

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
SHELL GULF OF MEXICO INC. and) PSD Approval No.
SHELL OFFSHORE INC.) R10OCS/PSD-AK-09-01
)

PETITION FOR REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....1

THRESHOLD PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS1

ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.....2

FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....3

A. Petitioners’ Interests6

LEGAL BACKGROUND7

STANDARD OF REVIEW9

ARGUMENT.....10

**I. REGION 10 ERRED BY EXCLUDING THE DISCOVERER’S
 PROPULSION ENGINE AND THE ASSOCIATED VESSELS
 FROM THE DEFINITION OF OCS SOURCE.....11**

**A. Region 10 Committed Clear Legal Error In Determining That
 The Drill Ship’s Propulsion Engine, The Icebreaker /Anchor
 Handler, And The Associated Fleet Do Not Meet The
 Regulatory Definition Of OCS Source.....11**

 1. Legal authority demonstrating how Region 10
 misinterpreted the regulatory definition of OCS source11

 2. Factual background regarding EPA’s application of the
 regulatory definition of OCS source12

 3. Preservation of error and subject of this petition14

 4. Argument14

 a. *EPA’s determination of when the Discoverer
 becomes an OCS source violates the plain language
 of the regulatory definition of OCS source.14*

 b. *Region 10 committed clear error in determining
 that its regulatory definition of OCS source does not
 apply to the anchor handler or any of the associated
 fleet.....18*

B. Region 10 Committed Clear Legal Error By Failing To Apply The Statutory Definition of OCS Source Or Even Rectify Its New Definition of The OCS Source With The Statutory Definition22

1. The legal requirements for what constitutes the OCS source under the Clean Air Act.....23

2. Factual background demonstrating the EPA violated the statutory definition of OCS source and never rectified its permit determination with the statute24

3. Preservation of error and subject of this petition25

4. Argument25

II. REGION 10 ERRED BY NOT REQUIRING COLLOCATED PM_{2.5} BACKGROUND DATA OR SECONDARY PM_{2.5} DATA IN DETERMINING WHETHER SHELL’S OPERATIONS ARE WITHIN THE NAAQS AND BY FAILING TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PM_{2.5} AND PM₁₀ IN APPLYING BACT.....32

A. Region 10’s Failure To Require Compliance With The Regulation Requiring Collocated Sampling Of PM_{2.5} By A Monitor With An Approved Quality Assurance Project Plan Was A Clear Error.....32

1. Legal requirements for the ambient air quality analysis accompanying a PSD permit application.....33

2. Factual background pertaining to the collection of background data on and monitoring of PM_{2.5} along the North Slope of Alaska.....34

3. Preservation of error and subject of this petition..37

4. Clear legal error was committed by EPA in not requiring collocated PM_{2.5} data before approving Shell’s permit37

B. Region 10’s Failure To Account For Secondary Particulate Matter Emissions Was A Clear Error40

1. Potential to emit, BACT and compliance with the NAAQS.....40

2.	Factual background on secondary PM _{2.5} formation.....	42
3.	Preservation of error and subject of this petition.....	44
4.	EPA’s legal errors resulting from the agency’s failure to take the formation of secondary PM _{2.5} into account.....	44
C.	Region 10’s Failure To Distinguish Between PM_{2.5} And PM₁₀ In Applying BACT To Shell’s Operations Was A Clear Error.....	48
III.	REGION 10 ERRED BY NOT REQUIRING SHELL TO COMPLY WITH EMERGING LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CO₂ AND NO₂ DESPITE ISSUING SHELL A PERMIT THAT IS WITHOUT TIME LIMITS AND THAT COVERS A VAST AREA OF THE CHUKCHI SEA.....	49
A.	The Failure To Regulate Shell’s CO₂ Emissions Is A Clear Legal Error	49
1.	The legal authority in support of the fact that carbon dioxide is a regulated pollutant under the Clean Air Act.....	49
2.	Factual background on the Arctic and Shell’s permit and CO ₂ emissions.....	52
3.	Preservation of error and subject of this petition	53
4.	EPA committed clear legal error by failing to regulate Shell’s CO ₂ emissions especially in light of its decision to approve a permit that pertains to all of Shell’s lease blocks in the entire Chukchi Sea	53
B.	Region 10 Committed A Clear Legal Error By Not Requiring Shell To Comply With The NO₂ NAAQS.....	59
1.	The legal authority in support of the fact that the Chukchi air permit should have required compliance with the new NO ₂ NAAQS.....	59
2.	The factual background demonstrating the need for compliance with the new NO ₂ NAAQS.....	59
3.	Preservation of error and subject of this petition	60
4.	Argument demonstrating that Region 10 failed to require compliance with current legal requirements	60

IV.	REGION 10 ERRED BY NOT REQUIRING THE INCLUSION OR REGULATION OF EMISSIONS FROM PLANNED, ROUTINE ASPECTS OF SHELL’S OPERATIONS.....	62
A.	Legal Background Establishing The Requirements For An Adequate Potential To Emit Calculation.....	62
B.	Factual Background On Shell’s Operations And How The Potential To Emit Was Challenged	63
C.	Preservation Of Error And Subject Of This Petition.....	64
D.	Argument As To Why Shell’s Potential To Emit Calculation Was Legally Inadequate.....	64
V.	REGION 10 COMMITTED A CLEAR LEGAL ERROR BY NOT PERFORMING AN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSIS	67
A.	Legal Background Supporting The Need For Environmental Justice Analyses Of PSD Permits	67
B.	Factual Background Demonstrating That An Environmental Justice Analysis Was Necessary For The Chukchi Air Permit	67
	1. Background on regulation of PM_{2.5} under the Clean Air Act.....	68
	2. Background on the regulation of NO₂ under the Clean Air Act.....	69
C.	Preservation Of Error And Subject Of This Petition.....	69
D.	Argument	69
	CONCLUSION	72

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. sections 55.6(a)(3) and 124.19(a), Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC) and Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope (ICAS) (Petitioners), petition for review of the conditions of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit No.R10OCS/ PSD-AK-09-01, which Region 10 of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued on March 31, 2010 for the proposed operations of Shell Gulf of Mexico, Inc. and Shell Offshore Inc. (hereafter Shell) on lease blocks in the Chukchi Sea. A copy of the final OCS PSD permit is attached as Exhibit 1.

The Chukchi OCS permit authorizes Shell “to construct and operate the Frontier Discoverer drillship and its air emission units” on over 250 lease blocks in the Chukchi Sea off the northwest coast of Alaska. Exhibit 1 at 1. Because the permit fails to include necessary permit conditions, fails to make certain necessary findings, is based on erroneous legal interpretations, and raises important policy considerations that the Board should address, review is appropriate pursuant to 40 C.F.R. part 124.

THRESHOLD PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

Petitioners have standing to petition for review of the permit decision because they live in the communities that will be impacted by Shell’s emissions and because they participated in the public comment period on the draft permit. 40 C.F.R. § 124.19(a); Petitioners’ Revised Chukchi Comment Letter (Exhibit 2); Petitioners Original Chukchi Comment Letter (Exhibit 3); *see also* EPA Response to Comments at 1 (Exhibit 4) (noting that “EPA received written comments on the January 2010 modified proposed permit from . . . the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC), the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope (ICAS), and the North Slope Borough (NSB) in a combined comment letter”). As described

below, the issues raised by Petitioners in this petition were either raised with EPA during the public comment period or are directly related to EPA's response to comments. This petition was timely filed because EPA set May 3, 2010 as the deadline for appeals. EPA Notice.

Consequently, the Board has jurisdiction to hear Petitioners' timely request for review. 40 C.F.R. § Part 124.

ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Petitioners respectfully request that the Board review the following issues:

1. Region 10 committed clear error by violating the plain language of its own regulation in determining that the drill ship's propulsion engine, the ice breaker/anchor handler, and the associated fleet are not part of the OCS source. Region 10 committed clear error by failing to apply the statutory definition of OCS source to Shell's operations and by failing to provide a rational explanation for ignoring the statute.
2. Region 10 committed clear error by failing to require compliance with the regulation that requires collocated PM_{2.5} sampling subject to an approved QAPP to establish PM_{2.5} baselines.
3. Region 10 committed clear error in not including secondary PM_{2.5} emissions in the air quality analysis and by not performing an environmental justice analysis of the particulate matter emissions on the local populations that already suffer from disparate lung and heart health problems when compared to other U.S. populations.
4. Region 10 committed clear error by failing to distinguish between PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ in applying BACT to Shell's emissions.
5. Region 10 committed a clear error by deciding not to require BACT for the regulated pollutant CO₂ and failing to provide a legally defensible position on why CO₂ is not a regulated pollutant. Important policy considerations weigh in favor of CO₂ controls for Shell's permit that contains no time limits and covers over 250 lease blocks in the Chukchi Sea.
6. Region 10 committed clear error by not requiring compliance with the new NAAQS for NO₂ or providing a legally defensible position for not addressing the environmental justice concerns raised with the permit.

7. Region 10 committed clear error by not requiring the inclusion of emissions from the clean-up of an oil spill, the response to a shallow hazard emergency, or high ice levels in Shell's Potential to Emit even though these events are all well defined, planned for, and are otherwise part of Shell's routine.
8. Region 10 committed a clear legal error by failing to perform an environmental justice analysis on the impacts of the air pollution from the Chukchi air permit on Inupiat communities.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Due to concerns about the safety of their food and the health of their people, communities along the North Slope successfully sought review of minor source air permits issued to Shell in 2007. *In re Shell Offshore Inc.*, OCS 07-01; OCS 07-02. In 2008, a second petition for review was filed over the second set of minor source permits issued to Shell. *In re Shell Offshore, Inc.*, OCS Appeal Nos. 08-01; 08-02; and 08-03. Those petitions were dismissed when Shell withdrew the permits.

Today, Petitioners seek review of the major source air permit issued to Shell for substantially the same operations. This is the first major source OCS PSD permit in the country. Shell is proposing to explore for hydrocarbons using a drillship the Discoverer accompanied by: two ice breakers (one of which also serves as an anchor handler), a supply ship, an Oil Spill Response fleet (consisting of an offshore management ship and three 34-foot work boats), an oil tanker, a barge, and shallow water landing craft. EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 23 (Exhibit 5). The air permit covers "drilling operations in the Chukchi Sea between July 1 and December 31 each year." Final Chukchi Permit at 10 (Exhibit 1). The permit applies to any of Shell's operations in over 250 lease blocks. *Id.* at 1. The permit has no time limit but Shell will need to apply for a Title V permit within 12 months after starting its operations pursuant to the PSD permit. EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 25 (Exhibit 5).

In 2010, Shell is proposing to drill up to three wells in the Chukchi Sea and – during the same timeframe – two wells in the vicinity of Camden Bay in the Beaufort Sea. *See* Excerpts of Exploration Plans submitted by Shell to MMS for operations in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas (Exhibit 6). The Mineral Management Service’s approval of these Exploration Plans is currently being reviewed by the Court of Appeal for the Ninth Circuit. *See AEWC v. Salazar*, Case Nos. 09-73944, No. 10-70368; *Native Village of Point Hope v. Salazar*, Case Nos. 09-73942, 10-70166. Argument is set for May 6, 2010 in these consolidated cases. Shell must also obtain incidental harassment authorizations (IHAs) from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Public notice and the opportunity to comment on Shell’s IHA for its Chukchi Sea operations has not yet occurred.

The draft Chukchi air permit and original Statement of Basis was originally released for public comment from August 20, 2009 until October 5, 2009. EPA Website, Chukchi Air Permit (Exhibit 7). As a result of the comments received on the permit, EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 3, EPA decided to revise and issue a new draft permit and Statement of Basis for public comment from January 8, 2010 until February 17, 2010. EPA Website, Chukchi Air Permit. Petitioners submitted comments during both comment periods. *Id.*¹

According to Shell’s calculations, its operations would result in:

Pollutant	Chukchi Potential To Emit (tons per year)	Significant Emission Rate (tons per year)²
CO	449	100
NO _x	1,188	40
PM	260	25
PM _{2.5}	52	10 (40 for NO _x or SO ₂)
PM ₁₀	58	15

¹ EPA has also issued an OCS PSD permit for Shell’s Beaufort Sea operations. That permit was issued on April 12, 2010 and any petitions for review are due May 12, 2010.

² Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(23)(i) a permit applicant must apply BACT for each pollutant for which the potential to emit exceeds the significant emission rate or SER.

Pollutant	Chukchi Potential To Emit (tons per year)	Significant Emission Rate (tons per year)²
SO ₂	2*	40
VOC	87	40
Lead	0.11	0.6
Ozone	See VOC and NO _x	(40 for VOC or NO _x)

* This sum was reduced after Shell agreed to use ultra-low sulfur fuel in the Revised Chukchi Permit, but originally was calculated at 181 tons per year of SO₂. EPA, Original Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 15 (Exhibit 8).

These potential to emit calculations only take into account the emissions from the engines on board the drill ship, but not its propulsion engine, and those vessels in the associated fleet that will operate within 25 miles of the Discoverer during the normal course of their operations. EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 23 (Exhibit 5).

Shell’s “associated fleet” includes two icebreakers, a resupply ship, an oil response fleet (including an offshore management ship and three 34-foot work boats), and other vessels that will remain more than 25 miles from the Discoverer. Petitioners Comments at 9 (Exhibit 1). Region 10 has calculated that these vessels will emit at least 95 percent of Shell’s total emissions of the five criteria pollutants. Appendix A, EPA Revised Stmt of Basis at A-1: Summary of Annual Emissions for the Discoverer and the Associated Fleets (Exhibit 5). The permit only controls the emissions from the engines on board the drill ship the Discoverer (except for its propulsion engine) and the engines on board the supply ship (except for its propulsion engine) when it is attached to the Discoverer. The “permit does not impose BACT on emission units that comprise the Associated Fleet.” EPA RTC at 23 (Exhibit 4) (“this permit does not impose BACT on emission units that comprise the Associated Fleet”).

After applying emission limitations to the Discoverer and the supply ship, Region 10 had to impose additional restrictions on Shell’s emissions to “ensure attainment of the NAAQS and compliance with increment for some pollutants.” EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 29

(Exhibit 5). These additional restrictions include operational limitations for the time and location of the certain vessels. *See e.g.*, Chukchi Final Permit at 53 (Exhibit 1) (requiring the supply ship to limit its use of its propulsion engine).

A. Petitioners' Interests.

The Inupiat people have lived along the North Slope of Alaska and relied upon the abundant marine life in this area to feed their people since time immemorial. Their subsistence lifestyle is the basis of their culture, which is centered around bowhead whales and the whale hunt, but also other marine life such as fish and walrus as well as migratory waterfowl and other species that are critical to the Inupiat diet. With the advent of modern technologies, the Inupiat have learned that those operations that pollute the air and water also contaminate their food sources and threaten their health.

With the onset of global warming, the ice in this Arctic region once thought to be impermeable is now subsiding and the rush to discover marketable oil and gas resources, develop new shipping routes, and otherwise access this once rarely accessible area will have an untold impact on Inupiat culture and the fragile environment upon which the culture is based. Put another way, Inupiat are experiencing the effects of global climate change well before most other U.S. populations.

The Inupiat people who will be affected by Shell's air emissions live in isolated areas and enjoy a lifestyle and diet that is radically different from other populations in the United States. Communities along the North Slope of Alaska have markedly higher rates of pulmonary disease than the general U.S. population, and may have genetic predispositions to disease that differ from other U.S. populations. As abundant public health data has demonstrated, Inupiat are substantially more vulnerable to morbidity and mortality from air pollution than are other

Americans. For example, rates of chronic lung disease on the North Slope are dramatically higher than in the general U.S. population. MMS, Beaufort Sea and Chukchi Sea Planning Areas, Oil and Gas Lease Sales 209, 212, 217, and 221 OCS EIS/EA MMS 2008-0055, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, at 3-232.

Compared to many areas in the United States, the communities along the North Slope of Alaska have fewer combustion sources. Although they are recipients of air pollution from other areas, North Slope communities are still relatively pristine. Oil and gas operations will impact air quality on the North Slope. For example, as EPA has noted, “[o]zone levels” and the levels of “ozone precursors (*i.e.*, NO_x and VOC)” in areas where “oil and gas operations are currently located” in Alaska are “higher than the levels that have been collected” on the North Slope. E EPA Original Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 76 (Exhibit 8).

