation of a federal or state regulation upon which the authority to include that Specific Requirement is based. In the event of a discrepancy between an applicable federal or state regulation and the corresponding permit Specific Requirement, the federal or state regulation shall prevail. If an applicable federal or state regulation is modified during the term of this permit such that it conflicts with the corresponding permit Specific Requirement, the modified regulation shall prevail, and the permittee shall comply with the modified regulation by any compliance dates established in the modified regulation.

				Given the format of the general permit, LDEQ seeks the regulated community's input as to whether very detailed synopses of potentially applicable federal regulations are helpful to permittees in their effort to ensure compliance with such regulations, or if generic references to such regulations are sufficient for this purpose.
88	EQT0015 - Specific Requirement 182	Thomas LaSalle	Please check wording on this one. Appears 40 CFR 60.8 would dictate when JJJJ tests are due. If so, this requires test w/i 60-days of achieving max. rate, but no later than 180-days of startup.	It appears the wording of Specific Requirement 182 accurately reflects the provisions of 40 CFR 60.4243(a)(2)(ii) & (iii), which requires a "performance test within 1 year of engine startup." (ii) If you are an owner or operator of a stationary SI internal combustion engine greater than or equal to 100 HP and less than or equal to 500 HP, you must keep a maintenance plan and records of conducted maintenance and must, to the extent practicable, maintain and operate the engine in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions. In addition, you must conduct an initial performance test within 1 year of engine startup to demonstrate compliance. (iii) If you are an owner or operator of a stationary SI internal combustion engine greater than 500 HP, you must keep a maintenance plan and records of conducted maintenance and must, to the extent practicable, maintain and operate the engine in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions. In addition, you must conduct an initial performance test within 1 year of engine startup and conduct subsequent performance testing every 8,760 hours or 3 years, whichever comes first, thereafter to demonstrate compliance.
89	EQT0015 - Specific Requirement 183	Thomas LaSalle	Recommend this condition be removed as conditions 185 thru 187 seem to better portray the requirements.	40 CFR 60.4243(a) [*draft* Specific Requirement 183] applies to owners or operators of a stationary SI internal combustion engine that is manufactured after July 1, 2008, and must comply

				with the emission standards specified in §60.4233**(a) - (c)**. 40 CFR 60.4243(b) [*draft* Specific Requirements 185-187] applies to owners or operators of a stationary SI internal combustion engine that must comply with the emission standards specified in §60.4233**(d) or (e)**.
90	EQT0015 - Specific Requirement 184	Thomas LaSalle	Recommend this condition be prefaced with the term (Certified Engines).	The change will be made. The second sentence of this Specific Requirement suggests that the permittee has chosen to operate and maintain the certified stationary SI internal combustion engine and control device according to the manufacturer's emission-related written instructions as described in 40 CFR 60.4243(a)(1).
91	EQT0015 - Specific Requirement 197 & 199	Thomas LaSalle	These methods should not be allowed under the general permit because they are too vague and too hard to enforce. It seems that a typical inspector will have a hard (if not impossible) time of sifting through these records to determine if the engine is actually operating within or outside of permit limits (ie. if combustion stability is off by 3% are NOx emissions within permit limits or if fuel header pressure is down by 3% are the CO emissions within permit limits?) Furthermore, removing the conditions will simplify the compliance monitoring process for engines and will NOT excluded many operators for General Permit coverage.	LDEQ acknowledges the parametric monitoring and semiannual preventive maintenance analysis options are seldom requested by permittees in the oil and gas industry. LDEQ agrees that removal of these options from the permit would simplify the document without significantly limiting its use. LDEQ will reconsider this matter if public comments to the contrary are received.
92	EQT0022 - Specific Requirement 219	Thomas LaSalle	Recommend the permit exclude any site subject to the control requirements of 2103 C, D or E. This would not exclude any (or very few) oil and gas sites. This would allow the department to remove specific requirement 219.	Section V.F (formerly Section VI.F) of the general permit specifies that: Except as noted below, each storage vessel located *prior to* lease custody transfer containing any material *other than* crude oil, condensate, or produced water shall have a capacity less than or equal to 19,800 gallons; each vessel storing crude oil, condensate, or produced water shall have a capacity less than or equal to 420,000 gallons. Except as noted below, each storage vessels located *after* lease custody transfer shall have a capacity less than or equal to 19,800 gallons. Storage vessels storing a liquid with a *maximum true vapor pressure* less than 0.5 psia are eligible for coverage under this general permit.

