

Bryan W. Shaw, Ph.D., *Chairman*
Buddy Garcia, *Commissioner*
Carlos Rubinstein, *Commissioner*
Mark R. Vickery, P.G., *Executive Director*



TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Pollution

June 3, 2010

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

Re: Executive Director's Response to EPA Objection
Renewal
Permit Number: O2715
ExxonMobil Oil Corporation
Colonial Storage Facility
Beaumont, Jefferson County
Regulated Entity Number: RN102553336
Customer Reference Number: CN600920748

Dear Mr. Edlund:

On March 5, 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6 office signed a letter identifying objections to the issuance of the proposed federal operating permit for the above-referenced site. In accordance with Title 30 Texas Administrative Code § 122.350 (30 TAC § 122.350), the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) may not issue the permit until the objections are resolved. In addition, the letter identifies certain additional concerns. The TCEQ understands that the additional concerns are provided for information only, and do not need to be resolved in order to issue the permit.

The TCEQ has completed the technical review of your objections and offers the enclosed responses to facilitate resolution of the objections. In addition, the attached responses to the objections describe the changes, if applicable, that have been made to the revised proposed permit and supporting statement of basis (SOB). The revised proposed permit and SOB are attached for your review.

Mr. Carl E. Edlund, P.E.
Page 2
June 3, 2010

Consistent with Title 30 TAC §122.350, please provide an indication of your acceptance or assessment of the responses and resolutions to the objections as soon as possible. After receipt of your acceptance to the responses and resolutions to the objections, TCEQ will issue the proposed permit. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. Please contact Mr. Alfredo Mendoza, P.E., at (512) 239-1335 if you have any questions concerning this matter.

Sincerely,



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

SH/AM/bb

cc: Mr. Brad VanMarion, Environmental Advisor, ExxonMobil Oil Corporation, Beaumont
Ms. Amber M. Russell, Operating Services Department Head, ExxonMobil Oil Corporation,
Beaumont
Air Section Manager, Region 10 - Beaumont

Enclosures: TCEQ Executive Director's Response to EPA Objection
Proposed Permit
Statement of Basis
Flexible Permit Number 49131
Technical Review for Permit Number 49131

Project Number: 14032

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO EPA OBJECTION

Permit Number O2715

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Executive Director (ED) provides this Response to EPA's Objection to the renewal of the Federal Operating Permit (FOP) for ExxonMobil Oil Corporation, Colonial Storage Facility, Permit No. O2715, Jefferson County, Texas.

BACKGROUND

Procedural Background

The Texas Operating Permit Program requires that owners and operators of sites subject to 30 Tex. Admin. Code (TAC) Chapter 122 obtain a FOP that contains all applicable requirements to facilitate compliance and improve enforcement. The FOP does not authorize construction or modifications to facilities, and it does not authorize emission increases. To construct or modify a facility, the responsible party must have the appropriate new source review authorization. If the site is subject to 30 TAC Chapter 122, the owner or operator must submit a timely FOP application for the site and ultimately must obtain the FOP to operate. ExxonMobil Oil Corporation applied to the TCEQ for a renewal of the FOP for the Colonial Storage Facility located in Beaumont, Jefferson County on August 4, 2009, and notice was published on January 8, 2010 in the *Beaumont Enterprise* and *El Perico*. The public comment period ended on February 7, 2010. During the concurrent EPA review period, TCEQ received an objection to the permit from EPA on March 5, 2010.

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

Description of Site

ExxonMobil Oil Corporation owns and operates the Colonial Storage Facility, located at 14713 West Port Arthur Road in Beaumont, Jefferson County, Texas 77701.

The Colonial Storage Facility is comprised of seven floating roof tanks and three cone roof storage tanks. The facility receives petroleum liquids and fuel oils via a pipeline from the Beaumont Refinery. These products are stored prior to being routed from the tanks into pipelines for transfer across the United States to marketing facilities.