LEGAL BACKGROUND

In response to concerns about air pollution from sources on the outer continental shelf (OCS), Congress amended the Clean Air Act in 1990 to include a new provision, section 328, which mandates the development of “requirements to control air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf sources located offshore of the” United States. 42 U.S.C. § 7627(a)(1). OCS sources include equipment and activities that emit any air pollutant, are regulated under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, and are located on waters above the outer continental shelf, specifically including drill ship exploration. 42 U.S.C. § 7627(a)(4)(C). Section 328 requires EPA to promulgate regulations to ensure that outer continental shelf or “OCS sources” comply with the Prevent of Significant Deterioration (PSD) provisions of the Clean Air Act. *Id.* § 7627(a)(1) (requiring compliance with “part C of subchapter I” of the Act).

As its name suggests, the PSD program is intended to prevent existing air quality levels from deteriorating. Its provisions, therefore, seek to protect public health and welfare from the adverse effects of air pollution and “to insure that economic growth will occur in a manner consistent with the preservation of existing clean air resources.” 42 U.S.C. §§ 7470(1), (3). Motivated by a concern that air pollutants could have serious harmful effects to health even at concentrations below primary ambient air quality standards, *see* H.R. Rep. 95-294, at 105-127 (1978) *reprinted in* 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1077, 1183-1205, Congress adopted the PSD provisions, which embody “a policy of maximum practicable protection of health,” *id.* at 127 *reprinted in* 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N. at 1206. When adopting the PSD provisions, Congress made clear that practices that “squander[] finite air resources, thereby limiting the potential for long-term economic growth” are contrary to the national interest as reflected in the PSD program. *Id.* at 152 *in* 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N. at 1231. Thus, the PSD provisions also “assure that any decision to permit increased air pollution ... is made only after careful evaluation of all the consequences of such a decision and after adequate procedural opportunities for informed public participation in the decisionmaking process.” 42 U.S.C. § 7470(5).

A central provision of the PSD program is the requirement that, prior to constructing any “major emitting facility,” an applicant must obtain a permit from EPA. *Id.* § 7475(a)(1). To obtain a PSD permit, the owner or operator of a proposed major emitting facility must demonstrate that emissions from construction or operation of the facility will not cause or contribute to a violation of any National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) or other applicable emission standard and must conduct monitoring as necessary to determine the effect of emissions on air quality. *Id.* §§ 7475(a)(3), (a)(7). The proposed facility also will be “subject to the best available control technology for each pollutant subject to regulation . . . emitted from,

or which results from, such facility.” *Id.* § 7475(a)(4). EPA has defined “best available control technology” or BACT to mean “an emissions limitation (including a visible emission standard) based on the maximum degree of reduction for each pollutant subject to regulation” 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(12).

Pursuant to Clean Air Act section 328, an OCS source includes “any equipment, activity, or facility which— (i) emits or has the potential to emit any air pollutant, (ii) is regulated or authorized under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act [], and (iii) is located on the Outer Continental Shelf or in or on waters above the Outer Continental Shelf.” 42 U.S.C. § 7627 (a)(4)(C).

To determine whether an OCS source exceeds the 250-ton limit and is a major source, EPA calculates its “potential to emit,” which is defined as “the maximum emissions of a pollutant from an OCS source operating at its design capacity.” 40 C.F.R. § 55.2. The Clean Air Act is clear that “emissions from any vessel servicing or associated with an OCS source, including emissions while at the OCS source or en route to or from the OCS source within 25 miles of the OCS source, shall be considered direct emissions from the OCS source.” 42 U.S.C. § 7627 (a)(4)(C).

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Board reviews a permitting authority’s final permit decision if the decision is based on “a clearly erroneous finding of fact or conclusion of law, or involves an important matter of policy or exercise of discretion that warrants review.” *In re Northern Michigan University*, PSD Appeal No. 08-02, slip op. at 10 (Feb. 18, 2009), 14 E.A.D. __ (citing 40 C.F.R. § 124.19(a)). As part of its review, the Board is to determine “whether the permit issuer ‘duly considered’ the issues raised in the comments and whether the approach ultimately adopted by the [permit issuer]

is rational in light of all information in the record.” *In re Shell*, slip op. at 41 (quoting *In Re Gov’t of D.C. Mun. Separate Storm Sewer.*, 10 E.A.D. 323, 342 (EAB 2002)). The rationale for the decision must be “adequately explained and supported in the record.” *In re Shell*, slip op. at 41 (citing *In re City of Moscow, Idaho*, 10 E.A.D. 135, 142 (EAB 2001); *In re NE Hub Partners, L.P.*, 7 E.A.D. 561, 567-68 (EAB 1998)). Furthermore, “two differing explanations” render the rationale for the permit determination unclear and subject to remand. *In re Austin Powder Co.*, 6 E.A.D. 713, 719-20 (EAB 1997) (citing *In re GSX Servs. of s. c., Inc.*, 4 E.A.D. 451, 454 (EAB 1992) (holding that the administrative record must reflect the “considered judgment” necessary to the support the permit determination)).

In front of the Board, Region 10 is not entitled to deference for any of its interpretations of statutory or regulatory provisions that it has advanced. *See, e.g., In re Lazarus, Inc.*, 7 E.A.D. 318, 351 n.55 (EAB 1997) (noting the general rule that agencies may not advance “the doctrine of administrative deference . . . because the Board serves as the final decisionmaker for EPA in cases within the Board’s jurisdiction”).

ARGUMENT

I. REGION 10 ERRED BY EXCLUDING THE DISCOVERER’S PROPULSION ENGINE AND THE ASSOCIATED VESSELS FROM THE DEFINITION OF OCS SOURCE.

EPA committed clear legal error in issuing the Chukchi OCS permit to Shell. Region 10 misapplied its regulatory definition of OCS source in determining that the drillship the Discoverer is only regulated once secure and stable at the well site – thus excluding regulation of the drillship’s propulsion engine and the ice breaker that attaches to the drillship for the purpose of dropping its anchors. More importantly, Region 10’s decision that only the engines on the drillship (except the propulsion engine) and the supply ship while attached to the drillship are

OCS sources directly conflicts with the statutory definition of OCS source. EPA failed to provide a reasoned explanation for its failure to comply with the plain language of the Clean Air Act in delineating the vessels and engines that would be regulated under the permit.

A. Region 10 Committed Clear Legal Error In Determining That The Drill Ship's Propulsion Engine, The Icebreaker /Anchor Handler, And The Associated Fleet Do Not Meet The Regulatory Definition Of OCS Source.

By failing to regulate the Discoverer's propulsion engine and the associated fleet, Region 10 ignored Congress's intent to regulate the emissions from these sources, violating the definition of OCS source in EPA's regulations. None of the arguments that Region 10 advances in its response to comments can justify its failure to follow its own regulation. To correct these errors, the Board should review Region 10's permitting decision and remand the permit to the agency.

1. Legal authority demonstrating how Region 10 misinterpreted the regulatory definition of OCS source.

Under section 328 of the Clean Air Act, EPA is required to regulate "Outer Continental Shelf Sources" for the purpose of controlling air pollution, attaining and maintaining ambient air quality standards, and complying with the PSD program. 42 U.S.C. § 7627(a); *see, e.g.*, Conference Report 136 Cong. Rec. S16895-01 (Oct. 27, 1990). The regulatory definition of "OCS Source" provides:

[t]his definition shall include vessels only when they are:

- (1) Permanently or temporarily attached to the seabed and erected thereon and used for the purpose of exploring, developing or producing resources therefrom, within the meaning of section 4(a)(1) of OCSLA (43 U.S.C. Sec. 1331 et seq.); or
- (2) Physically attached to an OCS facility, in which case only the stationary sources aspects of the vessels will be regulated.

40 C.F.R. § 55.2.

2. Factual background regarding EPA’s application of the regulatory definition of OCS source.

Shell’s exploration plan for the Chukchi Sea will require the first major source OCS PSD permit in the country. Throughout this permitting process, Region 10 has struggled to apply the regulatory definition of OCS source to Shell’s operations ultimately changing its interpretation of when the drillship, the Discoverer, becomes an OCS source. Region 10 initially took the position that the Discoverer becomes an OCS source as soon as the first anchor is attached to the seabed. EPA Letter of Incompleteness to Shell Attachment A at 3 (Jan. 16, 2009) (Exhibit 9) (“[w]hen the first anchor is laid, the Discoverer is considered a stationary source”).

In the original draft permit in August 2009, Region 10 defined the Discoverer as an OCS source “during all times between placement of the first anchor on the seabed to removal of the last anchor from the seabed at a drill site.” Chukchi Original Proposed Permit at 5 (Exhibit 10). In the Statement of Basis accompanying the original draft permit, Region 10 provided no explanation for this interpretation. EPA Original Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 21 (Exhibit 8). Several commenters, including Shell and petitioners, questioned Region 10’s interpretation and proposed alternative interpretations. Shell suggested that the Discoverer does not become an OCS source until it is “stabilized and the anchoring process is complete.” EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 20 (Exhibit 5). Petitioners argued that the Discoverer’s propulsion engine and the associated vessels must be regulated as part of the OCS source. Petitioners’ Comments on the Original Draft Permit at 8 (Exhibit 3).

When Region 10 proposed the revised draft Chukchi permit, it included two alternative options for the definition of OCS source. EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 20 (Exhibit 5). Option 1 reflected the same definition that Region 10 proposed in the original draft permit. Option 2 reflected Shell’s suggestion, proposing to define the Discoverer “from the time the

Discoverer is declared by the Shell's on-site company representative to be secure and stable in a position to commence exploratory activity at the drill site." *Id.* at 21. Neither option addressed the petitioners' concerns that the Discoverer becomes an OCS source well before the placement of the first anchor or that the associated fleet is included within the definition of OCS source.

In the Statement of Basis for the Revised permit, Region 10 relied upon the same reasoning to justify both Options 1 and 2. EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 21 (Exhibit 5). Region 10 stated, "[u]nder [Option 1], connection of the Discoverer to the seabed by an anchor at the drill site would be considered both attachment to and erection on the seabed." *Id.* In support of Option 2, Region 10 supplied the reasoning: that after the Discoverer becomes secure and stable, "the Discoverer is clearly both attached to and erected on the seabed 'for the purpose of exploring, developing or producing resources therefrom' within the meaning of EPA's OCS implementing regulations." *Id.*

In the final permit, Region 10 decided to apply Option 2 to define when Shell's operations become an OCS source. Concluding the Discoverer is as an OCS source when:

declared by the Discoverer's on-site company representative to be secure and stable in a position to commence exploratory activity at the drill site until the Discoverer's on-site company representative declares that, due to retrieval of anchors or disconnection of its anchors, it is no longer sufficiently stable to conduct exploratory activity at the drill site, as documented by the records maintained pursuant to Condition B.2.2.

Final Chukchi OCS Permit at 5 (Exhibit 1). In explaining this definition, Region 10 interpreted the regulatory definition to mean that a vessel must be "in a position to begin exploring" before it becomes an OCS source.

Throughout the permitting process, Region 10 took the position that the associated fleet does not fall within the definition of OCS source and thus is not subject to regulation. EPA RTC at 22-23 (Exhibit 4).

3. Preservation of error and subject of this petition.

Petitioners preserved this issue for appeal in their comments of February 17, 2010.

Petitioners Comments on Revised Chukchi Permit at 9-17 (Exhibit 2).

This issue is properly subject to appeal because EPA committed a clear legal error by not applying its regulatory definition of OCS source to Shell's proposed operations.

4. Argument.

Region 10 erred by narrowly interpreting "OCS source" to allow Shell to escape regulation of a significant source of its emissions: the Discoverer's propulsion engine, the icebreaker/ anchor handler and the rest of the associated fleet. Region 10 ignores the plain language of the regulatory definition and instead offers its own factual and legal interpretations that conflict with the regulation. In so doing, Region 10 ensured that the propulsion engine of the drill ship would not be regulated by the permit. It also foreclosed any regulation of the ice breaker/ anchor handler, which attaches to the Discoverer to place the anchors once the drill ship is at the well site. Finally, EPA ignored language in the regulation calling for the regulation of the associated fleet – *i.e.*, the fleet of other vessels accompanying the drill ship including: two ice breakers, a supply ship, an Oil Spill Response fleet (consisting of an offshore management ship and three 34-foot work boats), an oil tanker, a barge, and shallow water landing craft. EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 23 (Exhibit 5).

- a. EPA's determination of when the Discoverer becomes an OCS source violates the plain language of the regulatory definition of OCS source.*

In the final permit, Region 10 determined that the Discoverer does not become an OCS source until an on-site Shell representative announces that the Discoverer is ready to commence exploratory activities. By adopting the argument that the Discoverer does not become an "OCS

source” until it is secure and stable at the drill site, Region 10 violated its own regulatory definition of OCS source.

The regulation provides that any equipment that has the potential to emit air pollutants, is authorized under OCSLA, and is located on the OCS that is also “[p]ermanently or temporarily attached to the seabed and erected thereon and used for the purpose of exploring . . . resources” is an OCS source. 40 C.F.R. § 55.2. After dropping a single anchor, the Discoverer meets all three regulatory requirements: it is 1) attached to the seabed; 2) erected thereon; and 3) used for the purpose of exploring for resources. 40 C.F.R. § 55.2. This is demonstrated by the Record. EPA, MMS, and Petitioners all agree that the Discoverer does not have to have all of its anchors set to engage in actual exploration related activities. *See* EPA RTC at 17 (Exhibit 4) (rejecting a commenter’s argument that the Discoverer must actually be engaged in exploratory operations to be “used for the purpose of exploring”); Letter from Jeffery Walker, MMS (Exhibit 11); Petitioners Comments on the Revised Chukchi Permit at 14 (Exhibit 2). Moreover, the entire purpose for bringing the drill ship to the OCS is to explore for hydrocarbons.

Dating back to January 16, 2009, Region 10 took the position that the Discoverer becomes an OCS source when it was attached by a single anchor to the seabed. EPA Letter of Incompleteness to Shell Attachment A at 3, (Jan. 16, 2009) (Exhibit 9) (“[w]hen the first anchor is laid, the Discoverer is considered a stationary source”). The agency maintained this position when it initially issued the draft permit. Chukchi Original Proposed Permit at 5 (Exhibit 10). When EPA re-proposed the draft permit in January 2010, the agency included this position as “Option 1.” EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 21 (Exhibit 5). But when the agency issued the final permit, the agency rejected Option 1. Chukchi Final Permit at 5 (Exhibit 1). This change in position was never adequately explained by the agency and certainly is not supported

by the record and therefore, should not be upheld by the board. *Kulluk*, slip op. at 48 (remanding Shell's minor source permit because Region 10 had failed to adequately provide record support for or adequately explain its permitting decision); *see also In re: Deseret Power Electric Cooperative*, PSD Appeal No. 07-03, slip op. at 62 (EAB Nov. 13, 2008), 14 E.A.D. __ (“[A]n agency changing its course . . . is obligated to supply a reasoned analysis for the change beyond that which may be required when an agency does not act in the first instance.” (quoting *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 42 (1983))).³

Region 10’s first response is that defining when a particular vessel becomes an OCS source is a factual determination. *See, e.g.*, EPA RTC at 19 (Exhibit 4) (stating “the point in time at which a particular vessel or drilling rig becomes an OCS source within the meaning of the OCS regulations is a fact specific determination.”). However, this assertion is faulty because the agency is actually offering a new legal interpretation of the regulatory definition that requires the source be “secure and stable” to determine when the Discoverer becomes an OCS source.

Region 10 next explains that:

the Discoverer will be an “OCS source” from the time the Discoverer is sufficiently secure and stable to commence exploratory activity at the drill site, which in the case of the Discoverer, is a determination made for other operational purposes by the Shell on-site representative and is an event that is recorded in the Discoverer’s logs. In reaching this conclusion, EPA relies on the fact that the regulatory definition of OCS source requires more than just attachment to the seabed. Specifically, the definition provides, in part, that vessels are OCS sources only when they are “[p]ermanently or temporarily attached to the seabed and erected thereon *and* used for the purpose of exploring, developing or producing resources therefrom, within the meaning of section 4(a)(1) of OCSLA (43 U.S.C. § 1331 et seq.)” 40 C.F.R. 55.2 (defining “OCS source”) (emphasis added). The Agency interprets this provision to require that vessels be permanently or

³ Under this interpretation, the Discoverer would most likely have to use the propulsion engine after the first anchor is dropped, as several commenters, including MMS and Shell, pointed out on the original draft permit. Petitioners’ Comments on Chukchi Revised Permit at 14.

temporarily attached to the seabed and in a position to begin exploring, developing or producing resources from the OCS.

