

**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON**

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
FOR
OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF
PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT AND
TITLE V AIR QUALITY OPERATING PERMIT
CONICAL DRILLING UNIT KULLUK**

**SHELL OFFSHORE INC.
BEAUFORT SEA EXPLORATION DRILLING PROGRAM
PERMIT NO. R10OCS030000**

Table of Content

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	CATEGORY – COMMENTS OF GENERAL SUPPORT	3
B.	CATEGORY – COMMENTS OF GENERAL OPPOSITION	4
C.	CATEGORY – PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS	5
D.	CATEGORY – DEFINITION OF OCS SOURCE.....	11
E.	CATEGORY – OPERATIONS IN SAME SEA.....	15
F.	CATEGORY – REQUIREMENT TO OPERATE AIR POLLUTION CONTROLS.....	16
G.	CATEGORY – ULTRA LOW SULFUR DIESEL.....	18
H.	CATEGORY – PERMITTING THE KULLUK AS A MINOR SOURCE	20
I.	CATEGORY – ENFORCEABILITY OF PTE LIMITS	25
J.	CATEGORY – LIMITS TO PROTECT THE NAAQS	36
K.	CATEGORY – OPERATIONAL LIMITS TO MAKE PSD UNNECESSARY AND THE PROTECT THE NAAQS	39
L.	CATEGORY – SOURCE TESTING	42
M.	CATEGORY – MONITORING AND RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS	43
N.	CATEGORY – REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	48
O.	CATEGORY – COMPLIANCE MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT	49
P.	CATEGORY – AMBIENT AIR BOUNDARY	51
Q.	CATEGORY – GENERAL COMMENTS ON AMBIENT AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS AND SUPPORTING DATA.....	55
R.	CATEGORY – CHOICE OF MODEL.....	58
S.	CATEGORY – PRORATING IMPACTS	64
T.	CATEGORY – METEOROLOGICAL DATA	65
U.	CATEGORY – BACKGROUND AIR MONITORING DATA	68
V.	CATEGORY – AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS FOR 1-HOUR NO ₂ NAAQS.....	74
W.	CATEGORY – AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS FOR PM _{2.5} NAAQS	90
X.	CATEGORY – AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS FOR OZONE NAAQS.....	96
Y.	CATEGORY – CUMULATIVE IMPACTS.....	98
Z.	APPLICABILITY OF PSD INCREMENT AND VISIBILITY PROTECTION	102
AA.	CATEGORY – VISIBILITY PROTECTION	112
BB.	CATEGORY – ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	113
CC.	CATEGORY – BASELINE DATA	122
DD.	CATEGORY – IMPACT ON LOCAL COMMUNITIES, SUBSISTENCE ACTIVITIES, AND TRADITIONAL USE	123
EE.	CATEGORY – HEALTH IMPACTS AND GENERAL AIR QUALITY CONCERNS	126

FF.	CATEGORY – MODELING ICEBREAKER ACTIVITY	127
GG.	CATEGORY – ANNUAL MODELING ANALYSIS	130
HH.	CATEGORY – OTHER PERMIT TERMS AND CONDITIONS	134
II.	CATEGORY – GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT CONSULATION	141
JJ.	CATEGORY – COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT	142
KK.	CATEGORY – ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT	143
II.	SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE PERMIT	143

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAC	Alaska Administrative Code
ADEC	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
AERMOD	American Meteorological Society/EPA Regulatory Model
BACT	Best Available Control Technology
BOEMRE	Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management and Regulatory Enforcement
CAA	Clean Air Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CO _{2e}	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
COA	Corresponding Onshore Area
COARE	Coupled Ocean-Atmosphere Response Experiment
Discoverer	Noble Discoverer Drillship
Draft Permit	Draft Permit to Construct and Title V Air Quality Operating Permit No. R10OSC030000
EAB	Environmental Appeals Board
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
Fed. Reg.	Federal Register
GHG or GHGs	Greenhouse Gas or Greenhouse Gases
ICAS	Iñupiat Community of the Arctic Slope
km	Kilometers
Kulluk	Kulluk Conical Drilling Unit
kW-h	KiloWatts Hour
µg/m ³	Microgram per Cubic Meter
LCC	Logging, Cementing and Casing
MLC	Mud Line Cellar
MMS	Minerals Management Service
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NO	Nitric Oxide
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NO _x	Oxides of Nitrogen
NSB	North Slope Borough
NSR	New Source Review

OCD.....	Offshore and Costal Dispersion
OCS.....	Outer Continental Shelf
OCSLA.....	Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act
OSRV.....	Oil Spill Response Vessel
OxyCat.....	Oxidation Catalyst
PM.....	Particulate Matter
PM _{2.5}	PM with an Aerodynamic Diameter less than 2.5 Microns
PM ₁₀	PM with an Aerodynamic Diameter less than 10 Microns
ppm.....	Parts Per Million
PTE.....	Potential to Emit
PDF.....	Portable Document Format
PSD.....	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
PVMRM.....	Plume Volume Molar Ration Method
QAPP.....	Quality Assurance Project Plans
Region 10.....	Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
SCR.....	Selective Catalytic Reduction
Shell.....	Shell Offshore Inc.
SILs.....	Significant Impact Levels
SO ₂	Sulfur Dioxide
tpy.....	Tons per Year
ULSD.....	Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel
VOC.....	Volatile Organic Compound

I. INTRODUCTION

On October 21, 2011, pursuant to Clean Air Act (CAA) section 328, 42 U.S.C. § 7627, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10 (Region 10) issued an Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Permit to Construct and Title V Air Quality Operating Permit, Permit Number R10OCS030000 (Kulluk Permit), to Shell Offshore, Inc. (Shell).