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

EPA OBJECTION 1:

The New Source Review (NSR) Authorization References table in the draft Title V permit incorporates by reference Flexible Permit No. 49131, issued on June 15, 2009. Flexible permits are issued pursuant to 30 TAC Chapter 116, Subchapter G; however, those provisions have not been approved, pursuant to Section 110 of the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), 42 U.S.C. § 7410, as part of the applicable implementation plan for the State of Texas (Texas SIP). Therefore, pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(1), EPA must object to the issuance of this Title V permit because the terms and conditions of the incorporated flexible permit cannot be determined to be in

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO EPA OBJECTION

Permit Number O2715

Page 2

compliance with the applicable requirements of the Texas SIP. The failure to have submitted information necessary to make this determination constitutes an additional basis for this objection, pursuant to 40 CFR §70.8(c)(3)(ii). In order to respond to this objection, additional information must be provided by the applicant showing how the emissions authorized by the flexible permit meet the air permitting requirements of the federally-approved provisions of the Texas SIP. Furthermore, the Title V permit must include an additional condition specifically requiring the source to prepare and submit to TCEQ a written analysis of any future change/modification to ensure that minor and/or major new source review requirements under the federally-approved Texas SIP have not been triggered. Finally, the terms and conditions of flexible permits based upon the requirements of 30 TAC Chapter 116, Subchapter G must be identified as State-only terms and conditions, pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.6(b)(2).

TCEQ RESPONSE:

As a preliminary matter, the ED believes that resolution of EPA concerns regarding flexible permits is a common objective for both TCEQ and the EPA. The concerns discussed below regarding the use of the Title V permitting process to challenge independent flexible permits on a case-by-case basis does not diminish the importance of reaching an expeditious resolution to the NSR flexible permit issue. The ED recognizes the flexible permit rules, located in 30 TAC Chapter 116, Subchapter G, and submitted to EPA in 1994, have not been approved into the Texas SIP. However, the Texas federal operating permit (FOP) program is EPA-approved. TCEQ reviews applications and issues FOPs according to EPA-approved program rules found in 30 Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Chapter 122. The Texas Operating Permit Program was granted full approval on December 6, 2001 (66 FR 63318), and subsequent rule changes were approved on March 30, 2005 (70 FR 161634). The application procedures, found in 30 TAC § 122.132(a) require an applicant to provide any information required by the ED to determine applicability of, or to codify any "applicable requirement." In order for the ED to issue an FOP, the permit must contain all applicable requirements for each emission unit (30 TAC § 122.142). "Applicable requirement" is specifically defined in 30 TAC § 122.10(2)(h) to include all requirements of 30 TAC Chapter 116 and any term and condition of any preconstruction permit. As a Chapter 116 preconstruction authorization, flexible permits are applicable requirements, and shall be included in applications and Texas issued FOPs, in compliance with Texas's approved program. According to the EPA review procedures of Chapter 122, EPA may only object to issuance of any proposed permit which is not in compliance with the applicable requirements or requirements of this chapter. Therefore, this objection is not valid under the program EPA has approved in Texas because the applicant provided information as to the applicable Chapter 116 requirements, including flexible permits, and the ED has included these requirements in the draft FOP. EPA objections to individual permits issued under an EPA approved operating permit program are not appropriate for concerns that relate to programmatic elements.

The ED disagrees with the allegation that the failure of the applicant to have submitted information necessary to make a determination of whether they were in compliance with the SIP constitutes an additional basis for this objection, pursuant to 40 CFR §70.8(c)(3)(ii). Section 70.8(c)(3)(ii) is premised on the *permitting authority* not "submitting any information necessary [for EPA] to review adequately the proposed permit." The ED has provided all

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO EPA OBJECTION

Permit Number O2715

Page 3

information requested by EPA, when asked, including NSR permits and other supporting information. The flexible permit applications, technical reviews, and flexible permits clearly do not allow sources to utilize the flexible permit authorization mechanism to circumvent major NSR permitting requirements. Specifically, 30 TAC Chapter 116 requires that all new major sources or major modifications be authorized through nonattainment or PSD permitting under Subchapter B, Divisions 5 and 6.

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

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

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO EPA OBJECTION

Permit Number O2715

Page 4

However, the ED recognizes that some companies are in negotiations with EPA to include a special term and condition in the draft FOP requiring that they submit an application to reissue a permit, through the SIP-approved amendment, alteration, or renewal process, with a deadline for application submittal, and specific information to EPA and TCEQ for review prior to public notice. If Exxon Mobil agrees to such a process, the TCEQ will work with Exxon Mobil to change the draft permit appropriately.

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

EPA OBJECTION 2: Special Condition 11 of the draft Title V permit states that the permit holder shall certify compliance with all terms and conditions. The compliance certification requirements for Title V permits are stated in 40 CFR § 70.6(c)(5). Pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(1), EPA objects to the issuance of the Title V permit because Special Condition 11 of the draft Title V permit does not meet the regulatory requirements. In response to this objection, TCEQ must amend Special Condition 11 to include all the requirements for compliance certifications, as set forth in 40 CFR § 70.6(c)(5), including the identification of the methods or other means for determining the compliance status with each term and condition of the permit.