EPA RTC at 16 (Exhibit 4). This explanation is not supported by the record, which clearly establishes that the drillship can be attached by as little as one anchor to the seabed while being used for the purpose of exploration. *See Kulluk Slip op.* at 18 (remanding a permit because Region 10 provided “no record foundation . . . other than a brief statement in its Response to Comments that [was] unsupported by facts or analysis in the record.”)

Region 10 next relies on a quotation from the preamble to the regulation definition. EPA RTC at 16-17 (Exhibit 4). However, this quotation merely restates the language in the regulatory definition providing that

[v]essels therefore will be included in the definition of ‘OCS source’ when they are ‘permanently or temporarily attached to the seabed’ and are being used ‘for the purpose of exploring, developing or producing resources therefrom. This would include, for example, drill ships on the OCS.

Id. (citing 57 Fed. Reg. 40,792, 40,793 (September 4, 1992)). First of all, this quote does not support Region 10’s conclusion that vessels must be “in a position to begin exploring” to be “erected thereon and used for the purposes of exploring” within the meaning of the regulatory definition. As explained, a vessel can be “erected thereon and used for the purposes of exploring” before it is “in a position to begin exploring.” Thus, Region 10 simply made up a legal requirement that does not exist in regulation, making the agency’s decision erroneous. *See In re: Arecibo & Aguadilla Regional Wastewater Treatment Plants* 12 E.A.D. 97, n.60, 130 NPDES Appeal Nos. 02-09 & 03-05 (March 10, 2005) (“if language is plain and unambiguous it must be given effect.”).

Region 10 further argues that because it is possible that the Discoverer could be located somewhere other than the drill site when attached by only one anchor, it should not be

considered an OCS source at that point in time. EPA RTC at 17 (Exhibit 4). However, the regulatory language only requires that the equipment be “used for the purpose of exploring,” 40 C.F.R. § 55.2, not that the equipment actually be engaged in exploration activities – as Region 10 has admitted. EPA RTC at 17 (Exhibit 4) (rejecting a commenter's argument that the Discoverer must actually be engaged in exploratory operations to be “used for the purpose of exploring”). Aside from transporting the drill ship through the OCS for purposes of repair, a majority of the time the drill ship is in the OCS *for the purpose of exploring* for or producing hydrocarbons as authorized under OCSLA. Thus, there is no support for Region 10’s effort to draw a distinction between when the drill ship is a “ship” and when it is drilling, the Board should remand the permit. *Kulluk*, slip op. at 18 (remanding a permit because Region 10 provided “no record foundation . . . other than a brief statement in its Response to Comments that [was] unsupported by facts or analysis in the record”).

- b. Region 10 committed clear error in determining that its regulatory definition of OCS source does not apply to the anchor handler or any of the associated fleet.*

Had Region 10 properly applied its regulation to the Discoverer, then it would have had to conclude that the ice breaker/anchor handler is also part of the OCS source, because it is attached to the Discoverer while dropping the anchors. The second prong of the regulatory definition of OCS source provides that equipment that is “[p]hysically attached to an OCS facility” is considered to be part of the OCS source “in which case only the stationary sources aspects of the vessels will be regulated.” 40 C.F.R. § 55.2. Thus, once attached to the Discoverer for the purpose of dropping its anchors, the ice breaker/anchor handler is subject to regulation as part of the OCS source.

In response to this point, Region 10 argues that Icebreaker #2 “is not ‘permanently or temporarily attached’ to the Discoverer during the time it is assisting the Discoverer in the anchor setting and retrieval process at a drill site.” EPA RTC at 25 (Exhibit 4). The reason is that the cable connecting the Discoverer and the icebreaker/ anchor handler during anchoring does not fall within the regulation’s meaning of “temporarily attached.” To be temporarily attached, Region 10 explains means that the “purpose” of attachment must be to “prevent or minimize relative movement between two vessels.” *Id.* (citing preamble to the regulatory definition). This is clearly contrary to the plain language of the regulation, which contains no such requirement. Region 10’s citation to the preamble to the final regulatory definition fails to support its argument. Nothing in the preamble suggests that there must be a specific “purpose” to the attachment.

Region 10’s alternative argument, that even if the Icebreaker #2 is attached to the Discoverer it is not conducting “stationary source activities” that may be regulated, is also clearly erroneous. EPA RTC at 25 (Exhibit 4). Again, the regulation contains no such requirement. The regulation clarifies that only that the stationary aspects of the equipment (*i.e.*, not the propulsion engine) will be regulated under the Clean Air Act. 40 C.F.R. § 55.2 (stating that when a vessel is “physically attached” to an OCS facility, “only the stationary source aspects of the vessels will be regulated”). But it does not specify that only “stationary source activities” are regulated. Nor does EPA even explain what it means by “stationary source activities” or offer any record support for this argument. EPA RTC at 25 (Exhibit 4).

In deciding whether the regulation requires regulation of the Icebreaker and the other associated vessels,⁴ Region 10 should have considered 1) Congress's intent to regulate associated vessels, 2) section 328's goals, all of which require Region 10 to conduct a BACT determination for the associated fleet, and 3) EPA's definition of "stationary source" under the PSD program. *Northern Michigan University*, slip op. at 46 (rejecting Sierra Club's "plain language" argument based upon other factors that showed Congress's intent supported the agency's decision) ((citing *In re Rochester Pub. Utils.*, 11 E.A.D. 593, 603-08 (EAB 2004) (Board generally will give effect to unambiguous regulatory language, but where the meaning of a regulation is unclear, the Board must construe the regulation in light of its context and purpose), *appeal dismissed by stip. sub nom. Minn. Ctr. for Env'tl. Advocacy v. EPA*, No. 05-1113 (8th Cir. Jan. 12, 2005)).

Under section 328, Congress clearly intended for EPA to regulate vessels associated with OCS sources in the same manner as OCS sources. S. Conf. Rep. No. 136, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. at S16983 (1990) (stating that "the cruising emissions from marine vessels are controlled and offset as if they were part of the OCS facility's emissions" and considering emissions from vessels associated with an OCS source "including those from crew and supply boats, construction barges, tugboats, and tankers," to be "part of the OCS facility emissions *for the purposes of regulation*") (emphasis added). Congress's express goal for section 328 was to control air pollution on the OCS. 42 U.S.C. § 4627(a). As Shell's operations demonstrate, vessels associated with a drill ship represent the overwhelming majority of drill ship exploration

⁴ At the outset, Petitioners would like to note that nothing in the regulatory definition expressly prohibits Region 10 from applying BACT to vessels associated with an OCS source that are not actually defined as being part of an OCS source. 40 C.F.R. § 55.2.

emissions.⁵ Exempting vessels associated with drill ship exploration, an activity that Congress expressly included within the definition of OCS source, will seriously undermine section 328's goal of controlling air pollution on the OCS by allowing the vast majority of the emissions from drill-ship exploration to escape regulation.⁶ By failing to regulate the emissions from the associated fleet in the same manner as the Discoverer, Region 10 has interpreted the regulatory definition in a way that conflicts with Congress's intent.

Applying BACT to the associated fleet is the only way that Region 10 can interpret the regulation consistently with the EPA's definition of stationary source under the PSD program. EPA requires a BACT determination for all stationary sources, including all of a facility's "pollutant emitting activities." 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(5) (defining "any building, structure, facility, or installation," part of the definition of "stationary source," as "all of the pollutant-emitting activities which belong to the same industrial grouping, are located on one or more contiguous or adjacent properties, and are under the control of the same person (or persons under common control)"). As an integral part of the Discoverer's operations, all of the vessels in the associated fleet are a part of the Discoverer's "pollutant-emitting activities" because they are grouped together for the purposes of the permit, are located within the same lease block area, and are all controlled by Shell. *See* EPA RTC at 25 (Exhibit 4) (describing how Icebreaker #2 is required to set the anchors before the Discoverer can drill); *id.* at 98 (explaining how the oil spill

⁵ Region 10 has calculated that these vessels will emit at least 95 percent of Shell's total emissions of the five criteria pollutants. Appendix A, EPA Chukchi Revised Stmt of Basis at A-1: Summary of Annual Emissions for the Discoverer and the Associated Fleets (Exhibit 5).

⁶ As the first major source OCS PSD permit, the Board's approval of Region 10's decision to exempt the associated vessels from a BACT determination will significantly narrow section 328's reach in future permits for currently pending and imminent exploration plans. At the very least, Petitioners urge the Board to review this important policy consideration. 40 C.F.R. § 124.19(a)(2) (allowing the Board to review an important policy consideration); *In re Chem. Waste Mgmt.*, 2 E.A.D. 575, 577 (EAB 1988) (relying upon policy considerations to remand a permit).

response fleet's daily on-water training exercises were included in the primary operating scenario).

Underlying EPA's response to comments and the preamble to the regulatory definition of OCS source, seems to be an assumption that EPA is prohibited from regulating vessels under the CAA. Of course such an assumption is faulty. EPA has now exercised its authority under the CAA to regulate emissions from marine vessels by promulgating a final rule that includes emissions limitations for marine vessels. EPA Final Rule: Control of Emissions of Air Pollution From Locomotive Engines and Marine Compression-Ignition Engines Less than 30 Liters per Cylinder; Republication, 73 Fed. Reg. 37096, 37102 (June 30, 2008) (discussing EPA's authority under the CAA to issue these standards). Thus, any previous concerns over the regulation of air emissions from marine vessels that may have existed are now irrelevant in light of the fact these emissions are now being regulated under the statute.

B. Region 10 Committed Clear Legal Error By Failing To Apply The Statutory Definition of OCS Source Or Even Rectify Its New Definition Of The OCS Source With The Statutory Definition.

Region 10 erred because its interpretation of OCS source ignores the statutory definition of OCS source provided by Congress that is much broader than the regulatory definition. As the application of the regulatory definition to this permitting situation demonstrates, the regulatory definition ignores Congress's intent to regulate emissions from OCS sources in transit and emissions from vessels associated with OCS sources. Thus, Region 10 erred in relying upon the regulatory definition to justify its permitting decision while ignoring the broader statutory definition. Because this permit is the first major source OSD PSD permit, it will set significant precedent for Region 10 and other permitting agencies to follow when issuing similar permits for other operations in the OCS.

1. The legal requirements for what constitutes the OCS source under the Clean Air Act.

Congress provided EPA with an expansive definition of “Outer Continental Shelf source” or “OCS source” that includes “any equipment, activity, or facility which:”

- (i) emits or has the potential to emit any air pollutant,
- (ii) is regulated or authorized under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act [], and
- (iii) is located on the Outer Continental Shelf or in or on waters above the Outer Continental Shelf.”

Such activities include, but are not limited to, platform and drill ship exploration, construction, development, production, processing, and transportation. For purposes of this subsection, emissions from any vessel servicing or associated with an OCS source, including emissions while at the OCS source or en route to or from the OCS source within 25 miles of the OCS source, shall be considered direct emissions from the OCS source.

42 U.S.C. § 7627(a)(4)(C). Through this definition, Congress intended to regulate the emissions from the in transit activities of an OCS source and the emissions from vessels associated with an OCS source. *See, e.g.,* S. Conf. Rep. No. 136, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. at S16983 (1990) (considering emissions from vessels associated with an OCS source “including those from crew and supply boats, construction barges, tugboats, and tankers,” to be “part of the OCS facility emissions *for the purposes of regulation*”) (emphasis added); *see also* S. Rep. No. 228, 101st Cong., 1st Sess. 70 (1989) reprinted in 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3385, 3463-64 (“[a]ll emissions from marine vessels (including engine emissions) which service or are associated with an OCS source, are subject to the same permitting, enforcement, monitoring, reporting, and offset requirements which would apply if these vessels were located in the corresponding onshore (State waters) area. This is intended to include emissions generated while vessels are traveling within the same air basin. These requirements should apply to vessel emissions occurring while at the OCS

source, or when en route to or from the OCS source and to or from the corresponding onshore area.”).

Under the Clean Air Act, Congress required that EPA regulate OCS sources to control air pollution on the OCS. 42 U.S.C. § 6727(a). OCS sources, just like other stationary sources, are subject to requirements of the PSD program, including BACT. 42 U.S.C. § 7627(a)(1) (requiring OCS sources to comply with the PSD program); 40 C.F.R. § 55.13(d) (requiring that OCS sources comply with the PSD regulations). EPA cannot provide a blanket exemption from the requirements of the Act for a stationary source. *Whitman v. American Trucking Associations*, 531 U.S. 457, 485 (2001) (“EPA may not construe [a] statute in a way that completely nullifies textually applicable provisions meant to limit its discretion.”); *see also Sierra Club v. E.P.A.*, 551 F.3d 1019 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (rejecting EPA’s startup, shutdown, and malfunction exemption under the CAA); *Alabama Power v. Costle*, 636 F.2d 323, 358 (D.C. Cir. 1979) (noting the general principle that an agency cannot provide categorical exemptions from a statute) (citing *American Iron & Steel Institute v. EPA*, 568 F.2d 284, 306-08 (3rd Cir. 1977) (“reject[ing] EPA’s blanket exemption of steel plants in the Mahoning Valley from BACT requirements”)).

2. Factual background demonstrating the EPA violated the statutory definition of OCS source and never rectified its permit determination with the statute.

As described previously, Region 10 put forth several different interpretations of when the Discoverer becomes an OCS source. *See supra* at 15-16. Region 10 also issued a final permit that allows Shell to use a whole fleet of vessels that are necessary for its exploration activities, but that are not subject to regulation under the Clean Air Act. EPA RTC at 23 (Exhibit 4) (“this permit does not impose BACT on emission units that comprise the Associated Fleet”). Shell’s “associated fleet” includes two icebreakers, a resupply ship, an oil response fleet (including an

offshore management ship and three 34-foot work boats), and other vessels that will remain more than 25 miles from the Discoverer. Petitioners Comments at 9.

Region 10 has calculated that these vessels will emit at least **95 percent** of Shell's total emissions of the five criteria pollutants. Appendix A, EPA Re-Proposed Stmt of Basis at A-1: Summary of Annual Emissions for the Discoverer and the Associated Fleets (Exhibit 5). These vessels are associated with, and are an integral part of, Shell's exploratory operations. *See, e.g.*, EPA RTC at 24-25 (explaining how Icebreaker #2 will be used to anchor the Discoverer before drilling). Throughout the permitting process, Region 10 maintained the position that the associated fleet does not fall within the definition of OCS source and thus are not subject to regulation. EPA RTC at 22-23 (Exhibit 4).

3. Preservation of error and subject of this petition.

Petitioners preserved this issue for appeal in their comments of February 17, 2010. Petitioners Comments on Revised Chukchi Permit at 12-15 (Exhibit 2).

This issue is properly subject to appeal because Region 10 committed a clear legal error in failing to apply the statutory definition of OCS source or rectify it with the Region's permitting decision.

4. Argument.

Region 10 promulgated an interpretation of OCS source that conflicts with the statutory definition. Section 328 of the statute defines OCS source to:

include any equipment, activity, or facility which –

- (i) emits or has the potential to emit any air pollutant,
- (ii) is regulated or authorized under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act [], and
- (iii) is located on the Outer Continental Shelf or in or on waters above the [OCS].

42 U.S.C. § 7627(a)(4)(C). Additionally, Congress explicitly mentioned “drill ship exploration” as an example of an *activity* included within the definition of OCS source. 42 U.S.C. § 7627(a)(4)(C). The Discoverer is equipment that meets all three criteria long before it is secure and stable at the drill site. The associated fleet are equipment that have the potential to emit air pollutants, are authorized under OCSLA (as part of Shell’s exploration plan), and are located in the waters above the OCS. Collectively, the drill ship and the associated fleet are engaged in the activity of exploring for hydrocarbons, as authorized under OCSLA in an exploration plan, and are emitting air pollutants in the OCS while engaged in exploration. Therefore, Region 10 committed clear legal error by not controlling the emissions from the Discoverer’s propulsion engine and the associated fleet as part of the OCS source.