The permit authorizes Shell to conduct air pollutant emitting activities for the purpose of oil exploration with the conical drilling unit Kulluk on lease blocks in the Beaufort Sea off the North Slope of Alaska, as authorized by the United States Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement (BOEMRE).¹ The Kulluk Permit provides for the use of an associated fleet of support vessels (Associated Fleet), such as icebreakers, oil spill response vessels (OSRV), and a supply ship, in addition to the Kulluk.

Shell submitted an initial application to Region 10 for three air permits to cover air pollution from its exploratory drilling operations on OCS lease blocks in the Beaufort Sea: an OCS/Title V permit under 40 CFR Parts 55 and 71 for operations beyond 25 miles of Alaska's seaward boundary; an OCS/minor permit for air quality protection under 40 CFR Part 55 and 18 Alaska Administrative Code (AAC) 50.502 and for owner-requested limitations under 40 CFR Part 55 and 18 AAC 50.508 for operations within 25 miles of Alaska's seaward boundary; and an OCS/Title V permit under 40 CFR Part 55 and 18 AAC 50.326 for operations within 25 miles of Alaska's seaward boundary. Shell requested that the three permits be consolidated into a single permit (hereinafter "Kulluk Permit" or "OCS/Title V Permit").

Following the receipt of Shell's completed permit application, Region 10 published notice of the issuance of a draft permit on July 22, 2011 (Draft Permit), and requested public comment on the Draft Permit by September 6, 2011. An informational meeting and public hearing on the Draft Permit were held in Barrow, Alaska on August 23, 2011, and a second public hearing was held in Anchorage, Alaska on August 26, 2011.

Region 10 received written comments on the Draft Permit from Shell (the applicant); the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission, the Iñupiat Community of the Arctic Slope, and the North Slope Borough in a combined comment letter (collectively the "North Slope commenters"); the Native Village of Point Hope; Alaska Wilderness League, Audubon Alaska, Center for Biological Diversity, Defenders of Wildlife, Greenpeace, Earthjustice, EYAK Preservation Council, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Northern Alaska Environmental Center, Ocean Conservancy, Oceana, Pacific

¹ The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) regulates and manages the development of mineral resources on the OCS. See 42 U.S.C. § 1334 (authorizing Secretary to administer leasing on the OCS). In particular, the BOEMRE is responsible for overseeing the safe and environmentally responsible development of energy and mineral resources on the OCS. BOEMRE was established as a result of Secretarial Order 3302, signed on June 18, 2010, by the Secretary of Interior. Secretary of Interior, U.S. Department of Interior, Secretarial Order No. 3302, *Change of the Name of the MMS to the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement* (June 18, 2010), available at http://elips.doi.gov/app_so/index.cfm?fuseaction=chroList/.

Environment, REDOIL, Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, and World Wildlife Fund in a combined comment letter (collectively, the “Conservation commenters”); the Alaska Department of Natural Resources; the Alaska Oil and Gas Association; the Center for Water Advocacy; Alaska’s Big Village Network; and other individual commenters. Region 10 also received more than 14,500 identical or similar comments resulting from a campaign sponsored by environmental organizations.

In addition to receiving written comments, Region 10 received numerous comments on the Draft Permit as oral testimony during the public hearings in Barrow and Anchorage. This testimony was transcribed and has been included in the permit record.

This Response to Comments document summarizes the written and oral comments received by Region 10 pertaining to the Draft Permit. After Region 10’s careful review and consideration, responses to these comments are presented below. Comments have been condensed and similar comments have been combined for purposes of this document. Complete copies of all comments are in the administrative record for the Kulluk Permit.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

A. CATEGORY – COMMENTS OF GENERAL SUPPORT

Comment A.1: Several commenters, including the State of Alaska, express general support for issuance of the permit and urge Region 10 to issue the permit without further delay. The commenters, several of whom submitted identical or similar form comments, stated that other countries are moving ahead to develop Arctic resources and expressed concern that the United States was behind in these efforts. Some commenters support private sector-led energy development to the fullest extent possible and assert the benefits of such development to Alaska and Alaska's rural communities. The commenters also cite to a study titled, Potential National-Level Benefits of Alaska OCS Development by Northern Economics and Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage, which projects that drilling on Alaska's OCS could make Alaska the eighth largest oil resource province in the world. Commenters also contend that the Alaska OCS region is a vast, yet untapped resource which has the potential to increase the United States' energy security, provide thousands of high-paying jobs in Alaska and the rest of the United States, and generate billions of dollars in revenue.