TCEQ RESPONSE: The ED does not agree that Special Condition 11 of the draft permit needs to be revised. Special Condition 11 of the draft permit is in compliance with the specific requirements of the EPA approved Federal Operating Permit program, as found in 30 TAC Chapter 122. Specifically, § 122.146(5), requires the annual compliance certification to include or reference the specified elements, including: the identification of each term or condition of the permit for which the permit holder is certifying compliance, the method used for determining the compliance status of each emission unit, and whether such method provides continuous or intermittent data; for emission units addressed in the permit for which no deviations have

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO EPA OBJECTION

Permit Number O2715

Page 5

occurred over the certification period, a statement that the emission units were in continuous compliance over the certification period; for any emission unit addressed in the permit for which one or more deviations occurred over the certification period, specific information indicating the potentially intermittent compliance status of the emission unit; and the identification of all other terms and conditions of the permit for which compliance was not achieved. All permit holders are required to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 122.146, as well as all other rules and requirements of the commission.

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

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

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

EPA OBJECTION 3: Special Condition 16 of the draft Title V permit references a "Permit Shield" attachment which identifies emission units, groups and processes TCEQ has determined are exempt from specifically identified potentially applicable requirements. The statement of basis (SOB) does not fully discuss the factual or legal basis for TCEQ's determinations. EPA has previously objected to negative applicability determinations based on blanket statements claiming a "grandfathered" status (See, e.g., letter from Kerrigan G. Clough, Assistant Regional Administrator, EPA, Region 8 to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Re: EPA Review of Proposed Title V Operating Permit for TriGen-Colorado Energy Corporation, dated September 13, 2000 ("TriGen Objection")). Similar blanket statements such as those contained in the draft Title V permit and the accompanying SOB do not meet the permit shield requirements of 40 CFR § 70.6(f). Pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(1) and (3), EPA objects to the issuance of the Title V permit because the shield provisions in the draft Title V permit are only supported by conclusory statements in the SOB. The SOB fails to provide an adequate discussion of the legal and factual basis for the determinations made under 40 CFR § 70.6(f) used to support the nonapplicability of those requirements identified in the "Permit Shield" attachment to the Title V permit. In response to this objection, the Title V permit renewal application must be revised to include all potentially relevant facts supporting a request for a determination of nonapplicability, and the SOB must be revised to provide adequate discussion of TCEQ's legal and factual basis for all determinations of nonapplicability for those requirements identified in the "Permit Shield" attachment to the Title V Permit. Alternatively, Special Condition 16 and the "Permit Shield" attachment must be deleted from the permit.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO EPA OBJECTION

Permit Number O2715

Page 6

TCEQ RESPONSE: The ED disagrees that the permit shield does not meet the requirements of 40 CFR § 70.6(f). Special Condition 16 was drafted in compliance with the requirements of the EPA approved federal operating permit program for the State of Texas, 30 TAC Chapter 122. Section 122.142(f), Permit Content Requirements, clearly allows the ED discretion to grant a permit shield for specific emission units at the request of an applicant. Additionally, § 122.148, Permit Shield, provides the requirements for the exercise of discretion by the ED, including that specific information be submitted by the applicant, in addition to other requirements. The ED determined that the application information submitted by Exxon Mobil and certified by a responsible official was sufficient to grant the permit shield.

Furthermore, the permit shield as listed in FOP O2715 provides a "concise summary" of the negative applicability determination for each regulation that may potentially apply to emission units listed in the Permit Shield table as required by 40 CFR § 70.6(f)(1)(ii). This concise summary contains both the determination and the relevant facts upon which the determination was based, as supported by a certification by the responsible official as to the truth, accuracy and completeness of the facts for which the responsible official is liable both civilly and criminally. The SOB notes that a permit shield was requested and granted, and refers the reader back to the permit shield attachment to the permit for information regarding the permit shield. The ED has thus exercised his discretion, as allowed under the EPA approved operating permit program for the State of Texas, and the permit shield thus is not an unsupportable or unenforceable "blanket statement". The ED is aware of no provision in 40 CFR Part 70 stating that a permit shield cannot be granted based on certified representations regarding construction, modification, or reconstruction date information.

EPA's reliance on the TriGen-Colorado Energy Corporation objection to support an objection to the permit shield for ExxonMobil Colonial's storage tanks is misplaced. In the TriGen objection, EPA Region 8 stated the state permitting authority must remove the permit shields for PSD and NSPS nonapplicability based on a statement of no modification subsequent to initial construction. However, EPA also concluded the permit authority "may retain the permit shield for original NSPS applicability based on the date of construction of the boilers." The NSPS K negative applicability reasons at issue here for the storage tanks listed in the Permit Shield table of FOP O2715 are based on construction date.