As discussed above, *see supra* at 15-16, the EPA erroneously determined that the drill ship has to be “secure and stable” on the drill site, before it is considered to be an OCS source. However, as with EPA’s regulatory definition of OCS source there is nothing in the statutory definition that supports this interpretation. The statutory language as well as the underlying legislative history, support the need for the associated fleet to also be regulated as part of the OCS source, since these vessels also emit air pollutants, are authorized under Shell’s exploration plan, and are in the waters above the OCS. 42 U.S.C. § 7627(a)(4)(C); S. Conf. Rep. No. 136, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. at S16983 (1990); S. Rep. No.228, 101st Cong., 1st Sess. 70 (1989), reprinted in 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3385, 3463-64. Thus, vessels associated with a drillship must be regulated as a part of an OCS source. *Kulluk*, slip. op. at 45 (faulting the Region for not considering other scenarios for the definition of “stationary source” and stating that the Region was required to “[a]t a minimum . . . discuss circumstances that give rise to reasonably anticipated questions”).

Instead of grappling with the statutory definition of OCS source, Region 10 consistently takes the position that it can base its decision on the much more narrow regulatory definition of OCS source. EPA RTC at 23 (Exhibit 4). Region 10's reliance on and current interpretation of the regulatory definition in this situation, as previously described, is unlawful, in addition to the fact that it impermissibly restricts the inclusive statutory definition.⁷ The Supreme Court made clear in *Massachusetts v. EPA* that EPA does not have the authority to restrict an unambiguous and inclusive statutory definition. 549 U.S. 497 (2007). There, the Court determined that the agency did not have the discretion to narrow the CAA definition of "air pollutant" by excluding "carbon dioxide" because the statutory definition was unambiguous and inclusive. *Id.* at 528-529. In finding that the definition of "air pollutant" was unambiguous and inclusive, the Court relied up the "sweeping" language in the definition, specifically "includes any." *Id.*

Just as the EPA had in *Massachusetts*, the agency is impermissibly restricting a Clean Air Act term by defining OCS source to exclude the Discoverer before it is secure and stable at the drill site and by failing to regulate the associated fleet aside from when the supply ship is attached to the Discoverer. The statutory definition of OCS source is unambiguous and inclusive because it includes the same "sweeping" and "inclusive" language: "include[s] any," 42 U.S.C. § 7627(a)(4)(C), that was at issue in *Massachusetts v. EPA*. Additionally, Congress emphasized the inclusive nature of the definition by stating that "[s]uch activities include, *but are not limited to.*" 42 U.S.C. § 7627(a)(4)(C) (emphasis added). Because the inclusive statutory definition of

⁷ Petitioners recognize that the respondents will argue that the Board cannot consider the legality of the regulatory definition in this proceeding. However, Petitioners urge the Board to reach this issue because valid legal and policy reasons warrant the Board's consideration of this issue. At the very least, Petitioners maintain this argument to preserve the issue of Region 10's legal error for judicial review of the final permit decision. *See In re: Christian County Generation, LLC*, PSD Appeal No. 07-01, Slip op. at 17, FN 21 (EAB Jan. 28, 2008) (noting that "courts are often unwilling to entertain a new issue for the first time on appeal where the record has not been fully developed") (internal citation omitted).

OCS source is unambiguous, EPA's regulatory definition is impermissibly narrow since it provides a basis for excluding many of the drill ship exploration activities Congress intended the agency to regulate under the Act.

Region 10 next turns to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia's decision in *Santa Barbara* to conclude that the vessels associated with an OCS source are not subject to regulation. EPA RTC at 23 (Exhibit 4) (stating that EPA "was challenged on this precise issue in *Santa Barbara* . . . and the OCS regulations were upheld"). But *Santa Barbara* did not address the question at issue here: whether it was reasonable for EPA to exclude the propulsion engine of a drill ship and the vessels that are associated with drill ship exploration. 31 F.3d at 1181. Rather, the petitioners in *Santa Barbara* challenged EPA's failure to regulate *marine vessels in transit* – *i.e.*, vessels other than those engaged in oil and gas exploration. *Id.* at 1181. The court addressed only whether the EPA was reasonable to exclude the very broad category of "vessels merely traveling over the OCS." *Id.* This category of vessels is entirely different from the vessels at issue here – *i.e.*, those associated with drill ship exploration.

Moreover, the court's reasoning in *Santa Barbara* actually contradicts Region 10's argument. In rejecting the petitioners' challenge, the court found that "the County's position would be unassailable if vessels in transit were unambiguously included within the definition of OCS source." *Id.* The court then noted that the statutory definition mentions vessels in only two contexts, one of which is "drill ship exploration." *Id.* Thus, *Santa Barbara* fails to support Region 10's position that the regulation allows it to exclude vessels that are part of drill ship exploration.

Region 10's reliance on the EAB's *Kulluk* decision is also misplaced. The factual and legal circumstances in *Kulluk* are very different than those presented in this case. In *Kulluk*, the

issue was whether the drill ship was a source when it moved to multiple drill sites and whether all of its emissions from the various sites had to be considered together. Slip op. at 18. This is distinct from Petitioners argument here that the emissions from vessels that are essential to Shell's operations and authorized under OCSLA need to be regulated as part of the OCS source.

To support its failure to address the statutory definition of OCS source, Region 10 relied upon the preamble to the regulatory definition, where EPA cited two jurisdictional limitations to justify its failure to regulate vessels. EPA RTC at 16-17 (Exhibit 4) (citing EPA Final Rule: Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations, 57 Fed. Reg. 40,792, 40,793-94 (Sept. 4, 1992)). Region 10 erred in relying on these justifications because neither limitation is legally defensible. First, EPA stated that the Department of Interior only has the authority under OCSLA to regulate vessels that are attached to the seabed and erected thereon. *Id.* EPA erred in stating that OCSLA does authorize or regulate vessels that are not attached to the seabed. OCSLA regulates several activities that include vessels that are not attached to the seabed. For example, OCSLA's jurisdiction extends over activities that require vessels which are never attached to the seabed: "exploration" includes seismic testing with ships; "development" include "geophysical activity;" and "production" includes "transfer of minerals to shore." 43 U.S.C. § 1331; *see also* 43 U.S.C. § 1333(d)(1) (requiring that the Coast Guard "promulgate . . . regulations with respect to lights and other warning devices, safety equipment, and other matters relating to the promotion of safety of life and other property . . . on the waters adjacent thereto . . ."). The legislative history confirms that OCSLA's jurisdiction extends to vessels that are not attached to the seabed. *See* H.R. Conf. Rep. 95-1474 at 6 (extending jurisdiction to facilities "brought into OCS waters for placement so that it can be used to develop and produce OCS materials"). Moreover, EPA only

referred to activities that are “regulated” under OCSLA and failed to address Congress’s requirement that OCS sources include activities that are “authorized” under OCSLA.

Second, EPA explained in the preamble that “[s]ection 328 of the CAA does not provide EPA with the authority to regulate emissions from engines being used for propulsion” and that the agency is “prohibited from directly regulating mobile sources under [title I of the CAA].” 57 Fed. Reg. 40,792, 40,793-94. As explained below, both of these justifications are erroneous. EPA has now exercised its authority under the CAA to regulate emissions from vessels in transit by promulgating emission standards for marine vessels. EPA Final Rule: Control of Emissions of Air Pollution From Locomotive Engines and Marine Compression-Ignition Engines Less than 30 Liters per Cylinder; Republication, 73 Fed. Reg. 37096, 37102 (June 30, 2008). Because EPA’s legal justifications for the regulatory definition of OCS source are erroneous and no longer accurate, Region 10’s reliance on the regulation was clear error.

Ultimately, in comments on both draft permits, petitioners and other commenters questioned whether Region 10’s interpretation complies with the statutory definition of OCS source. EPA RTC at 11-12 (repeating the comment that “the Discoverer meets the three statutory elements days before the anchoring process even begins, triggering the statute’s jurisdiction.”) But Region 10 failed to respond to the petitioners’ comments with a reasonable answer. *In re: Amerada Hess Corp. Port Reading Refinery*, 12 E.A.D. 1, 19 (EAB 2005) (“Ultimately, the failure to *reasonably* respond to significant comments is itself sufficient grounds for remanding the Permit” (emphasis added)) (citing *In re: Wash Aqueduct Water Supply Sys.*, 11 E.A.D. 565, 586, 589-90 (EAB 2004)). The agency merely stated that the petitioners were barred procedurally from raising the issue. EPA RTC at 11 (Exhibit 4) (“These comments appear to present a challenge to the definition of “OCS source” in the OCS regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 55.2,

and not to EPA’s application of the regulation to this permitting action”). This response is inadequate and unreasonable. Moreover, it ignores well-established precedent that parties can challenge regulations well after the 60-day limit when the parties were not harmed by the regulation until a subsequent EPA action. *Illinois E.P.A. v. U.S. E.P.A.*, 947 F.2d 283, 287-289 (7th Cir. 1991); *see also Bethlehem Steel Corp. v. United States Environmental Protection Agency*, 723 F.2d 1303, 1306 (7th Cir. 1983) (rejecting a similar jurisdictional argument and finding that the petitioners were not required to challenge a regulation that “might some day harm it” because “it makes no sense at a time of heavy federal judicial caseloads to challenge regulations that may never harm them”). These cases highlight that CAA section 307(b)’s 60-day limitation on challenges to regulations is not dispositive in all cases and that the agency was erroneous in relying so heavily on this provision. At the very least, Region 10 should have discussed the merits of the questions raised by petitioners. *Kulluk*, slip. op. at 45 (stating that the Region was required to “[a]t a minimum . . . discuss circumstances that give rise to reasonably anticipated questions”).

Nor did Region 10 respond to Petitioners’ concern that the new interpretation of the regulatory definition of OCS source fails to regulate the Discoverer when engaged in pre-construction activities. EPA RTC at 12 (Exhibit 4). Region 10’s only response to this comment was “[s]ee response to Comment F.1.a. with respect to concerns that EPA has impermissibly narrowed the regulatory definition of OCS.” *Id.* at 11-12. Region 10 cannot simply refer to a previous statement without providing a reasoned response to a particular comment. *Kulluk*, Slip. op. at 41 (citing *In re McGowan*, 2 E.A.D. 604, 606-07 (Adm’r 1988) (finding that the “total lack of response” to a comment cannot be cured by reference to an earlier statement because that statement “merely provides a conclusion without supportive reasoning”)).

II. REGION 10 ERRED BY NOT REQUIRING COLLOCATED PM_{2.5} BACKGROUND DATA OR SECONDARY PM_{2.5} DATA IN DETERMINING WHETHER SHELL'S OPERATIONS ARE WITHIN THE NAAQS AND BY FAILING TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PM_{2.5} AND PM₁₀ IN APPLYING BACT.

In approving the Chukchi air permit, Region 10 failed to obtain sufficient information on PM_{2.5}. In so doing, the agency violated its regulations that call for collocated sampling of PM_{2.5} from a monitor with an approved quality assurance project plan to establish background levels of the pollutant and failed to calculate or model the amount of secondary PM_{2.5} that would be generated by Shell's operations. Additionally, Region 10 failed to conduct an adequate BACT analysis for PM and PM₁₀ deciding instead to rely solely on the BACT analysis performed for PM_{2.5}. As a result of these clear legal errors, the Chukchi air permit should be remanded.

A. Region 10's Failure To Require Compliance With The Regulation Requiring Collocated Sampling Of PM_{2.5} By A Monitor With An Approved Quality Assurance Project Plan Was A Clear Error.

Shell's Chukchi permit was approved by Region 10 based upon background PM_{2.5} data that fails to meet the requirements set forth in EPA's regulations. The monitoring data currently being collected at Wainwright, Alaska "is the first site on the North Slope with a PM_{2.5} monitor." Letter from EPA to Shell (Sept. 4, 2009) (Exhibit 12). The data generated at this station and relied upon by Shell in its permit application was neither collocated nor collected subject to an approved quality assurance project plan as required by EPA's regulations. EPA's failure to require the use of collocated PM_{2.5} samplers was a clear legal violation of 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(m)(3) and 40 C.F.R. part 58 Appendix A sections 3.2.5.5 and 3.2.5.6. The agency's failure to require that the data be collected pursuant to an approved quality assurance project plan in a collocated network violated 40 C.F.R. part 58 Appendix A § 2.1.2. These are clear legal errors, which are not entitled to any deference from the Board. *See In re Lazarus, Inc.*, 7 E.A.D. 318, 351 n.55 (EAB 1997) (noting the general rule that agencies may not advance "the doctrine

of administrative deference . . . because the Board serves as the final decisionmaker for EPA”); *see also In re Rochester Pub. Utils.*, 11 E.A.D. 593, 603-08 (EAB 2004) (Board generally will give effect to unambiguous regulatory language).

1. Legal requirements for the ambient air quality analysis accompanying a PSD permit application.

EPA’s PSD regulations provide that “[a]ny application for a permit under this section shall contain an analysis of ambient air quality in the area that the major stationary source or major modification would affect for” “each pollutant that it would have the potential to omit in a significant amount.” 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(m)(1)(i)(a). The regulations further provide that for each “such pollutant” for which a NAAQS exists “the analysis shall contain continuous air quality monitoring data gathered for purposes of determining whether emissions of that pollutant would cause or contribute to a violation of the standard or any maximum allowable increase” and that

[i]n general, the continuous air quality monitoring data that is required shall have been gathered over a period of at least one year and *shall represent at least the year preceding receipt of the application*, except that, if the Administrator determines that a complete and adequate analysis can be accomplished with monitoring data gathered over a period shorter than one year (*but not to be less than four months*), the data that is required *shall have been gathered over at least that shorter period*.

40 C.F.R. § 52.21(m)(1)(iii)-(iv) (emphasis added). In gathering this data the applicant “shall meet the requirements of Appendix B to part 58 of this chapter during the operation of monitoring stations for purposes of satisfying paragraph (m) of this section.” 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(m)(3). As EPA acknowledges, the requirements of Appendix B have been added to Appendix A, thus, the applicant must meet the requirements of Appendix A to part 58. EPA RTC at 109-110.

Appendix A to part 58 provides that “[f]or each PSD monitoring network, *one site must be collocated*. A site with the predicted highest 24-hour pollutant concentration must be

selected.” 40 C.F.R. part 58 Appendix A § 3.2.5.5 (emphasis added). Appendix A provides further requirements for the “two collocated monitors” such as their spacing and that the “[c]alibration, sampling, and analysis must be the same for both collocated samplers and the same as for all other samplers in the network.” *Id.* § 3.2.5.6. Additionally, “[t]he quality assurance policy of the EPA requires every environmental data operation (EDO) to have a written and approved QAPP [quality assurance project plan] prior to the start of the EDO” that is “suitably documented,” and that “[i]t is the responsibility of the monitoring organization to adhere to this policy.” 40 C.F.R. part 58 Appendix A § 2.1.2. As Petitioners describe below, none of these legal requirements were met. This is particularly egregious here, where North Slope communities requested additional site-specific monitoring data back in 2007 when EPA was accepting comments on draft minor air permits for Shell’s operations. *See* Letter from Johnny Aiken, North Slope Borough, to Natasha Greaves and Dan Meyer, EPA Region 10 (May 11, 2007) (Exhibit 13).

2. Factual background pertaining to the collection of background data on and monitoring of PM_{2.5} along the North Slope of Alaska.

As the Board is aware, particulate matter pollution is a mixture of soot, smoke and tiny particles formed in the atmosphere from sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and ammonia (NH₃). Williams Decl. ¶14 (Exhibit 14). Fine particles (PM_{2.5}) contain microscopic solids or liquid droplets that are so small they can get deep into the lungs and even into the bloodstream, bypassing the body’s defense systems. *Id.* They are implicated in thousands of premature deaths each year.

The EPA started regulating PM_{2.5} in 1997 and recently lowered the short-term NAAQS for PM_{2.5} from 65 µg/m³ to 35 µg/m³ because scientific information showed that the pollutant is a health concern at levels lower than what the previous standard allowed. EPA, National

Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter; Final Rule, 71 Fed. Reg. 61,144 (Oct. 17, 2006). The health concerns exposure to particulate matter raises are chronic respiratory disease, asthma, lung cancer, and cardio-respiratory mortality. 71 Fed. Reg. at 61,154.