Response: Region 10 is proceeding with issuance of the final permit based on Region 10's determination that all Clean Air Act requirements will be met. Region 10 understands that some individuals support this project due to the expected benefits to the economy and the potential for additional oil and gas resources. Region 10 notes, however, that the potential for economic benefits to Alaska or the United States does not affect the standards for issuing this permit.

Region 10 also notes that Shell needs a number of other regulatory approvals before it is authorized to engage in exploration operations in the Beaufort Sea. These include approvals of Applications for Permits to Drill from BOEMRE, Marine Mammal Protection Act authorization from the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and a corresponding Endangered Species Act Incidental Take Statement, as well as other approvals. See, e.g., Letter from Jeff Walker, BOEMRE, to Susan Childs, Shell, re: 2012 Revised Camden Bay Exploration Plan, dated August 4, 2011.

Comment A.2: A commenter states that it is important to remember that the Draft Permit does not provide Shell authorization to drill and only authorizes air pollutant emissions from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet. The commenter asserts that Shell must also obtain at least 10 other federal permits and authorizations in order to proceed with an exploratory drilling program and that this drilling project is not occurring without adequate oversight and necessary approvals.

Response: As discussed in response to comment A.1, Region 10 agrees that this permit does not authorize Shell to conduct exploratory operation, but rather authorizes emissions from any such operations, and that several other regulatory approvals are needed before Shell is authorized to conduct exploratory operations in the Beaufort Sea.

Comment A.3: In its comment, Shell states that a significant amount of effort has gone into obtaining the Draft Permit. Shell states that it has committed to many operational restrictions and measures to ensure its operation's emissions are as low as the practicable application of current technology affords, including the commitment to use ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel in all of its vessels, not just the Kulluk, as well as installing selective catalytic reduction (SCR) and other control technologies on not only the Kulluk but also its ice management and anchor handling vessels. Finally, Shell states that it has voluntarily agreed to reduce the number of potential drilling days to further confirm that operations will be conducted with emissions as low as is practicably allowable. These emissions are low enough, Shell continues, that the Kulluk will meet the EPA's minor source permitting thresholds.

Response: Region 10 agrees that the permit terms and conditions should ensure that the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet operate as a minor source (that is, that emissions will be less than the PSD major source thresholds). Note that, although the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel, SCR, and other control technologies, as well as the limits on the number of drilling days, were initially requested by Shell in its permit application, they are not “voluntary.” Instead, they are included in the permit as terms and conditions needed to assure compliance with Clean Air Act requirements.

B. CATEGORY – COMMENTS OF GENERAL OPPOSITION

Comment B.1: Region 10 received over 14,500 identical and similar comments during the public comment period for this permit opposing issuance of OCS air permits in the Arctic Seas. A number of comments of general opposition were also made during the public hearings on the Draft Permit. The commenters ask Region 10 to adopt the strongest and most protective standards for this and other drillship air permits and to permit the proposed emissions only when their impact to the health and welfare of North Slope residents is minimized to the greatest extent possible. The commenters state that air emissions from large scale and long term oil and gas activities in the Arctic Seas, including drillships and icebreakers, result in a large amount of air pollution that puts workers and nearby communities at risk, and accelerates already rapid climate change in the region. The commenters encourage EPA and other federal agencies to consider the impacts of oil and gas development on the ecosystem of the Arctic because they believe there is a lack of sufficient scientific data to demonstrate that oil development in this remote area is safe. The commenters are concerned that an oil spill in these waters would be catastrophic for endangered and threatened species and would devastate nearby subsistence communities, and assert that no technology currently exists that safely and effectively contains and cleans up oil spilled in icy waters. Many of these commenters point to the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010 as evidence of the risk of offshore drilling and assert that the risks of drilling in the Arctic are even higher than the risks of drilling offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. The commenters encourage Region 10 to consider the cumulative impacts of this and other dangers prior to moving forward with oil drilling in the Arctic Ocean.

Response: As an initial matter, it is important to note that issuance of this Clean Air Act permit does not provide Shell authorization to drill on the OCS. Rather, issuance of this permit authorizes air emissions from Shell's operations and requires compliance with air quality regulations and permit terms and conditions when and if drilling commences. BOEMRE is the federal agency that provides authorization to drill. See also response to comment A.1.

After thorough review and careful consideration of the comments requesting that this permit be denied, Region 10 is proceeding to issue the permit. The permit complies with the requirements of CAA § 328 (governing air pollution from OCS sources), EPA's OCS regulations at 40 CFR Part 55 (OCS regulations), Title V regulations in 40 CFR part 71 and the regulations of the Corresponding Offshore Area (COA), including the COA regulations for minor new source review. As discussed in more detail in the response to comments for Categories Q through Y, Section 4 of the Statement of Basis, and Appendix A to the Statement of Basis (Technical Support Document),² Region 10 has conducted an extensive analysis of the air quality impacts of the project and has determined that issuance of the permit will not cause or contribute to a violation of currently applicable NAAQS.

