

RECEIVED
U.S. E.P.A.

2006 JUL 26 PM 1:52

ENVIR. APPEALS BOARD

Patricia Jiminez
Attorney at Law
13613 Jaybird Way
Redding, Ca. 09003
530-275-6201

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Clerk of the Board, Environmental Appeals Board 1103B
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460-0001

July 21, 2006

In re: Knauf Insulation
Permit number: NSR 4 -4 -4, SAC 03-01
Appeal Number: PSD 06-03

Dear Sirs:

My objections to the Knauf Fiberglass emissions increase were not made orally at the "Public Hearing in Shasta Lake City," Exhibit B, at 17: 18-18:4. Instead, as was stated in the newspapers, I was permitted to state my objections by letter, which I did.

1. I did raise the issue of a conflict of interest between the permit issuing representative of the EPA and Shasta County. The person was, and is, a county employee of Shasta County AQMD. Therefore, the county pays his wages, and he pretty much complies with the wishes of his bosses, who are the county board of supervisors. So, until there is an independent representative of the EPA, that conflict is not for the better reasons of the public.

2. My objection to the emission increases, after Knauf had purchased air Emission Reduction Credits (ERCs), was summarily dismissed as not even being considered in the PSD process. Why not? Dirty and dangerous emissions should all be considered,

regardless of how they are allowed. The **SUM TOTAL** are the important numbers, not where fractions and parts come from that are ignored in permits.

3. My statement that Shasta County, at times of the year, has some of the most polluted air in the nation, Region 9 just summarily dismissed this information does not, “Relate to any PSD permitting requirements and therefore is outside the jurisdiction of the EAB in this proceedings.” PSD Appeals Nos. 06-01 through 06-page 14.

Again, I asked why not? Knauf has purchased additional ERCs, and has still exceeded the emissions allowed. Yet, these additional ERCs are not even considered in this PSD permit? Why does it not all count?

4. I did not realize because I am an attorney, my personal and informal letters as a citizen, would be held to the legal and formal requirement of a court brief. Therefore, mine, along with the other nonprofessional petitions was just summarily dismissed.

5. My giving the EPA a quick synopsis of the Knauf history, in regard to its record on pollution, apparently was summarily disregarded. History repeats itself, as already has been shown. Why does the EPA totally disregard company history, ERC purchases, etc. when considering a greater emission allowance permit? These facts are all relevant.

The EPA should not only be cognizant of the problems discussed by petitioners, as the problems are real; the EPA should seriously consider some of the protests and allegations and not just dismiss them.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Patricia Jiminez". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Patricia Jiminez

Pj/sj