Little if any monitoring of PM_{2.5} has been done on the North Slope. Letter from EPA to Shell (Sept. 4, 2009) (Exhibit 12). Thus, “[b]eginning in early 2006, EPA suggested that Shell collect ambient data to support its preparation of an air permit application.” EPA RTC at 8 (Exhibit 4). However, Shell did not heed this advice. Instead, the company elected to rely upon previous background data that was collected in 1999. *See* Excerpt from Shell Original Chukchi Air Permit Application at 33 (Exhibit 15). When this data was rejected by EPA, Shell decided to rely on data collected by ConocoPhillips at an air monitoring station in Wainwright that started collecting data in late 2008. Email from Thomas Damina to Herman Wong at 2 (Sept. 22, 2009) (Exhibit 16). Due to a malfunction with the equipment, all of the PM_{2.5} data collected from November 8, 2008 to March 5, 2009, from the Wainwright station was “rendered invalid.” EPA RTC at 110 (Exhibit 4).

In addition to the Wainwright station, ConocoPhillips with some assistance from Shell is now operating air monitoring stations at Deadhorse, Nuiqsut, and Badami. EPA RTC at 110 (Exhibit 4). One issue that arose with this network of monitors and with Shell’s permit application was the need for collocated PM_{2.5} background data. *See* Email Herman Wong to Thomas Damiana at 1 (July 27, 2009) (Exhibit 17) (EPA explained the need for collocated samplers for PM_{2.5} to Shell in July of 2009). As explained in Appendix A to 40 C.F.R. part 58, a collocated monitor for a network of monitoring stations (such as Shell and ConocoPhillips are operating) is required and is to be located at the facility likely to have the highest PM_{2.5} levels. 40 C.F.R. § part 58 Appendix A § 3.2.5.5 (“For each PSD monitoring network, one site must be

collocated. A site with the predicted highest 24-hour pollutant concentration must be selected”). The monitoring station at Deadhorse was selected for this purpose. EPA RTC at 110 (Exhibit 4). Collocated sampling started at the Deadhorse station on October 23, 2009. *Id.*⁸ The data from the monitoring stations is analyzed in quarters. EPA received “[d]ata from the collocated samplers at Deadhorse . . . through December 15, 2009.” EPA RTC at 113 (Exhibit 4).

Only after collocated sampling commenced at the Deadhorse station, did work begin on the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) for the Deadhorse Station and in turn updates to the QAPPs for the other stations, including the Wainwright station, in light of the fact that they are now operating a collocated network. *See* Emails between Herman Wong and Brad Thomas (Oct. 26, 28, 2009) (Exhibit 19). Negotiations occurred over a month and half with several proposals going back and forth between EPA and AECOM for the QAPPs. *See id.*; Email and Attachment from Herman Wong (Nov. 18, 2009) (Exhibit 20). After many weeks of discussions between the contractor collecting the monitoring data for ConocoPhillips and Shell, and EPA, the QAPP for the Wainwright station was revised on November 25, 2009 to account for the collocated data collection, Email from Thomas Damiana to Christopher Hall and Excerpt of Attachment (Nov. 25, 2009) (Exhibit 21), and the QAPP for the Deadhorse Station was finalized on December 16, 2009 and signed by EPA on December 18, 2009. Email from Christopher Hall to Thomas Damiana (Dec. 18, 2009) (Exhibit 22).

On December 22, 2009, Shell submitted its final permit application materials to EPA. EPA Website, Chukchi Air Permit at 2 (Exhibit 7) (the last entry under “permit application materials” is “Dec 22, 2009”). Shell relied “on data from [the] monitoring station in

⁸ Thereafter, EPA also expressed concerns about “instruments” at the Deadhorse site that “were not in agreement.” Email from Christopher Hall, EPA to Thomas Damiana (Dec. 9, 2009) (Exhibit 18).

Wainwright, Alaska referred to as the ‘Near-Term Station’” in order “to fulfill the preconstruction monitoring requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(m)(1).” EPA RTC at 110 (Exhibit 4). The EPA received at most two months of collocated PM_{2.5} data from Shell. *See id.* at 110 (noting that collocated sampling started on October 23, 2009); *id.* at 113 (explaining that EPA received “[d]ata from the collocated samplers at Deadhorse . . . through December 15, 2009”). However, these two months of collocated data were not collected at monitors operating pursuant to approved QAPPs. *See* Exhibits 21 and 22. The draft permit was released for public comment on January 8, 2010. EPA RTC at 1 (Exhibit 4). The final permit was issued on March 31, 2010.

3. Preservation of error and subject of this petition.

In their comments on the revised Chukchi air permit, Petitioners discussed the need for Region 10 to ensure Shell collected collocated PM_{2.5} data that was sufficient to support its permit application. Petitioners’ Comments at 45-46 (Exhibit 2).

By failing to follow its regulatory requirements, Region 10 committed a clear legal error.

4. Clear legal error was committed by EPA in not requiring collocated PM_{2.5} data before approving Shell’s permit.

Shell has not provided a year’s worth of PM_{2.5} data in support of its permit as recommended by 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(m)(1)(iv). EPA RTC at 110 (Exhibit 4) (explaining that data from “November 8, 2008 through March 5, 2009” was “invalid”). More importantly, Shell has not provided the mandatory minimum of at least four months worth of collocated PM_{2.5} monitoring data in support of its application. 40 C.F.R. § part 58 Appendix A § 3.2.5.5 (“For each PSD monitoring network, one site must be collocated”). EPA admits this fact stating that “AECOM was not operating collocated PM_{2.5} monitors during the entire period of PM_{2.5} [data] relied on by Shell in its permit application” EPA RTC at 111 (Exhibit 4). For almost all the collocated PM_{2.5} data that Shell did collect, it did not have “a written and approved QAPP prior

to the start of the” data collection, 40 C.F.R. part 58 Appendix A § 2.1.2, and it certainly did not have an approved QAPP that provided for the necessary collocated data. Approving Shell’s permit based on the data provided to EPA was a clear legal error, especially in light of the lack of prior monitoring data for PM_{2.5} for the North Slope. Letter from EPA to Shell (Sept. 4, 2009) (Exhibit 12). EPA violated the requirements of 40 C.F.R. § part 58 Appendix A § 3.2.5.5 and 40 C.F.R. part 58 Appendix A § 2.1.2.

EPA’s explanation for these violations is that it has “discretion” to decide not to comply with its regulations. EPA RTC at 112 (Exhibit 4). The agency states that “[a]lthough AECOM was not operating collocated PM_{2.5} monitors during the entire period of PM_{2.5} [data] relied on by Shell in its permit application, other information and quality control data collected since March 2009 is appropriately used to evaluate data quality.” EPA RTC at 111 (Exhibit 4). The “other information” includes the “QAPP for the Wainwright Near-Term Station,” EPA RTC at 112 (Exhibit 4), that made no provision for collocated monitoring until approved on November 25, 2009, *see supra* at 36 (discussing revised QAPP for this station after collocation sampling commenced); the calibrations, “flow checks,” and “audits” performed. EPA RTC at 112 (Exhibit 4). EPA also specifies that the data “is documented and is identifiable,” “[l]og report are available,” and “[d]ocumentation of the traceability of maintenance and calibration exists.” *Id.* These points fail to take into account EPA’s concerns about “instruments” at the Deadhorse site that “were not in agreement.” Email from Christopher Hall, EPA to Thomas Damiana (Dec. 9, 2009) (Exhibit 18).

Since the regulatory language is clear and provides no opportunity for non-compliance, EPA committed a clear legal error. *See In re: D.C. Water and Sewer Authority NPDES Appeal Nos. 05-020, 7-10, 07-11, 07-12, slip op. at 26* (EAB March 19, 2008) (finding that the plain

language of a regulation controls); *In re Rochester Pub. Utils.*, 11 E.A.D. 593, 603-08 (EAB 2004) (Board generally will give effect to unambiguous regulatory language). Indeed, the decision to simply argue for discretion in this instance, despite the clear language of EPA's own regulations, was the subject of debate within the agency. For example, EPA employee Herman Wong explained regarding this subject that:

Shell is collecting the minimum four months of air quality data to meet 40 CFR Part 52.21(m)(1)(iv) and (m)(3). Paragraph (m)(3) refers to Appendix A in Part 58 and in there, *I did not find any exemptions or discretionary words to the collocated monitoring.* The language I read referred to scheduled samples and analysis on an annual or yearly basis. There was no indication of random samples, delayed samples or unscheduled samples. Hence, *my interpretation of the regulation is that any valid and useable PM_{2.5} data in a PSD application ambient air quality analysis must be collected during the period in which there was concurrent and collocated sampling occurring at a monitoring state or network station.* This is what I am willing to defend if challenged.

Email Herman Wong to Christopher Hall at 3 (Aug. 18, 2009) (Exhibit 23) (emphasis added).

Thus, even within EPA this decision was questioned.

Critical to this decision also is the fact that EPA does not have collocated PM_{2.5} background data for most of the months in which the permit authorizes Shell to operate – *i.e.*, between “July 1 and December 1.” Chukchi Final Permit at 10 (Exhibit 1). In numerous instances throughout the record, various EPA employees stress the need for background data from “the Shell drilling season in the Chukchi Sea.” *See e.g.*, Email from Herman Wong to Pat Nair (Aug. 26, 2009) (Exhibit 24) (“Currently, we are assuming that a minimum four months of collected data is adequate. Based on the Wainwright measurement, I now believe that it would be prudent to change the data collection period to include the Shell drilling season in the Chukchi Sea, *i.e.*, data collection from July to December which I assume is a permit condition.”). This was of particular concern once the third term (May-July) monitoring results came out revealing much higher levels of PM_{2.5} than had previously been recorded. *Id.*; Email from Thomas

Damiana to Herman Wong (Aug. 26, 2009) (Exhibit 25). In response, EPA states only its belief that “the PM_{2.5} data used in the models are reliably representative of the period during which Shell will be operating in the Chukchi Sea” EPA RTC at 114 (Exhibit 4).

B. Region 10’s Failure To Account For Secondary Particulate Matter Emissions Was A Clear Error.

Region 10 committed clear error by not calculating or accounting for the formation of secondary particulate matter as a result of Shell’s operations. As previously described, communities along the North Slope of Alaska have markedly higher rates of pulmonary disease than the general population in the U.S., different genetic predispositions to disease, and are substantially more vulnerable to morbidity and mortality from air pollution than are other Americans. *See supra* at 6-7. Also as previously described, the health concerns posed by particulate matter include chronic respiratory disease, asthma, lung cancer, and cardio-respiratory mortality. Because Region 10 failed to take into account the formation of secondary PM_{2.5} in calculating Shell’s potential to emit and in ensuring compliance with the NAAQS, the agency committed a clear error.

1. Potential to emit, BACT and compliance with the NAAQS.

Before issuing a Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit to a major new stationary source, the EPA must conduct a BACT analysis for each pollutant that the source has the potential to emit in significant quantities. 42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(4). The OCS regulations define potential emissions as

the maximum emissions of a pollutant from an OCS source operating at its design capacity. Any physical or operational limitation on the capacity of a source to emit a pollutant, including air pollution control equipment and restrictions on hours of operation or on the type or amount of material combusted, stored, or processed, shall be treated as a limit on the design capacity of the source if the limitation is federally enforceable. Pursuant to section 328 of the Act, emissions from vessels servicing or associated with an OCS source shall be considered

direct emissions from such a source while at the source, and while en route to or from the source when within 25 miles of the source, and shall be included in the ‘potential to emit’ for an OCS source.

40 C.F.R. § 55.2.⁹

As EPA has explained “[u]nder the PSD program, a source’s potential to emit is used to determine . . . the pollutants that are subject to application of ‘best available control technology’ or ‘BACT,’” and the “analysis of ambient air quality impacts from the project . . .” EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 17 (Exhibit 5). “A source is required to apply BACT for each pollutant for which the [potential to emit] PTE exceeds the ‘significant emission rate’ or ‘SER’ within the meaning of 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(23)(i).” *Id.*

Typically, BACT is applied using a “top down” approach. EPA, New Source Review Workshop Manual (1990) (available at: <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/nsr/gen/wkshpman.pdf>). EPA describes this as:

the top-down process provides that all available control technologies be ranked in descending order of control effectiveness. The PSD applicant first examines the most stringent--or “top”--alternative. That alternative is established as BACT unless the applicant demonstrates, and the permitting authority in its informed judgment agrees, that technical considerations, or energy, environmental, or economic impacts justify a conclusion that the most stringent technology is not “achievable” in that case. If the most stringent technology is eliminated in this fashion, then the next most stringent alternative is considered, and so on.

Id.

The permit applicant is also “required” to analyze “ambient air quality for each” pollutant that exceeds the significant emission rate, and provide “a demonstration that it will not cause or contribute to a violation of any NAAQS or PSD increment.” EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of

⁹ The PSD regulations define the “potential to emit” as “the maximum capacity of a stationary source to emit a pollutant under its physical and operational design. Any physical or operational limitation on the capacity of the source to emit a pollutant including air pollution control equipment and restriction on hours of operation or on the type of amount of material combusted, stored, or processed, shall be treated as part of its design if the limitation or the effect it would have on emissions is federally enforceable.” 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(4).

Basis at 17-18 (Exhibit 5); *see also* 42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(3) (a PSD permittee must demonstrate that it will not “cause, or contribute to, air pollution in excess of any ... maximum allowable increase”).

2. Factual background on secondary PM_{2.5} formation.

PM_{2.5} is emitted directly from combustion point sources and from fugitive emissions sources. Williams Decl. ¶15 (Exhibit 14). Emissions of NO_x, VOCs, SO₂ and ammonia can form, after being emitted into the atmosphere, into PM_{2.5} (also called secondary PM_{2.5}) and these secondary emissions can potentially be a significant component of ambient PM_{2.5} concentrations. Memorandum from Stephen D. Page, Director, Office Air Quality Planning and Standards, dated March 23, 2010 Re: Modeling Procedures for Demonstrating Compliance with PM_{2.5} NAAQS at 3 (Exhibit 26) (hereafter Page Memorandum); Damberg, Policies for Addressing PM 2.5 Precursors (Exhibit 27). While primary PM_{2.5} emissions are generally a localized issue, secondary PM_{2.5} emissions can occur on a more regional scale and affect a larger region. Williams Decl. ¶15 (Exhibit 14). The fraction of PM_{2.5} concentrations in the ambient air that is due to the secondary formation of PM_{2.5} (*e.g.*, sulfates and nitrates), as opposed to directly emitted [primary] PM_{2.5} (*e.g.*, as a product of combustion) is dependent on many factors. *Id.*

One factor is the presence of strong temperature inversions that limit dispersion of emitted pollutants and contribute to the formation of secondary PM_{2.5} in the atmosphere. Williams Decl. ¶16 (Exhibit 14). Such temperature inversions can increase secondary PM_{2.5} formation. PM_{2.5} concentrations, therefore, can be due to gaseous pollutants that form fine particles after reacting with other compounds in the air during meteorological inversions. Strong temperature inversions occur on the North Slope. *Id.*; Petitioners Comments at 47 (Exhibit 2).

As previously described, while there are very limited data available regarding background PM_{2.5} levels on the North Slope, *see supra* at 6-7, high levels of the pollutant were recorded at the Wainwright monitoring station in the third and fourth quarter monitoring reports from the station. Exhibits 24 and 25; EPA RTC at 104 (Exhibit 4). As a result, Petitioners raised concerns about the failure to analyze secondary PM_{2.5} emissions in the original and revised drafts of the Chukchi permit. Indeed, EPA even explained in a letter to Shell that “as of July 2008, EPA rescinded the surrogate policy for the federal PSD permitting programs, such that PSD permit applications needed to fully comply with all requirements for PM_{2.5} direct emissions and PM_{2.5} precursors (SO₂ and NO_x).” Letter from Regional Administrator, EPA to Peter Slaiby, Shell (Aug. 20, 2009) (Exhibit 28) (emphasis added).

Nevertheless, the final Chukchi permit does not take into account the formation of secondary PM_{2.5} resulting from Shell’s emissions. Region 10 never calculated or modeled whether or how secondary PM_{2.5} could impact air quality and whether Shell could still demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS. Moreover, of the modeling results that were presented in EPA’s Revised Statement of Basis for the Chukchi permit, those results predict PM_{2.5} concentrations at over 84 percent of the 24-hour NAAQS. EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 110 (Exhibit 5); *see also* Exhibit 24. When the accuracy of the data inputs underlying this analysis are taken into account, this prediction is barely within the appropriate margin of error for a demonstration that the operations will comply with the NAAQS. Williams Decl. ¶15 (Exhibit 14); *see also* Exhibit 24. This is true even without acknowledging the fact that these calculations only take into account direct emissions of PM_{2.5} and not the formation of secondary PM_{2.5}.