Comments and concerns with noise and the possibility of oil spills are outside the scope of the Clean Air Act OCS and Title V programs.

Comment B.2: One commenter states that, even though this permit is for experimental arctic drilling, eventually it really becomes an oilfield or production facility that will emit dangerous gases that can kill people or animals.

Response: Shell will need to apply for additional permits to operate a production facility if such facility will involve any equipment or activities not authorized under this permit. The air quality impacts from such production facility will be considered at that time.

C. CATEGORY – PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS

Comment C.1: Commenters note that CAA regulations require a minimum of 30 days for public comment on permits, but that a comment period of more than 30 days may be necessary to provide additional time for complicated proceedings. Commenters also note that the Environmental Appeals Board (EAB) has recognized the adequacy of public participation as an important factor and found inadequate participation as a basis for objecting to a permit. Commenters state that an inadequate public comment period opens the door to raising issues on appeal that were not raised during the comment period and that this can complicate the permitting process.

Response: Region 10 agrees with the commenters that CAA regulations require a minimum of 30 days for public comment on the Draft Permit, and that the regulations

² Technical Support Document: Review of Shell's Ambient Air Quality Impact Analysis for the Kulluk OCS Permit Application, dated July 18, 2011.

acknowledge a period of more than 30 days may be necessary for complicated proceedings. Region 10 proposed the Draft Permit for public comment on July 22, 2011, and requested that comments be submitted by September 6, 2011. The 46-day comment period provided for the Draft Permit complies with the 30-day public comment period required by 40 CFR §§ 71.11(d)(2) and 124.10(b)³ and provides an additional 16 days for the submission of comments. Region 10 believes that the length of the comment period provided the public a reasonable opportunity to comment on the Kulluk Draft Permit.

The commenters are correct that the EAB has recognized the important role public participation plays in the permitting process, and has remanded permits for inadequate public participation. However, EAB remands for inadequate public participation typically involve the permit issuer's failure to comply with applicable public participation requirements. See *In re Russell Energy Center*, PSD Appeal Nos. 10-01 to 10-05 (EAB Nov. 18, 2011)(remanding for failure to comply with notice requirements); *In re Rockgen Energy Center*, 8 E.A.D. 536 (EAB Aug. 25, 1999)(remanding because the record did not show that the permit issuer considered comments before issuing the permit); and *In re Atochem N. Am.*, 3 E.A.D. 498 (EAB Jan. 24, 1991)(remanding for failure to respond to comments). Region 10 has complied with its statutory and regulatory obligations regarding public notice and comment and believes that the public participation process was adequate.

Region 10 takes seriously its responsibility to ensure that the public has a meaningful opportunity to participate in permitting decisions. Prior to and during the public comment period, Region 10 took a number of affirmative steps to promote meaningful public involvement. To inform the North Slope community of the Draft Permit and to describe opportunities for public participation, Region 10 conducted three separate informational meetings in Barrow and Kaktovik, Alaska from June 15 – 17, 2011, more than a month prior to the start of the public comment period. At the start of the comment period, Region 10 distributed copies of the Draft Permit and supporting materials to a number of information repositories located in North Slope communities and made these documents available on its website. In addition, documents that will be contained in the administrative record were burned onto compact discs and provided to commenters who requested the documents during the comment period. On August 23, 2011, Region 10 held an informational meeting and a public hearing on the Draft Permit in Barrow,

³ The portion of this permit that is a Part 71 permit (e.g., the portion of the permit that applies on the Outer OCS) is issued under 40 CFR Part 55 and 40 CFR Part 71 and subject to the procedural requirements of 40 CFR Part 71 as provided in 40 CFR § 71.4(d). The portion of this permit that is a COA Title V permit and a COA minor source permit (e.g., the portion of the permit that applies on the Inner OCS) is issued under 40 CFR Part 55 and, in the absence of other applicable procedures, subject to the permit issuance procedures for PSD permits under 40 CFR Part 124, Subpart A and C. See 40 CFR §§ 55.6(a) (3) and 124.1. Note that the Statement of Basis (at 10) erroneously stated in discussing the public participation requirements that this permit is a Part 71 permit subject to the procedures of 40 CFR Part 71. The Statement of Basis makes clear in other discussions (at page 4 and Section 2) that this permit is in fact a permit issued under Parts 55 and 71 as well as under the COA regulations for minor permits and Part 70 permits. Requirements for issuance of permits under 40 CFR Parts 71 and 124 are the same or very similar in most respects.

Alaska. On August 26, 2011, a second public hearing was held on the Draft Permit in Anchorage, Alaska.

Commenters cite to 40 CFR § 71.11(l)(1) as support for the statement that an inadequate public comment period opens the door for raising issues on appeal that were not raised during the comment period. Region 10 disagrees with the commenters characterization of this regulatory provision. The pertinent question is not the adequacy of the public comment period but whether it was impracticable for commenters to raise objections during the public comment period. Although the commenters object to the length of the comment period, Region 10 is not aware of any circumstances that would have made it impracticable for commenters to raise objections to the Kulluk Draft Permit during the comment period provided.