EPA OBJECTION 4: The draft Title V permit fails to identify the applicable monitoring requirements for the storage tanks covered by the Title V permit, as required by 40 CFR § 70.6(a)(3). Notwithstanding Objection 1 above, Special Conditions 5, 6, 7 of the incorporated Permit No. 49131 identifies the monitoring requirements for the storage tanks; however, the requirements are not clear as to which tanks they apply. All applicable monitoring requirements must be contained in the Title V permit to ensure compliance. Pursuant to 40 CFR § 70.8(c)(1), EPA objects to the issuance of the Title V permit since it is not in compliance with the requirements of 40 CFR § 70.6(a)(3). Furthermore, the Applicable Requirements Summary table does not list any applicable requirements for monitoring and testing, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements for Tanks 68TFX#3003, 68TFX#3004, and 68TFX#3005. These tanks

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO EPA OBJECTION

Permit Number O2715

Page 7

are also missing from the Unit Summary table as well. In response to this objection, the Title V permit must be revised to identify each storage tank covered by the Title V permit and to list the applicable monitoring and testing, recordkeeping and reporting requirements for each such tank.

TCEQ RESPONSE: Special Condition 5 applies to storage tanks 60TEF#3000, 60TEF#3001, 60TEF#3002, 68TFX#3003, 68TFX#3004, 68TFX#3005, 68TIF#3006, 68TIF#3007, 68TEF#3008, and 68TEF#3009. Special Condition 6 applies to 60TEF#3000, 60TEF#3001, 60TEF#3002, 68TIF#3006, 68TIF#3007, 68TEF#3008, and 68TEF#3009. Special Condition 7 applies to fugitive emissions at the tank farm identified as 68FUG#001.

The Title V permit was updated to identify the specific NSR monitoring conditions of permit 49131 that apply to each storage tank in the Applicable Requirement Summary tables. The Unit Summary and Applicable Requirements Summary tables were updated to add tanks 68TFX#3003, 68TFX#3004, and 68TFX#3005.

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


_____)	
In re:)	
)	
Flint Hills Resources, LP)	Title V Appeal No.
Permit No. O1445)	
)	
)	
_____)	

REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Flint Hills Resources, LP ("FHR") hereby requests that the Environmental Appeals Board order oral argument in the above-captioned matter. Oral argument would assist the Board in its deliberations on the significant issues presented by the case.

The issues presented are of first impression for the Board. This case presents questions regarding EPA's authority to effectively revoke a facility's state-issued Title V Permit and to demand a full application for an entirely new federal Title V permit, along with extensive additional information, on the basis of objections unrelated to the permittee's requested minor permit revision. The regulatory authorities cited by EPA for its takeover of FHR's Texas Title V Permit have never been applied in the present manner before. EPA's underlying dispute with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality over the state's Title V and "Flexible Permitting"

programs is also procedurally complex, as is the relevant permit history of FHR's Corpus Christi East Refinery. Oral argument would therefore materially assist in the resolution of the issues presented.



David M. Friedland
Beveridge & Diamond PC
1350 I Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005-3311
Telephone: (202) 789-6047
Fax: (202) 789-6190
dfriedland@bdlaw.com

Kevin T. Haroff
Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P.
600 Travis Street, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77002-2992
Telephone: (713) 227-8008
Fax: (713) 227-9508
kharoff@shb.com

Counsel for Petitioner Flint Hills Resources, LP

Date: _____


June 24, 2016

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing Petition for Review and Request for Oral Argument in the matter of Flint Hills Resources, LP, Title V Appeal No. _____, was served by FedEx on the following persons, this 24th day of June, 2010:

Dr. Alfredo Armendariz
Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6
1445 Ross Avenue
Suite 1200
Dallas, Texas 75202

Joshua M. Olszewski
Assistant Regional Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6
1445 Ross Avenue
Suite 1200
Dallas, Texas 75202



David M. Friedland
Beveridge & Diamond, PC
1350 I Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005-3311
Telephone: (202) 789-6047
Fax: (202) 789-6190
dfriedland@bdlaw.com

Kevin T. Haroff
Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P.
600 Travis Street, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77002-2992
Telephone: (713) 227-8008
Fax: (713) 227-9508
kharoff@shb.com

Counsel for Petitioner Flint Hills Resources, LP

Date: June 24, 2010