In their comments, Petitioners pointed to several models that have been used to address secondary PM_{2.5} formation and discussed the fact that EPA's Support Center for Regulatory Atmospheric Modeling (SCRAM) provides resources for modeling secondary PM_{2.5}. Petitioners Comments at 47-48 (Exhibit 2). Petitioners also explained that the Bureau of Land Management has modeled secondary PM_{2.5} formation. *Id.*

3. Preservation of error and subject of this petition.

In their comments on the revised Chukchi air permit, Petitioners discussed the need for modeling of secondary PM_{2.5} emissions from Shell's operations. Petitioners' Comments at 47-49 (Exhibit 2).

By failing to model or otherwise take into consideration the formation of secondary PM_{2.5}, Region 10 committed a clear legal error.

4. EPA's legal errors resulting from the agency's failure to take the formation of secondary PM_{2.5} into account.

The calculation of secondary PM_{2.5} emissions was never performed for Shell's operations. The determinations that the Chukchi permit will not cause or contribute to violations of the NAAQS or PSD increments also does not account for Shell's actual secondary PM_{2.5} emissions. As a result, EPA committed clear legal and factual errors in finalizing the Chukchi permit.

As an initial matter, EPA's position that it did not have to address secondary PM_{2.5} emissions is contrary to what EPA told Shell in July of 2008, regarding the need "to fully comply with all requirements for PM_{2.5} direct emissions and PM_{2.5} precursors (SO₂ and NO_x)." Letter from Regional Administrator, EPA to Peter Slaiby, Shell (Aug. 20, 2009) (Exhibit 28). As described below, Region 10 has failed to adequately explain its change in position from first noting that Shell had to account for both direct and secondary PM_{2.5} emissions to its current

position that Shell need only account for direct PM_{2.5} emissions. *In re Austin Powder Co.*, 6 E.A.D. 713, 720 (EAB 1997) (remanding a permit because the agency provided different explanations for its permitting decision that were unclear).

With respect to the failure to calculate and account for Shell's secondary PM_{2.5} emissions, EPA first says this failure is justified due to the "limitations in the tools and models currently available to address secondary PM_{2.5} emissions." EPA RTC at 122 (Exhibit 4). The only support EPA provides for this statement is a reference to an EPA memorandum dated March 23, 2010. *Id.* (citing Memorandum from Stephen D. Page, Director, Office Air Quality Planning and Standards, dated March 23, 2010 Re: Modeling Procedures for Demonstrating Compliance with PM_{2.5} NAAQS). This memorandum acknowledges that "[s]econdary formation of PM_{2.5} from emissions of NO_x, SO_x and other compounds from sources across a large domain will often contribute significantly to the total ambient levels of PM_{2.5}, and may be the dominant source of ambient PM_{2.5} in some cases." Page Memorandum at 3 (Exhibit 26). It also presents an interim method of analyzing PM_{2.5} emissions because "[t]he current preferred dispersion model for near-field PM_{2.5} modeling, AERMOD, does not account for secondary formation of PM_{2.5}." *Id.* at 9. The author explains that EPA intends to issue "additional guidance" on secondary PM_{2.5} but that "if the facility emits significant quantities of PM_{2.5} precursors, some assessment of their potential contribution to cumulative impacts as secondary PM_{2.5} may be necessary." *Id.* Therefore, the memorandum fails to support EPA's statement that there are limitations on the tools currently available to address secondary PM_{2.5} emissions, since it presents a way forward for addressing these very emissions.¹⁰

¹⁰ Petitioners take no position on the adequacy of the analyses recommended in the Page Memorandum, since it was not followed by EPA in approving the Chukchi permit only a few days later. Petitioner point out that the Memorandum does stress the need for adequate and

Moreover, Region 10's explanation ignores the tools for assessing secondary PM_{2.5} emissions that Petitioners pointed to in their comments to EPA. Petitioners Comments at 48-49 (Exhibit 2). EPA's response is that the CAMx, CMAQ, and REMSAD models referred to by Petitioners "are not included in [Appendix W of 40 C.F.R. Part 51] and are therefore, not recommended for air permit modeling" EPA RTC at 123 (Exhibit 4). This response is wholly insufficient. First, EPA has discretion under Appendix W to select appropriate models for "a given situation." See Appendix W § 3.3(a) ("The Regional Administrator has the authority to select models that are appropriate for use in a given situation"). Second, several of these models have been used by other agencies to model secondary PM_{2.5} emissions as Petitioners described in their comments. Petitioners Comments at 48 (Exhibit 2). Thus, EPA clearly had the authority to propose use of one of the models recommended by Petitioners.

More importantly, Region 10's response directly conflicts with the fact that all the modeling performed by Shell was done using a model that is also not included in Appendix W of 40 C.F.R. Part 51 – the ISC3-Prime model. EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 92 (Exhibit 5). It was entirely arbitrary for EPA to approve the use of a non-guideline model for modeling of all Shell's emissions in its permit application, and then turn around and refuse to model secondary PM_{2.5} emissions because only a non-guideline model could be used. See *In re Austin Powder Co.*, 6 E.A.D. 713, 720 (EAB 1997) (remanding a permit because the agency provided different explanations for its permitting decision that were unclear).

EPA's next line of defense for its refusal to model secondary PM_{2.5} emissions is "the conservatism built into the modeling assumptions that were used in conducting the air impact

detailed background monitoring of PM_{2.5}, in order to properly address a PSD permit applicant's PM_{2.5} emissions, Page Memorandum (Exhibit 26), and that such background data is inadequate here, see *supra* at 33-39.

analysis . . . mitigate against the possibility that PM_{2.5} would cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS.” EPA RTC at 122 (Exhibit 4). Not surprisingly, Petitioners disagree with this conclusion. First, as previously discussed, *see supra* at 32; Exhibit 12, very limited background data exists for background PM_{2.5} levels on the North Slope. The background PM_{2.5} data collected by Shell was inadequate for permitting purposes because it fails to meet EPA’s regulatory requirements that the data is collected subject to an approved QAPP, and that collocated samplers were operating pursuant to approved QAPPs within the network during the time the data was collected. None of these requirements were met in Shell’s application which calls into question EPA’s characterization of the modeling performed using this data as conservative.

Additionally, the data that was collected (although not in compliance with EPA’s regulatory requirements) showed much higher levels of background PM_{2.5} than previously expected. EPA RTC at 104 (Exhibit 4). Nevertheless, for purposes of the air quality analysis EPA did not make the most “conservative” judgment. EPA did not use the highest value of PM_{2.5} – *i.e.*, “a 24-hour average was 22.8 ug/m³ in October 2009.” *Id.* Nor did the agency use any of the next highest values collected at the monitoring station of “15.0,” 14.9, 14.4, [or] 12.7” ug/m³ for a 24-hour average. *Id.* Instead, EPA approved the use of “a background value of 11 ug/m³ in the air quality analysis for the proposed permit.” *Id.* While EPA explains that this decision took into account wind speed and precipitation, *id.*, it also negates EPA’s claim that the “conservatism” built into the air quality analysis mitigates the impacts from secondary PM_{2.5} emissions. Moreover, without qualifying or modeling secondary PM_{2.5}, Region 10 has no idea whether Shell’s operations are within the NAAQS for PM_{2.5}.

As all of EPA's explanations make clear, the agency never denies that Shell's operations will result in secondary PM_{2.5} formation or that there is no basis for being concerned about these emissions. Rather, the agency simply brushes the secondary PM_{2.5} emissions under the rug.

C. Region 10's Failure To Distinguish Between PM_{2.5} And PM₁₀ In Applying BACT To Shell's Operations Was A Clear Error.

EPA's failure to distinguish between PM, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ emissions resulted in an arbitrary BACT analysis. The PSD program requires BACT limits for "each pollutant subject to regulation." 42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(4); 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(j)(2)). Since 1997, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ have been regulated as separate pollutants under the Act because they are subject to separate NAAQS. *See National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter*, 62 Fed. Reg. 38,652 (July 18, 1997) (codified as amended at 40 C.F.R. § 50.7).

Therefore, EPA erred in issuing the Chukchi permit because it addressed PM, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ all "together" in the BACT analysis. *See EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis* at 51 (Exhibit 5) ("Throughout the BACT section PM, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ emissions will be addressed together for all emission units except the incinerator since it is assumed that essentially all of the PM and PM₁₀ emissions are also PM_{2.5} emissions, and the control technologies available for PM_{2.5} emissions on the types of equipment aboard the Discoverer will also effectively control PM and PM₁₀"). This analysis violates the plain language of the Act and EPA's regulations.

In response to comments, EPA's explanation for these legal violations is that "[p]articulate control devices designed to reduce PM_{2.5} emissions from [diesel] engines are also effective on particulate matter in the larger size ranges" in contrast to control devices that are used on non-diesel engines that "have significantly different control effectiveness for the different particulate matter size ranges" EPA RTC at 30 (Exhibit 4). However, unless EPA

breaks down its analysis of control technologies by pollutant it cannot sufficiently assure that the NAAQS (and soon the PSD increments) will not be exceeded.

III. REGION 10 ERRED BY NOT REQUIRING SHELL TO COMPLY WITH EMERGING LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CO₂ AND NO₂ DESPITE ISSUING SHELL A PERMIT THAT IS WITHOUT TIME LIMITS AND THAT COVERS A VAST AREA OF THE CHUKCHI SEA.

A. The Failure To Regulate Shell's CO₂ Emissions Is A Clear Legal Error.

The EPA committed a clear legal error by failing to regulate Shell's CO₂ emissions. The Clean Air Act requires that before issuing a PSD permit, the EPA must conduct a BACT analysis and include emissions limitations for "each pollutant subject to regulation" under the Act. 42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(4). Carbon dioxide is a pollutant under the Act, *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497, 529 (2007), and is regulated as described below. Therefore, CO₂ needs to be controlled by the Chukchi OCS permit.

1. The legal authority in support of the fact that carbon dioxide is a regulated pollutant under the Clean Air Act.

CO₂ and other greenhouse gases clearly fall within the Clean Air Act's definition of "air pollutant." *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. at 532. The Act defines "air pollutant" to include "any physical, chemical, biological, radioactive . . . substance or matter which is emitted into or otherwise enters the ambient air." 42 U.S.C. § 7602(g) (emphasis added). Further, the Clean Air Act specifically includes carbon dioxide in a list of "air pollutants." 42 U.S.C. § 7403(g)(1).

The emission of air pollutants, such as carbon dioxide, are regulated under a number of the Clean Air Act's major substantive provisions, when, in EPA's judgment, such emissions cause or contribute to air pollution which "may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare." 42 U. S. C. § 7521(a)(1). The major substantive provisions include: section 111 establishing new source performance standards for categories of stationary sources; and

section 202 establishing standards for emissions from new motor vehicles. EPA requires that major sources monitor, record, and report emissions of CO₂ pursuant to section 821 of the CAA. 40 C.F.R. § 75; Section 821 of Pub.L. 101-549(a) (“The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall promulgate regulations . . . to require that all affected sources subject to Title V of the Clean Air Act shall also monitor carbon dioxide emissions according to the same timetable as in section 511(b) and (c)”).

On December 15, 2009, EPA formally announced that greenhouse gases “endanger both the public health and the public welfare of current and future generations.” Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act, 74 Fed. Reg. 66,496 (Dec. 15, 2009) (to be codified at 40 C.F.R. ch. I). The agency also found “that the combined emissions of these greenhouse gases from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines contribute to the greenhouse gas air pollution that endangers public health and welfare under CAA section 202(a).” *Id.* Section 202(a) of the Act pertains to transportation sources. The findings took effect on January 14, 2010. 74 Fed. Reg. at 66,496.

In reaching its conclusions, the agency relied upon evidence that demonstrated greenhouse gases pose a risk to food production and agriculture, forestry, water resources, sea level rise and coastal areas, energy infrastructure, and settlements, and ecosystems and wildlife. With respect to human health effects, EPA concluded that greenhouse gases “affect public health by:” changing “air quality” such that “[i]ncreases in ambient ozone . . . are expected to increase serious adverse health effects;” increasing “temperatures” with resultant “impact[s] on mortality and morbidity;” “lead to changes in aeroallergens that could increase the potential for allergenic illnesses;” and that “certain groups . . . are most vulnerable to these climate-related health

effects.” 74 Fed. Reg. at 66,497-99. As a result of its findings, EPA decided to regulate CO₂ and other GHG emissions from transportation sources.

EPA also announced that it will require large industrial facilities emitting at least 25,000 tons of greenhouse gases a year to obtain construction and operating permits covering the greenhouse gas emissions. Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule, 74 Fed. Reg. 55,292, 55,300 (Oct. 27, 2009) (to be codified at 40 C.F.R. pt. 51, 52, 70, and 71). These facilities must demonstrate the use of best available control technologies and energy efficiency measures to minimize greenhouse gas emissions. *Id.*

These recent decisions are in addition to other EPA decisions to regulate CO₂ under the Act. Effective May 29, 2008, the EPA approved a SIP amendment submitted by the state of Delaware that dealt with emissions from stationary generators. 73 Fed. Reg. 23101 (April 29, 2008). As EPA explained to the EAB at that time, the approved SIP included “specific limitations on the rate of several pollutants, including carbon dioxide, that may be emitted by stationary generators in the state.” Letter from Brian Doster, EPA, to Clerk of the Board (Sept. 9, 2008) (Exhibit 29).

On December 29, 2009, EPA started regulating carbon dioxide by requiring “fossil fuel suppliers and industrial gas suppliers, direct greenhouse gas emitters and manufacturers of heavy-duty and offroad vehicles and engines” that emit 25,000 metric tons or more per year of greenhouse gases “to monitor and report” their emissions. Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Final Rule, 74 Fed. Reg. 56,260 (Oct. 30, 2009). On July 8, 2009, EPA announced its decision to grant California’s request for a waiver for its GHG vehicle standard. California State Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Standards, Notice of Decision Granting a Waiver of Clean Air Act Preemption for California’s 2009 and Subsequent Model Year

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards for New Motor Vehicles, 74 Fed. Reg. 32,744 (July 8, 2009).

Section 165(a)(2) of the CAA provides that a major emitting facility is “subject to the best available control technology for each pollutant subject to regulation under [the Clean Air Act] emitted from, or which results from, such facility.” 42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(2).

2. Factual background on the Arctic and Shell’s permit and CO₂ emissions.

The Arctic has already witnessed temperature increases that are twice as large as global averages and is poised to continue warming temperatures at greater levels than the rest of the world. International Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change: 2007 Synthesis Report*, at 30 (Exhibit 30). The effects of global warming are acute in the Arctic where melting sea ice, changing ocean pH levels, and increased flooding and erosion threaten local species and coastal communities. *See Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009 Report*, Arctic Council p. 26 (Exhibit 31) (reporting that the five smallest September ice-covered areas for the Arctic Ocean during the modern satellite record (1979-2008) have occurred in the five most recent seasons (2004-2008)); Henry Huntington and Shari Fox, *The Changing Arctic: Indigenous Perspectives* p. 76, Chapter 3 in *Impact of a Warming Arctic: Arctic Climate Impact Assessment* (2004) (Exhibit 32); *Alaska Native Villages, Most Are Affected by Flooding and Erosion, but Few Qualify for Federal Assistance*, U.S. General Accounting Office Report to Congressional Committees, No. GAO-04-142 (2003) p. 3 (Exhibit 33). Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is imperative to slowing and stopping these dramatic events from further harming the people and ecosystem of the Arctic.

The Discoverer drillship and its associated support vessels will contribute large amounts of heat-trapping carbon dioxide each year in which Shell is operating. The operations include

emissions of approximately 55,000 tons of CO₂ per year. Shell EP EIA at 36 (Exhibit 6) (estimating that the drillship the Discoverer itself will emit an estimated 20,000 tons of carbon dioxide while the Discoverer and its support vessels will emit about 55,000 tons per year). The final Chukchi OCS PSD permit does not regulate Shell's emissions of CO₂.

As Petitioners explained in their comments to EPA, Shell's CO₂ emissions are equivalent to the annual carbon dioxide emissions from 11,000 cars based on EPA's MOBILE6.2 fuel economy numbers, which calculate that the average passenger vehicle emits approximately 5.5 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent per year. EPA, Emission Facts: Greenhouse Gas Emissions from a Typical Passenger Vehicle, EPA420-F-05-004 February 2005 (Exhibit 34). This is a significant increase for the North Slope.