Comment C.2: Commenters contend that the public comment period for the Draft Permit was inadequate. As support for this contention, the commenters reference the fact that the 46-day public comment period for the Draft Permit, which ran from July 22 to September 6, overlapped with the comment period for the 2011 Discoverer Permits, which ran from July 6 to August 5. Commenters also note that the comment period for ConocoPhillip's air permit ran from July 22 to September 21. The commenters calculate that Region 10 has provided a total of 60 calendar days to review four different air permits, all of which are technically and legally complex. The commenters contend that this schedule effectively limits stakeholders to 15 days to review each permit. The commenters request a minimum of 45-day comment periods for each air permit, without overlap, to conduct a comprehensive review of the permits and for residents most impacted by the permits to adequately engage in the public process. Finally, commenters state that there does not seem to be a reason for Region 10 to rush the permits and that the Region has eighteen months to review Title V permits once applications are complete. Commenters reference the July 19, 2011 date on which Region 10 issued its completeness determination for the permit application and state that there is plenty of time remaining to extend the public comment period for the Draft Permit.

Response: The 46-day comment period provided adequate opportunity for meaningful public involvement and exceeded the 30 day comment period required by 40 CFR §§ 71.11(d)(2) and 124.10(b). Region 10 understands that the commenters would like additional time for public participation. However, the commenters have not demonstrated that a period of more than 46 days is necessary to give the public a reasonable opportunity to comment. See 40 CFR §§ 71.11(g) and 124.13.

Although Region 10 denied the North Slope commenters' request to hold non-overlapping 45-day comment periods for each draft air permit in a letter dated July 21, 2011, the Region did subsequently extend the comment period on the ConocoPhillips draft permit for an additional two weeks in response to the fact, noted by the commenters, that ConocoPhillips does not intend to begin operations until July 2013. On September 26, 2011, Region 10 received notification from ConocoPhillips that it was withdrawing its permit application and would resubmit a new application in the future. Shell, on the other hand, intends to begin its exploratory drill operations with the Kulluk in July 2012.

The Region agrees with the commenters that some aspects of the Draft Permit are technically and legally complex. The comments submitted, however, demonstrate that the public was able to review, evaluate, and comment on many complex issues during the comment period provided. The Region received more than 14,500 public comments. Although a majority of these comments were practically identical and contained general statements of support or opposition, the Region received a number of substantive comments on, among other issues, the definition of OCS Source, limits on the source's potential to emit, choice of model, modeling data, ambient air boundary, source testing, emission factors, air quality analysis, applicability of increments and visibility, and cumulative impacts. The volume of comments received and the substantive issues addressing technically and legally complex issues demonstrate that the public was able to meaningfully review and comment on the Draft Permit.

Region 10 agrees that 40 CFR § 71.7(a)(2) requires that it take a final action on a Title V permit application within 18 months of receiving a complete application. That the Region may be able to take a final action on a permit application prior to the end of the 18-month period cited by the commenters does not mean that the permitting process was rushed. Although Shell's application was not deemed complete until July 2011, the Region has been carefully reviewing components of the application since it was first submitted in February 2011. In conducting the permitting process, Region 10 must strike a balance between its obligation to provide for meaningful public participation and its responsibility to make a final permitting decision in a timely manner. The Region has complied with the applicable requirements for public involvement and provided more than the required amount of time for public comment.

Comment C.3: Commenters contend that expert review of the new algorithms used in the modeling analysis proved impossible. To support this statement, commenters contend that they were unable to hire a consultant with the requisite expertise to review the algorithms and were told by the experts they talked to that it would be very difficult to conduct a comprehensive review in the time allowed. As a result, commenters state that it was impossible to identify potential problems or shortcomings with the modeling or to conduct a comprehensive review.

Response: It is important to note that the revised modeling approach was used for both the Shell Kulluk and Discoverer draft permits, and both public notices refer to the same supporting documentation. The commenters who raised this issue on the Draft Permit also commented on the modeling supporting the Discoverer permits. Therefore, the commenters in fact had a period of 60 days to review AERMOD-COARE prior to submitting comments on the Draft Permit. The inability to hire someone to assist with the preparation of comments does not mean that the public process provided was inadequate. In fact, the Region received substantive comments on a number of complex modeling issues, including the use of the new algorithms. The model used to support the permits, AERMOD, is an EPA guideline model that has, after notice and comment rulemaking, been approved as a guideline model. See 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W, Section 4.2.2(b). Region 10 approved partial changes to AERMOD for purposes of this

permitting action, comprised of two permit-specific algorithms for use with the guideline model: Coupled Ocean-Atmosphere Response Experiment (COARE) for the pre-processing of meteorological data and the Plume Volume Molar Ratio Method (PVRM) that is considered on a case-by-case basis as a non-regulatory default option under Section 5.2.4.d of Appendix W. Region 10 believes that the public was provided with sufficient time to review and comment on the use of the new algorithms.