				In this way, storage vessels subject to LAC 33:III.2103.C, D, or E are excluded from coverage under the general permit. However, *draft* Specific Requirement 219 will be retained due to the change made in Response to Comment 34.
93	RLP0001 - Specific Requirement 221	Thomas LaSalle	What if 2104 changes due to the list of non-attainment parishes changing in the future? Would the general permit have to be revised? Can the general permit just have a blanket statement that pulls in any parish regulated under 2104?	See Response to Comment 98. If LAC 33:III.2104 is amended in the future such that its applicability provisions change, the general permit can be modified concurrently.
94	UNF0001 – Specific Requirement 231	Thomas LaSalle	Recommend that any reference to 'midstreamer' be removed. Recommend this condition be worded as follows: Total volume of crude oil/condensate and natural gas, processed by the facility, shall be recorded each month. These records shall be...	The change will be made.
95	General	Richard Metcalf	It appears that the permit does not address process vents, which includes many dehy's, controlled pursuant to Section 2115.	See Response to Comment 80.
96	General	Thomas LaSalle	Suggest that the Department issue a 'Certificate of Authorization to Operate'. Suggest that this document comprise of the General Permit along with a site specific document that will itemize emission point sources w/max. operating rates, runtimes, etc. That will allow surveillance something to use when inspecting a site.	LDEQ acknowledges the comment. LDEQ intends to authorize coverage under the general permit, not issue the general permit to individual sources such as is current practice for the Title V general permit. In order to conserve resources (paper, ink, mailing costs, etc.), a copy of the general permit itself may not accompany LDEQ's response. LDEQ agrees that it is essential for the Surveillance Division to have all pertinent information about a facility authorized to operate under the general permit; however, the source of the information, whether it be the application itself or a document generated by the Air Permits Division, is yet to be decided.
97	General	Thomas LaSalle	Last sentence on Cover page should read: This General Permit shall expire ten (10) years from the effective date of the Permit. The Certificate of Authorization to Operate would expire when the General Permit would expire, but would extend as the General Permit is re-issued to the Department.	LDEQ will strike "and the authorization to emit" from the cover letter of the permit because this phrase could be viewed as inconsistent with Section XII (formerly Section XIV) of the general permit.
98	General	Thomas LaSalle	Will this general permit be able to incorporate any new federal programs which could be promulgated within the 10-year life of the permit or will the permit become obsolete if EPA passes a new regulation for O&G operators?	Yes, LDEQ has designed the permit such that it can be modified without the need for all affected permittees to reapply for coverage should new federal or state regulations impacting the oil and gas industry be promulgated during the term of the permit. Section XII (formerly Section XIV) of the general

				permit specifies that: This permit may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. Upon modification or reissuance of this permit, the permittee shall comply with any new or modified requirements by any compliance dates established in the modified or reissued permit.
99	General	Will Ward	The most challenging element for industry in complying with the LA DEQ air quality regulations stems from the inability to predict the daily production, required surface equipment, or the lead time required from permit submittal to permit issuance. To this day, a new permit or minor modification can be under review from two to six months and in some cases much longer. This new general permitting process would be an opportunity to follow other states processes by allowing operators to begin construction upon filing an application claiming the general permit. The liability and risk of potential enforcement would be assumed by the applicant for misrepresenting any details in the application. This action would give industry the flexibility to conduct E & P operations more efficiently and eliminate the majority of air quality enforcement cases that result from operating before receiving a permit. This would allow enforcement to focus on more serious air violations that truly harm the environment or endanger human health.	See Response to Comment 36.
			STATEMENT OF BASIS COMMENTS	
100	General	Richard Metcalf	Any comments on the permit language should be reflected in the SOB document	LDEQ agrees.
101	Section II	Richard Metcalf	Lean Burn Engine definition - the language in this definition regarding less than or equal to 1.0 in exhaust gas oxygen concentration appears to be extremely low. AP-42 allows for a lean burn to be defined as up to 4.0 oxygen concentration in the exhaust gas.	The definition of "lean-burn engine" stems from LAC 33:III.2201.B and indicates that an engine of such type **is not capable** of being operated with an exhaust stream oxygen concentration **equal to or less than** 1.0 percent by volume on a dry basis. *Lean-Burn Engine*—a spark-ignited, Otto cycle, or two-stroke engine that is not capable of being operated with an exhaust stream oxygen concentration equal to or less than 1.0 percent by volume on a dry basis, as originally designed by the manufacturer. The exhaust gas oxygen concentration shall be determined from the uncontrolled exhaust stream. This is consistent with AP-42 3.2.2, which states, "The exhaust excess oxygen levels of lean-burn

				engines are typically around 8 percent, ranging from 4 to 17 percent." Note, however, that this definition has been deleted, as lean-burn engines are no longer referenced in the general permit. See Response to Comment 16.
102	Section VII.A.	Richard Metcalf	These should only apply to Chapter 22 regulated sources.	See Response to Comment 16.
103	Section VII.B.	Richard Metcalf	The 25 ton limit is not in Section 2104 and this should be deleted.	This requirement will be removed from the permit and SOB.
104	Statement of Basis, Section VIII.D.1. and 2.	Richard Metcalf	Remove the conditions applicable to *any* glycol dehydration units for which construction commence after the effective date of the general permit. This should only be applicable as required by the current regulations.	See Response to Comment 84.