3. Preservation of error and subject of this petition.

In their comments on the revised Chukchi air permit, Petitioners discussed the need for regulation of CO₂ emissions from Shell's operations. Petitioners' Comments at 3-8 (Exhibit 2).

By failing to regulate Shell's CO₂ emissions, Region 10 committed a clear legal error.

4. EPA committed clear legal error by failing to regulate Shell's CO₂ emissions especially in light of its decision to approve a permit that pertains to all of Shell's lease blocks in the entire Chukchi Sea.

In deciding not to regulate the CO₂ emissions from Shell's operations, the EPA committed clear legal error. Section 165(a)(2) of the CAA provides that a major emitting facility is "subject to the best available control technology for *each pollutant subject to regulation* under [the Clean Air Act] emitted from, or which results from, such facility." 42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(2) (emphasis added). CO₂ is a pollutant subject to regulation under the Act and Shell will emit at least 55,000 tons per year of it, therefore, the Chukchi OCS PSD permit needed to include a BACT analysis for CO₂. EPA violated CAA sections 165(a)(4) and 169(3) by failing to apply

“BACT,” or best available control technology, to limit carbon dioxide (“CO₂”) emissions from the facility.

In response, EPA points to a memorandum that was issued two days before it issued the Chukchi OCS permit as its justification for the decision not to regulate CO₂ in the permit. EPA RTC at 132 (Exhibit 4). As a preliminary matter, Petitioners point out that EPA failed to provide any explanation for its decision to not regulate CO₂ in the Revised Statement of Basis for the Chukchi OCS PSD permit, after having received comments on this very issue in 2009. *See supra* at 4-5 (discussing the original and revised permits); Exhibit 2 at 3-8. The rationale set forth in the March 29 memorandum certainly was not included in EPA’s statement of basis for the revised Chukchi permit. Therefore, the permit should be remanded so the public can review and comment on EPA’s explanation for its decision. *In re: Amerada Hess*, slip op. at 19 (“Ultimately, the failure to *reasonably* respond to significant comments is itself sufficient grounds for remanding the Permit” (emphasis added)) (citing *In re: Wash Aqueduct Water Supply Sys.*, 11 E.A.D. 565, 586, 589-90 (EAB 2004)). Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners also provide a response to EPA’s new position herein.

EPA’s new position is that CO₂ will not be a regulated pollutant under the Clean Air Act unless: (1) it is “subject to either a provision in the CAA or regulation adopted by EPA under the CAA;” (2) the CAA provision or the regulation “requires actual control of emissions of that pollutant” such that monitoring or reporting requirements are not sufficient; and (3) “the PSD permitting requirements will not apply to a newly regulated pollutant until a regulatory requirement to control emissions of that pollutant ‘takes effect.’” 75 Fed. Reg. at 17,016, 17,006-08. Referring to this as the “actual control interpretation,” EPA determined this “is a permissible interpretation of the CAA and is the most appropriate interpretation to apply given

the policy implications.” *Id.* at 17,006. Specifically, with respect to CO₂, EPA “concluded that PSD program requirements will apply to GHGs upon the date that the anticipated tailpipe standards for light-duty vehicles (known as the “LDV Rule”) take effect.” *Id.* at 17,007.

First, the new position conflicts with the statutory language. The Clean Air Act provides that a major emitting facility is “subject to the best available control technology for each pollutant subject to regulation under [the Clean Air Act] emitted from, or which results from, such facility.” 42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(2). Moreover, Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the PSD program is to “protect public health and welfare from *any* actual or *potential adverse effect* which in the Administrator’s judgment may reasonably be anticipate[d] to occur from air pollution . . . notwithstanding attainment and maintenance of all national ambient air quality standards.” 42 U.S.C. § 7470(1) (emphasis added).

Furthermore, had Congress intended to express EPA’s interpretation that the regulation of CO₂ actually control the emissions (instead of regulate by requiring monitoring or reporting), it would have used the word “control” instead of regulate. Throughout the Clean Air Act, Congress differentiated “regulation” from “control.” *Compare* section 821, 42 U.S.C. § 7651k, *with* section 165(a)(4), 42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(4). Thus, EPA’s interpretation of the terms regulate and regulation would read this distinction out of the Act. *See In re: Arecibo & Aguadilla Regional Wastewater Treatment Plants* 12 E.A.D. 97, n.60 (EAB 2005) (“A fundamental canon of statutory construction is that if language is plain and unambiguous it must be given effect.”).

Second, the EPA has failed to provide an adequate explanation for its change in interpretation of a pollutant subject to regulation. While the agency states repeatedly that it is simply continuing its previous interpretation, 75 Fed. Reg. at 17004, in fact it added a new requirement to what constitutes a pollutant subject to regulation under the Act – *i.e.*, the fact that

regulation must actually be in effect and controlling emissions. The pollutant must not only be subject to a CAA or EPA regulation that requires actual emissions controls, but the emissions controls must actually be in effect. It is clear that EPA's new interpretation of a regulated pollutant was spurred by the Supreme Court's ruling in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, that CO₂ is a pollutant under the Act. EPA is now grasping for a way to yet again avoid regulating CO₂. Thus, it has added yet another requirement to its purely self-serving definition of a regulated pollutant under the Clean Air Act and failed to provide a rationale explanation for its change in position.

Third, EPA's purported policy rationales for its interpretation are simply not applicable to CO₂. The agency discusses the need to "assess whether is a justification for controlling emissions of a particular pollutant," "provide notice to the public," promote "orderly administration of the permitting program," and set significant emission rates before a pollutant is actually regulated under the PSD program. 75 Fed. Reg. at 17,006-07. Ironically, all of these things have already been done for CO₂. EPA made an endangerment finding for CO₂, which provides the justification for regulating CO₂. 74 Fed. Reg. 66,496. The public was put on notice by the Supreme Court's ruling in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, that CO₂ is a pollutant covered by the Act and that regulation was coming, as well as EPA's numerous notices in the federal register regarding CO₂ and greenhouses gases and the regulation thereof. *See supra* at 50-51. EPA established a significant emission rate for CO₂ in the tailoring rule. *See* 74 Fed. Reg. 55,292 (discussing "applicability threshold" of "25,000 tons per year"). Therefore, EPA's policy hurdles have all been overcome and there is no reason for Shell's CO₂ emissions not to be regulated.

As for the orderly administration of permitting, Petitioners are not unsympathetic to EPA's concerns but submit that whatever concerns the agency has about existing sources and how to bring them into compliance with significance levels for CO₂, *see* 75 Fed. Reg. at 17,008-10, and about new sources that will be regulated for the first time because of their CO₂ emissions, *see id.* at 17,009, are irrelevant here. Shell is neither. As demonstrated by the existing Chukchi OCS permit, Shell's operations make it a major source irrespective of its CO₂ emissions. Moreover, Shell will emit approximately 55,000 tons of CO₂ per year, which is well above the thresholds set in the tailoring rule.¹¹ Furthermore, because the Chukchi permit is time unlimited and applies to hundreds of lease blocks, it is imperative that BACT be applied to Shell's CO₂ emissions this first season and in all future seasons of operation. This is especially necessary because Shell's operations are proposed for the Arctic where Petitioners are already feeling the effects of climate change.¹²

Fourth, reality points overwhelmingly toward the fact that EPA has adopted regulations requiring the control of CO₂ that are in effect. The first of these is the EPA's preemption waiver. On July 8, 2009, EPA authorized California to implement its motor vehicle greenhouse gas emission standards pursuant to Section 209(b) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7543(b). 74 Fed. Reg. 32744; *see also id.* at 32752 ("California's greenhouse gas emissions standards establish allowable grams per mile ('gpm') levels for greenhouse gas emissions, including tailpipe emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂)"). As a result of this authorization, carbon dioxide

¹¹ By making this point Petitioners in no way concede that the threshold in the tailoring rule is sufficient.

¹² EPA's explanation that CO₂ might be included in Shell's Title V permit and therefore, should not be a concern now, EPA RTC at 53 (Exhibit 4), misses the point. Not only does this explanation fail to account for Shell's emissions from this summer, but it also ignores the fact that EPA may very well delay any regulation of CO₂ under the PSD program. 75 Fed. Reg. at 17,007 (noting EPA's intent to "defer applying PSD and Title V provisions for sources that are major based only on emissions of GHGs").

was immediately subject to emission limits not only in California, but also in ten other states that have imposed these same standards pursuant to their independent authority under Section 177 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7507. This is because Model Year 2010 began on January 2, 2009 (and Model Year 2009 began on January 2, 2008, see 40 CFR 85.2304). Two Courts have already determined that the CO₂ emission limits in California and ten other states are federal Clean Air Act standards. *Central Valley Chrysler-Jeep, Inc. v. Goldstene*, 529 F.Supp.2d 1151, 1165 (E.D. Cal. 2007); *Green Mountain Chrysler v. Crombie*, 508 F.Supp.2d 295, 350 (D.Vt. 2007). The same can be said for EPA's approval of the amendments to Delaware's SIP. *See supra* at 50.

Additionally, the fact that EPA has issued an endangerment finding *and* is regulating CO₂ through monitoring and reporting requirements should be sufficient to demonstrate that CO₂ is a regulated pollutant under the CAA. EPA makes the policy argument that it should not have to regulate an air pollutant under the PSD program when it is studying the pollutant to determine whether it should be regulated under the Act. 75 Fed. Reg. at 17,006-09. Inasmuch as this policy argument makes sense, it is not applicable to CO₂ since the agency has already determined that the pollutant endangers the public health and welfare.

As Petitioners pointed out in their comments to EPA, the precedent exists for major sources to conduct BACT analyses for CO₂. Petitioners explained “[a] combined petroleum refinery and IGCC power plant completed a CO₂ BACT analysis for its permit.” Hyperion Energy Center BACT Analysis for CO₂ (March 2009) (Exhibit 35). EPA provided absolutely no response to the suggestion that like Hyperion Refining, Shell should complete a BACT analysis for CO₂. As a result, the Chukchi OCS permit should be remanded for a further explanation from EPA regarding CO₂.

B. Region 10 Committed A Clear Legal Error By Not Requiring Shell To Comply With The NO₂ NAAQS.

On February 9, 2010, EPA issued a final rule to strengthen its NAAQS for nitrogen dioxide. Final Rule Nitrogen Dioxide NAAQS, 75 Fed. Reg. 6474 (Feb. 9, 2010). While this rule was finalized before the Chukchi air permit was issued, Region 10 did not require compliance with the new NAAQS for NO₂. As a result, the agency committed clear legal error.

1. The legal authority in support of the fact that the Chukchi air permit should have required compliance with the new NO₂ NAAQS.

The rule strengthening the NAAQS for NO₂ was finalized on February 9, 2010. Final Rule Nitrogen Dioxide NAAQS, 75 Fed. Reg. 6,474 (Feb. 9, 2010). With this action, EPA established a new one-hour standard of 100 parts per billion (ppb) to supplement the existing annual standard of 100 µg/m³. *Id.* According to EPA “[t]his level defines the maximum allowable concentration anywhere in an area” and is designed to “protect against adverse health effects associated with short-term exposure to NO₂, including respiratory effects that can result in admission to a hospital.” EPA Fact Sheet, Final Revisions to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards For Nitrogen Dioxide (Exhibit 36).

2. The factual background demonstrating the need for compliance with the new NO₂ NAAQS.

On June 26, 2009, EPA proposed the draft new NO₂ NAAQS. 74 Fed. Reg. 34,404 (June 26, 2009). On February 9, 2010, the new NAAQS for NO₂ were finalized. 75 Fed. Reg. at 6,474. This rulemaking was undertaken as the result of a “judicial order resolving a lawsuit filed in September 2005” that “provides that the Administrator will sign, for publication, notices of proposed and final rulemaking concerning the review of the primary NO₂ NAAQS no later than June 26, 2009 and January 22, 2010, respectively.” 75 Fed. Reg. at 6,477.

On January 8, 2010, the draft Chukchi air permit was released for public comment. Shell's operations are predicted to take up 20.2 percent of the old annual NAAQS for NO₂. EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 110 (Exhibit 5). EPA did not require Shell to demonstrate that it complied with the new NAAQS for NO₂. EPA RTC at 135 (Exhibit 4).

3. Preservation of error and subject of this petition.

In their comments on the revised Chukchi air permit, Petitioners discussed the need for Region 10 to ensure compliance with the new NO₂ NAAQS. Petitioners' Chukchi Revised Permit Comments at 17-20 (Exhibit 2).

By failing to require compliance with the new NO₂ NAAQS, Region 10 committed a clear legal error.

4. Argument demonstrating that Region 10 failed to require compliance with current legal requirements.

By failing to require Shell to comply with the new NO₂ NAAQS, EPA committed a clear legal error. The new NO₂ NAAQS was finalized on February 9, 2010, long before the final Chukchi air permit was issued – *i.e.*, on March 31, 2010. EPA's first explanation for this failure is that the new NO₂ NAAQS is "not currently in effect." *Id.* While the rule did not take effect until April 12, 2010, all of Shell's operations will occur after this date. *See supra* at 3 (noting that the permit covers operations between July and November). Therefore, Shell's operations under the PSD will not meet all applicable legal requirements.

EPA tries to explain this away by arguing that "Shell will be required to demonstrate compliance with the NO₂ NAAQS . . . when it applies for a Title V operating permit." EPA RTC at 136 (Exhibit 4). However, this ignores the fact that Shell need only "apply for an operating permit as provided in 40 C.F.R. § 71.5(a)(1)(i) within 12 months of first becoming an OCS on Shell's current leases in the Chukchi Sea." EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 25

(Exhibit 5). Therefore, Shell could operate for at least two seasons if not more, until the Title V permit is approved. During all this time, Shell would not be operating in compliance with the new NO₂ NAAQS.¹³

Furthermore, while the rule did not take effect before the Chukchi OCS permit was approved, the rule was finalized before the permit was issued. Because of the Court order the EPA was operating under, it and the regulated community were well aware of the timing for the new NO₂ NAAQS. In such unique circumstances, it is entirely arbitrary for EPA not to require compliance with a final regulation simply because it will not take effect until 12 days after the permit was issued (but before the permit operations commence).

Additionally, as Petitioners explained in their comments to EPA, there are serious concerns regarding whether Shell could comply with the new NO₂ NAAQS. Petitioners Comments at 8-9 (Exhibit 2). Shell's operations are predicted to take up 20.2 percent of the old annual NAAQS for NO₂. EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 110 (Exhibit 5). However, in looking at the NAAQS for which hourly predicting periods exist, Shell as a general matter will take up a much greater percentage of the hourly NAAQS. *Id.* For example, Shell is predicted to take up only 27.3 percent of the annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS but is predicted to take up 84 percent of the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. *Id.* Therefore, Shell's NO₂ emissions could be significant in light of the new one-hour NO₂ NAAQS. As a result, it was imperative that EPA provide an adequate justification for failing to require Shell to comply with the new, final NO₂ NAAQS. The agency simply failed to provide this justification.

¹³ There is precedent for sources complying with regulatory requirements prior to final agency action. As mentioned earlier, the Hyperion Energy Center in EPA Region 8 voluntarily conducted a BACT determination for CO₂ that was completed because the source "recognize[s] adding CO₂ emissions is an important issue, on which the political, regulatory, and legal framework may be changing." *See* Hyperion Energy Center Best Available Control Technology (BACT) Analysis for Emissions of Carbon Dioxide, March 2009, at 2 (Exhibit 35).

IV. REGION 10 ERRED BY NOT REQUIRING THE INCLUSION OR REGULATION OF EMISSIONS FROM PLANNED, ROUTINE ASPECTS OF SHELL'S OPERATIONS.

The calculation of Shell's potential emissions fails to include the emissions that would result from: the clean-up of an oil spill pursuant to Shell's Oil Spill Response Plan; the "other" vessels that Shell claims will remain more than 25 miles away from the drill ship including the oil tanker, the barge, and shallow water landing craft; and the drill ship's propulsion engine. The potential to emit therefore, fails to account for "the maximum capacity" of Shell's operations in violation of clear legal requirements.

A. Legal Background Establishing The Requirements For An Adequate Potential To Emit Calculation.

As previously explained, a BACT analysis for each pollutant that the source has the potential to emit in significant quantities must be conducted before a PSD permit can be issued.