Comment C.4: Commenters contend that the August 23, 2011 public hearing for the Draft Permit held in Barrow was problematic because the teleconference system that Region 10 established for other North Slope villages to participate proved problematic. Commenters state that the telephone connection was poor on both ends which is not uncommon for the North Slope, and that all parties involved acknowledged difficulty hearing the participants. The commenters also state that Region 10 did not make the PowerPoint presentation available to those attending the hearing by teleconference. The commenters urge Region 10 to give thought to how to effectively engage communities on the North Slope and, ideally, to visit each of the communities to hear directly from the residents.

Response: Region 10 recognizes that the Draft Permit is of interest to individuals and communities dispersed over a broad geographic area, and it made a concerted effort to foster public participation at the Barrow public hearing by providing a teleconferencing option. It is not practical for Region 10 to hold public hearings in each of the North Slope communities that have an interest in the Draft Permit. The rules governing the issuance of the permit do not require, if a hearing is held, that a hearing be held in more than one location. In this case, Region 10 determined that Barrow was the most appropriate location for the hearing. Barrow is an important center for the North Slope communities and a location with the infrastructure to hold and broadcast the hearing. Entities such as the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation have offices in Barrow, and members of the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission come from Barrow as well as other villages. To increase the opportunity for participation in the hearing, Region 10 made arrangements for North Slope communities outside of Barrow to participate by teleconference. Region 10 acknowledges that there were some problems with the teleconference, and, as the commenters acknowledge, telecommunication problems on the North Slope are not uncommon. To address potential issues, Region 10 recorded the public hearing in addition to having the hearing transcribed by a court reporter. From these two sources, Region 10 was able to capture the comments provided during the public hearing.

Comment C.5: A number of oral comments concerning public participation were received during the public hearing. Commenters said that the public comment period was insufficient and requested that it be extended to at least 45 days, and two commenters specifically requested that it be extended to September 19, 2011. A number of commenters described the permits as confusing and difficult to decipher and noted that an additional public process for ConocoPhillips was being conducted during the same time as the public process for the Draft Permit. Commenters referenced the highly technical nature of the permit and the use of a new model as reasons to extend the comment period.

One commenter stated that the public process schedule lends the appearance that the Region is checking a box and not working with the communities on the Draft Permit and that this decreases public confidence in the Region's permitting decisions. Two commenters requested that the ConocoPhillips permit be delayed because they are not planning to drill until 2013.

Commenters also addressed the Region's public hearing process. One commenter expressed appreciation for the steps Region 10 took to set up the teleconference line but stated that the communities have a right to meet with the Region in person. A number of commenters stated that the Region should hold hearings in other communities, especially Nuiqsut, to hear from the people who will be most affected. One commenter noted that technology is sometimes a problem on the North Slope and another commenter stated that the presenters at the public hearing kept fading in and out over the phone line and that the Region has not made improvements to how it conducts public hearings. Another commenter suggested that there were other ways to hold a public hearing and suggested that the Region use a video teleconference system. One commenter noted that communities of the Arctic are bilingual and that Inupiak is the first language for many people and it is difficult for these people to understand the issues and provide meaningful testimony.

Response: Region 10 appreciates the comments provided during the public hearing and recognizes that members of the North Slope communities have a significant interest in the permitting process. As described in response to comment C.2, the 46-day comment period for the Draft Permit provided meaningful opportunity for public participation. The Draft Permit involves consideration of complex issues but the commenters have not demonstrated that additional time is necessary to address these issues. As described in response to comment C.1, Region 10 has taken a number of affirmative steps to facilitate public involvement by the North Slope communities in the permitting process. With respect to the public comment process for ConocoPhillips, as described in response to comment C.2, Region 10 extended the public comment period by two weeks. On September 27, 2011, Region 10 received notification from ConocoPhillips that it was withdrawing its permit application and would submit a new application in the future.

As described in response to comment C.4, Region 10 conducted an inclusive public hearing process and selected Barrow as the most appropriate location for a public hearing. The Region understands that commenters would prefer that public hearings be held in other villages as well and that there may be better technological options for remote participation. However, considering the logistical limitations of holding a public hearing on the North Slope, the Region believes that the Barrow hearing provided an adequate opportunity for public participation.

Prior to the Barrow public hearing, Region 10 contacted the Iñupiat Community of the Arctic Slope to arrange for an Iñupiat speaker to be available to provide Iñupiat interpretation at the hearing if requested by any participant. At the beginning of the hearing, participants were provided the opportunity to request Iñupiat interpretation during the hearing. No participant requested translation and therefore an interpreter was

not used. Region 10 encourages public participation of North Slope communities and is open to additional suggestions from community members as to the best way to ensure meaningful participation of individuals who speak Iñupiat as a primary language.

D. CATEGORY – DEFINITION OF OCS SOURCE

Comment D.1: Commenters requested that because Shell is currently proposing only exploration for offshore oil and gas resources, that Region 10 classify Shell’s operations as a new “exploratory OCS source.”

Response: Region 10 agrees that the Kulluk is a new exploratory OCS source. 40 CFR § 55.2 defines the term “exploratory source” or “exploratory OCS source” as “any OCS source that is a temporary operation conducted for the sole purpose of gathering information. This includes an operation conducted during the exploratory phase to determine the characteristics of the reservoir and formation and may involve the extraction of oil and gas.” Shell has identified its activities in its permit application as exploratory. See OCS Permit Applications, Conical Drilling Unit Kulluk, Beaufort Sea – Supplemental Information, dated June 29, 2011 (Permit Application Supplement) at 1 and 9.

Note that the Kulluk is considered “temporary” under the Title V program because it is expected that the Kulluk will change locations over the life of this permit.

Comment D.2: Some commenters disagree with Region 10’s proposal that the Kulluk be considered an OCS source only when its attachment to the seabed by an anchor occurs at a drill site. The commenters note that under section 328 of the CAA, an OCS source is any equipment, activity or facility which: 1) has the potential to emit air pollutants, 2) is regulated or authorized under OCSLA, and 3) is located on the OCS or in the waters above the OCS and specifically includes “drillship exploration.” The commenters also cite to the regulatory definition of OCS source in the case of vessels. The commenters assert that because a vessel is an OCS source when it is “temporarily” attached to the seabed, “may be used” for the purpose of exploring for oil and gas resources, and is in an area authorized by OCSLA (*i.e.* Shell’s lease blocks), the Kulluk should be considered to be an OCS source whenever it drops a single anchor within Shell’s lease blocks. As support for this conclusion, the commenters cite to the EAB’s discussion of OCSLA § 4(a)(1) in *Shell Gulf of Mexico, Inc. and Shell Offshore, Inc., Frontier Discoverer Drilling Units*, OCS Appeal Nos. 10-01 through 10-04, Order Denying Review in Part and Remanding Permits, dated December 30, 2010 (Remand Order I), and to *Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound, Inc. v. United States Dep’t of the Army*, 288 F. Supp. 2d 64, 75 (D. Mass. 2003). The commenters also contend that Region 10 cannot argue both that Shell is “authorized” to operate at all of its lease blocks, which is necessary for CAA jurisdiction, and then limit Shell to being a source only where it has a permit to drill. The commenters request that Region 10 change the permit to read: “A drill site is any location at which Shell is the leaseholder of a lease from BOEMRE.”

Response: Region 10 proposed that the Kulluk be considered an OCS source any time it is attached to the seabed at a drill site by at least one anchor. A drill site is defined in the Kulluk Permit as any location at which Shell is authorized to operate under the applicable permit and for which Shell has received from BOEMRE an authorization to drill. Region 10 continues to believe this interpretation is consistent with the relevant statutes and regulations as applied to this specific permitting action.

Both EPA's regulatory definition of OCS source at 40 CFR § 55.2 and Section 4(a)(1) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA)—which is referenced in EPA's regulatory definition of OCS source in the case of vessels—discuss more than attachment to the seabed. Both EPA's regulatory definition in the case of vessels and OCSLA § 4(a)(1) reference the additional considerations that the source be “erected” on the seabed as well as the purpose of the attachment. These additional elements in EPA's regulatory definition and the explanatory clause in OCSLA § 4(a)(1) make clear that attachment to the seabed at any location on the OCS is not sufficient to render the Kulluk an OCS source.⁴ Region 10 continues to believe that, as in OCSLA § 4(a)(1), the reference to “erected thereon” in 40 CFR § 55.2 is intended to reflect the process by which a vessel becomes situated at the location where it will be used for the purpose of exploring, developing, or producing resources from the seabed. For the activities authorized under this permit, this requires that the location of the attachment occur at a location where the Kulluk is authorized to engage in such activities, namely at a drill site for which Shell has obtained an authorization for the Kulluk to drill.

The commenters do not argue that any attachment to the seabed alone is sufficient to render the Kulluk an OCS source. Instead, the commenters argue that the Kulluk should be considered an OCS source whenever it is attached to the seabed at any location within a Shell lease block. A review of the facts underlying this permitting action and the legal requirements for conducting exploratory operations under Shell's leases, however, reveals that the commenters' suggestion that the Kulluk be considered an OCS source whenever it is attached to the seabed in a Shell lease block is an overly broad approach that, if applied, could produce illogical results.

Shell's lease blocks in the Beaufort Sea comprise an area of approximately 1145 square miles. Under the commenters' proposed interpretation, the Kulluk could be considered an OCS source even though it was anchored many miles from a location in the same sea where it had authorization from BOEMRE to drill as long as the anchor location was in a Shell lease block. In contrast, the Kulluk would not be considered an OCS source under the commenters' proposed interpretation if it was located one mile from an authorized drill site waiting to move into location at the drill site if the location at which it was anchored was not in a Shell lease block. It makes little sense to regulate the Kulluk as an OCS source when it is a hundred miles or more from a location where it is authorized to engage in exploratory activities, as the commenters' approach would require, but not to

⁴ Region 10 is aware that the First Circuit has held that OCSLA § 4(a)(1) is not restricted to structures related to mineral extraction. *Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound, Inc. v. United States Dep't of the Army*, 398 F.3d 105, 107 (1st Cir. 2005). There is nothing in that case to suggest, however, that a vessel that is simply anchored anywhere on the OCS or on leases that it holds is subject to OCSLA's jurisdiction.

regulate the Kulluk as an OCS source when it is not located on a lease block but is one mile from a location where it is authorized to engage in exploratory activities.