42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(4). The potential to emit is defined in the PSD regulations as

the maximum capacity of a stationary source to emit a pollutant under its physical and operational design. Any physical or operational limitation on the capacity of the source to emit a pollutant including air pollution control equipment and restriction on hours of operation or on the type or amount of material combusted, stored, or processed, shall be treated as part of its design if the limitation or the effect it would have on emissions is federally enforceable.

40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(4). The definition of "potential emissions" in the OCS regulations is nearly identical except that it adds at the end that "[p]ursuant to section 328 of the Act, emissions from vessels servicing or associated with an OCS source shall be considered direct emissions from such a source while at the source, and while en route to or from the source when within 25 miles of the source, and shall be included in the 'potential to emit' for an OCS source." 40 C.F.R. § 55.2.

Under the PSD program, EPA has maintained a longstanding policy that the Clean Air Act does not allow automatic exemptions for excess emissions during startup, shutdown, and malfunction (SSM) events. *See, i.e., Indeck-Elwood, LLC*, PSD Appeal No. 03-04, slip op. at 66 (Sept. 27, 2006), 13 E.A.D. ___ (“EPA has, since 1977, disallowed automatic or blanket exemptions for excess emissions during startup, shutdown, maintenance, and malfunctions by defining most periods of excess emissions as ‘violations’ of the applicable emission limitations”) (citing *In re Tallmadge Generating Station*, PSD Appeal No. 02–12, at 24 (EAB, May 21, 2003)). Recently, the Tenth Circuit in *Arizona Public Service Co. v. U.S.*, highlighted that the agency’s “longstanding policy makes clear that excess emissions resulting from malfunctions are violations of the Clean Air Act, for such emissions can interfere with attainment of the national air standards.” 562 F.3d 1116 (10th Cir. 2009); *see also* 72 Fed. Reg. 25,702, 25,705. The EAB relied upon this policy to remand a PSD permit that included a provision exempting a coal-fired steam electric generating station from otherwise applicable emissions limits during startup, shut down, and malfunction events. *Indeck-Elwood, LLC*, slip op. at 71, 76 (Sept. 27, 2006).

B. Factual Background On Shell’s Operations And How The Potential To Emit Was Challenged.

In calculating the potential to emit for Shell’s Chukchi permit, the emissions from cleaning up an oil spill pursuant to Shell’s approved Oil Spill Prevent Plan were not included. EPA RTC at 93 (Exhibit 4) (explaining that “[e]missions from emergency or upset conditions” “are generally not considered”). The emissions from “the tanker, barge, and shallow water landing craft were not included in the EPA’s review for the PSD permit.” *Id.* at 95. Because an oil spill is such a likely, and not merely an unforeseeable event, Shell is employing an entire “oil spill response” (OSR) fleet as part of its proposed operations. One of the OSR vessels, the *Nanuq*, will be positioned about 5,000 meters away from the *Discoverer* and will be used to

conduct “on-water drills” for training, approximately 8-hours at a time, no more than once per day. EPA Chukchi Revised Stmt. of Basis at 48.

Region 10 does note “that engines on the Associated Fleet are regulated through emission limits and throughput limits in order to ensure that emissions from Shell’s exploration drilling operations will not interfere with attainment or maintenance of any currently applicable NAAQS or exceed any applicable increment.” EPA RTC at 7 (Exhibit 4). EPA also determined that “that emissions from the propulsion engine of the Discoverer are not to be considered in the PTE of the OCS source while en route to and within 25 miles of the drill site, a period of approximately four hours” *Id.* at 27.

C. Preservation Of Error And Subject Of This Petition.

In their comments on the revised Chukchi air permit, Petitioners discussed the need for oil spill response emissions, and emissions from all of the associated fleet and the Discoverer’s propulsion engine to be included in the potential to emit calculations. Petitioners’ Chukchi Revised Permit Comments at 17-20 (Exhibit 2).

In issuing the Chukchi air permit, Region 10 failed to comply with the regulatory definition of potential to emit and EPA’s longstanding interpretation thereof.

D. Argument As To Why Shell’s Potential To Emit Calculation Was Legally Inadequate.

As EPA explained, “determining a project’s PTE is essential for determining . . . the scope of PSD review, in particular, the pollutants that are subject to application of BACT” EPA Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 28. Nevertheless, in determining Shell’s potential to emit the emissions from the oil spill response fleet cleaning up an oil spill or responding to another emergency were not included, nor were any of the emissions from the rest of the ancillary fleet that are specified as remaining at least 25 miles from the Discoverer or the Discoverer’s

propulsion engine. This violated the plain language of EPA's regulations defining the potential to emit.

With respect to the oil spill response fleet, moving the entire OSR fleet to the drill site, cleaning up oil, and conducting other response activities, will cause the addition of air pollutants from the use of the propulsion engines, generators, and other equipment. Shell also lists in situ burning – *i.e.* burning of spilt materials either oil and/or gas – as a method to clean up a spill, which will also increase its air emissions. Excerpts Shell, Oil Discharge Prevention and Contingency Plan (Exhibit 37). These activities are well documented as required by MMS. For this reason, Petitioners requested that they be included in Shell's potential to emit calculation.

EPA's response is that “[e]missions from emergency or upset conditions” were not included within the potential to emit because they are not “routine operations.” EPA RTC at 93 (Exhibit 4). However, the record belies this conclusion. Shell's clean-up operations are well documented and are even rehearsed by the company. *See* Shell, Oil Discharge Prevention and Contingency Plan Excerpts (Exhibit 37); *see supra* at 62-63. More importantly, they fit squarely within the definition of potential to emit which includes “the maximum capacity of a stationary source to emit a pollutant.” 40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(4). Responding to an oil spill is a necessary capacity of Shell's fleet and is a component of exploration that Shell cannot be authorized to operate without. Thus, Region 10 committed clear legal error by failing to include these emissions within Shell's potential to emit.

Moreover, to provide Shell with an automatic exemption for these excess emissions would be contrary to EPA's longstanding policy under the PSD program that the Clean Air Act does not allow automatic exemptions for malfunctions. *Indeck-Elwood, LLC*, slip op. at 66; *Arizona Public Service Co. v. U.S.*, 562 F.3d 1116 (10th Cir. 2009); *see also* 72 Fed. Reg.

25,702, 25,705. EPA fails to address this policy in responding to comments regarding the need to model the emissions from responding to an oil spill pursuant to the Oil Discharge Prevention and Contingency Plan.

As for the rest of the associated fleet and the propulsion engine, EPA admits that emissions from the associated fleet were not included in Shell's potential to emit. However, its explanation for this is that "these vessels are not expected to operate within 25 miles of the Discoverer while the Discoverer is an OCS source." EPA RTC at 95 (Exhibit 4). As demonstrated by the fact that several of these vessels would be used to respond to an oil spill, this response is not adequate. Nor is the EPA's response that it will provide a proper response to these emissions when they occur. *Id.* at 97.

This is particularly true because excess emissions resulting from an oil spill response or the emissions from the associated fleet or propulsion engine of the drill ship could have the potential to increase Shell's emissions such that Shell can no longer demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS. In several instances, the modeling done for Shell's emissions demonstrate its operations will take up large percentages of the NAAQS. *See e.g.*, EPA Revised Chukchi Stmt of Basis at 110 (Exhibit 5) (documenting PM_{2.5} concentrations at over 84 percent of the 24-hour NAAQS). Moreover, EPA even clarified that the "associated fleet are being regulated through emission limits and throughput limits" in order to ensure that Shell's operations "will not interfere with attainment or maintenance of any currently applicable NAAQS." EPA RTC at 7 (Exhibit 4). Therefore, it was critical that these emissions be counted within Shell's potential to emit.

V. REGION 10 COMMITTED A CLEAR LEGAL ERROR BY NOT PERFORMING AN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSIS.

Petitioners requested that EPA perform an environmental analysis of Shell's operations. The Inupiat communities that will be impacted by Shell's emissions suffer from disparate lung and heart health problems when compared to other U.S. populations. Additionally, among the air pollutants that are authorized under the Chukchi air permit, are PM_{2.5} and NO₂ for which scientific evidence exists that the NAAQS are inadequate to protect the health of all populations.

A. Legal Background Supporting The Need For Environmental Justice Analyses Of PSD Permits.

Under Executive Order No. 12898, EPA must consider and address, when appropriate, "disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects of [their] programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations." Exec. Order No. 12,898, Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, 59 Fed. Reg. 7,629, 7,632-33 (Feb. 11, 1994). The board has previously remanded PSD permits to EPA when the agency has failed to include an environmental justice analysis in the record. *See e.g., In re: Knauf Fiber Glass*, 8 E.A.D. 121, 175 (EAB 1999) (remanding PSD permit to the permitting agency to include the environmental justice analysis in the record).

B. Factual Background Demonstrating That An Environmental Justice Analysis Was Necessary For The Chukchi Air Permit.

As previously described, North Slope communities have markedly higher rates of pulmonary disease, have different genetic predispositions to disease, and are substantially more vulnerable to morbidity and mortality from air pollution than the general population in the U.S. *See supra* at 4-5. The health concerns posed by particulate matter and nitrogen oxides include chronic respiratory disease, asthma, lung cancer, and cardio-respiratory mortality. *Id.*

EPA did not regulate secondary PM_{2.5} in the Chukchi air permit or even model the level of emissions of this pollutant, *see supra* at 40-47, the Chukchi air permit does not require compliance with the new PSD increments for PM_{2.5} that will be finalized this summer, *see* 73 Fed. Reg. 54,115 (Sept. 21, 2007), and the Chukchi permit does not require compliance with the new NO₂ NAAQS. *See supra* at 58-61.

1. Background on regulation of PM_{2.5} under the Clean Air Act.

PM_{2.5} concentrations at levels lower than the current NAAQS are a concern for human health. In revising the PM_{2.5} standard, the EPA Administrator convened the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC or Committee) pursuant to section 109(d)(2) of the Clean Air Act to recommend revisions to the PM_{2.5} standards. EPA-CASAC-LTR-06-003, Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee Recommendations Concerning the Final National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter, September 29, 2006 (Exhibit 38). The CASAC unanimously recommended to EPA that the 24-hr PM_{2.5} standard be lowered from 65 µg/m³ to 30-35 µg/m³ and that the annual standard be lowered from 15 µg/m³ to 13-14 µg/m³. *Id.* EPA set the standard on the high end of the CASAC recommended range for the short-term standard and chose not to lower the annual standard at all. 71 Fed. Reg. at 61,145.

In response, CASAC made it clear in their September 29, 2006 recommendation letter to the EPA that their recommendations were based on “clear and convincing scientific evidence” and that the EPA’s decision not to lower the annual standard does not provide for “an adequate margin of safety ... requisite to protect the public health” as required by the CAA and furthermore, that their recommendations were “consistent with the mainstream scientific advice that EPA received from virtually every major medical association and public health organization that provided their input to the Agency.” EPA-CASAC-LTR-06-003, Clean Air Scientific

Advisory Committee Recommendations Concerning the Final National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter, September 29, 2006 (Exhibit 37). Nevertheless, on October 16, 2006, EPA adopted the high range 24 standard and made no changes to the annual standard. 71 Fed. Reg. at 61,145. These PM_{2.5} standards remain in effect today.

2. Background on the regulation of NO₂ under the Clean Air Act.

As previously discussed, the rule strengthening the NAAQS for NO₂ was finalized on February 9, 2010. Final Rule Nitrogen Dioxide NAAQS, 75 Fed. Reg. 6,474 (Feb. 9, 2010). The new NO₂ NAAQS is designed to “protect against adverse health effects associated with short-term exposure to NO₂, including respiratory effects that can result in admission to a hospital.” EPA Fact Sheet, Final Revisions to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards For Nitrogen Dioxide (Exhibit 36).

C. Preservation Of Error And Subject Of This Petition.

In their comments on the Chukchi air permit, Petitioners discussed the need for EPA to perform an environmental justice analysis of the emissions from Shell’s operations citing to the disparate health problems on the North Slope and the failure of the NAAQS to protect all populations – especially with respect to particulate matter. Petitioners Comments at 54-55 (Exhibit 2).

Region 10 committed clear legal error by not requiring the completion of an environmental justice analysis for the Chukchi air permit.

D. Argument.

As previously described, Region 10 failed to require any modeling or calculation of secondary PM_{2.5} in approving the Chukchi air permit, any demonstration of compliance with the new PM_{2.5} increments, or compliance with the new NO₂ NAAQS. These failures are critical in

light of the existing health disparities in the populations that will be impacted by Shell's emissions. *See supra* at 4-5. Thus, it was critical that Region 10 at the very least analyze these issues in an environmental justice analysis as Petitioners requested. However, EPA failed to provide this analysis.

The EPA's only justification for this failure is that:

this permitting action will not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations because it does not affect the level of protection provided to human health or the environment . . . [because] the final permit is designed to meet the requirements of the CAA. The emissions limits in the permit are expected to curb air pollution sufficiently so that air quality in the region continues to attain applicable NAAQS. The level of the NAAQS is set low enough to protect public health, including sensitive individuals, with an adequate margin of safety . . . Objections to the NAAQS themselves must be addressed during the NAAQS review process . . .

EPA RTC at 138 (Exhibit 4). In other words, since the permit is designed to comply with the NAAQS, an environmental justice analysis is not required.

This means that no PSD permit will ever trigger the requirements of the Executive Order on environmental justice, because the EPA cannot issue a final PSD that fails to ensure compliance with the NAAQS. *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 7475(a)(3), (a)(7); *see also* Exhibit 24 at 2 (“We can't issue a permit with a predicted violation!”). Such arbitrary reasoning necessitates a further explanation from the agency. Additionally, the Board has previously remanded PSD permits in situations like this where the EPA has failed to include the environmental justice analysis in the record. *See e.g., In re: Knauf Fiber Glass*, 8 E.A.D. 121, 175 (EAB 1999) (remanding PSD permit to the permitting agency to include the environmental justice analysis in the record).¹⁴

¹⁴ EPA was well aware of the need to provide an adequate response on this issue. EPA's December 1, 2000 memorandum on environmental justice analyses recognizes that the “EAB remanded a PSD permit to the delegated permitting authority (the Shasta County Air Quality Management District) for failure to provide an environmental justice analysis in the administrative record in response to comments raising the issue.” EPA Memo at 12 (Exhibit 39).

As previously discussed, the Inupiat people living along the North Slope of Alaska suffer from disparate health problems from other U.S. populations. The permitted emissions will affect populations that already experience markedly higher rates of pulmonary disease and chronic lung disease and that are substantially more vulnerable to morbidity and mortality from air pollution than are other Americans. *See supra* at 3-4. Thus, EPA's reliance solely on compliance with the NAAQS to protect human health, risks increasing a pre-existing health disparity between Inupiat people on the North Slope and human populations elsewhere in the United States.

In addition, EPA updated the NAAQS for NO₂ and in so doing recognized that the new standards are necessary to "protect against adverse health effects associated with short-term exposure to NO₂, including respiratory effects that can result in admission to a hospital." EPA Fact Sheet, Final Revisions to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards For Nitrogen Dioxide (Exhibit 36). Additionally, CASAC has explained that there is "clear and convincing scientific evidence" that the EPA's decision not to lower the annual PM_{2.5} standard does not provide for "an adequate margin of safety ... requisite to protect the public health" as required by the CAA. EPA-CASAC-LTR-06-003, Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee Recommendations Concerning the Final National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter, September 29, 2006 (Exhibit 37). Thus, there is strong evidence here that the NAAQS are simply not sufficient to protect public health – let alone the health of Inupiat along the North Slope.

Therefore, in light of the disparate health problems that already exist on the North Slope, the likelihood of particulate matter and NO₂ worsening existing health problems, and the acknowledgements from both EPA and CASAC that the NAAQS that the Chukchi air permit are ensuring compliance with are not sufficient to protect human health, EPA needs to provide a new rationale for failing to conduct an environmental justice analysis.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, we respectfully urge the Board to review and remand the PSD permit to EPA for further analysis.

Respectfully submitted,

Tanya Sanerib
Tanya Sanerib
Crag Law Center
917 SW Oak Street, Suite 417
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 525.2722
tanya@crag.org

Christopher Winter
Christopher Winter
Crag Law Center
917 SW Oak Street, Suite 417
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 525.2725
chris@crag.org

Dated: May 3, 2010

Attorneys for Petitioners
ICAS