The fact that the Kulluk could potentially obtain authorization to drill anywhere within any valid lease block and that this permit would at that point authorize air emissions at such location is not a compelling basis for a different result. Even at locations where Shell holds leases, Shell would need to submit and obtain BOEMRE approval of an exploration plan and an application to drill (as well as obtain other approvals) before it would be authorized to conduct exploratory operations at a particular location in its lease holdings, a process that takes a minimum of several months. In this respect, a location on the OCS where Shell holds a lease but does not have authorization to drill is more similar to a location on the OCS where Shell does not hold a lease than it is to a location where Shell is the holder of a current authorization to drill from BOEMRE: it is not authorized to engage in exploratory operations at that time except at locations at which it holds a current authorization to drill from BOEMRE. Nor, as the commenters allege, is there an inconsistency in the fact that the permit authorizes operations at all identified lease blocks, provided that Shell is complying with all other federal requirements (see Condition A.4.1 of the Kulluk Permit), but then limits the location at which the Kulluk is considered an OCS source to those locations where the Kulluk is attached to the seabed at a location where it has a current authorization to engage in exploratory operations at the time of the attachment. Region 10 believes it is not the lease rights held by a company but the authorization to drill that determines the area where a drillship may be erected and used for the purpose of exploring, developing, or producing resources from the seabed.

Region 10 therefore rejects the commenters' suggestion that attachment of the Kulluk to the seabed at any location in a Shell lease block is sufficient to consider the Kulluk an OCS source within the meaning of 40 CFR § 55.2.

Comment D.3: Commenters state that, for the same reasons discussed in comment D.2, if any other vessel associated with Shell's operations anchors to the seabed floor, it should be considered an OCS source. The commenters note that Shell says the Oil Spill Response vessel and quartering vessel will be anchored. The commenters contend that anchored vessels have the potential to emit air pollutants, are authorized and regulated under OCSLA, are located on waters above the OCS, and are attached to the seabed and erected thereon for the purpose of aiding in the exploration of oil and gas.

Response: Based on the information in the permit application, as well as the regulatory definition of OCS source in the case of vessels and the language and legislative history of the statutory definition of OCS source and OCSLA § 4(a)(1), Region 10 does not agree that the other vessels that have been identified as associated with Shell's operations in this case are themselves "OCS sources" by the mere fact that they are anchored to the seabed. The vessels that comprise the Associated Fleet consist of icebreakers, supply ships, oil spill response vessels, and barges for removing drilling muds, as well as oil tankers and other support vessels associated with the Kulluk that will not be operating within 25 miles of the Kulluk when it is an OCS source.

In promulgating the regulatory definition of OCS source in the case of vessels, EPA required that a vessel be not only permanently or temporarily attached to the seabed, but also that it be erected on the seabed and used for the purpose of exploring, developing, or producing resources from the seabed. 40 CFR § 55.2. The commenters appear to be seeking an interpretation that a vessel is “used for the purpose of exploring, developing, or producing resources” from the seabed if it is, in the words of the commenters, “aiding” the effort of exploring, developing, or producing resources even though it is not itself directly engaged in such activities.

However, such a broad interpretation of OCS source is inconsistent with the distinction in the statutory definition of OCS source between the “OCS source” and a “vessel servicing or associated with an OCS source.” As the EAB recognized, Section 328(a)(4)(c) maintains a distinction between support vessels and the OCS source. Remand Order I at 25 (“Specifically, without making the support vessels part of the OCS source, the statute directs that emissions from those vessels while within twenty-five miles of the OCS source “shall be considered direct emissions from the OCS source.”). In promulgating the regulatory definition of OCS source in Part 55, EPA recognized this distinction, noting a drillship as an example of a vessel used for the purpose of exploring, developing, or producing resources, and discussing that the emissions of other vessels “related to OCS activity” would be included in the “potential to emit” of the OCS source, but be more appropriately regulated under Title II of the Act, and not regulated as an OCS source unless they were attached to an OCS source. 57 Fed. Reg. 40,792, 40,793-94 (September 4, 1992). Region 10 believes that the term “used for the purpose of exploring, developing, or producing resources” from the seabed is best interpreted in this instance as not encompassing the support vessels at issue in this permit that are used for activities such as icebreaking, resupply, and oil response activities conducted in support of the Kulluk drillship.

Important policy considerations also lead Region 10 to conclude that the anchoring of a vessel that aids or supports OCS activities but is not more directly engaged in exploration, development, or production—as is a jackup rig or drillship—is not sufficient to render the support vessel an OCS source. First, because support vessels may at times be used to support OCS activities and at other times to support other activities, it would require the agency to engage in complex decisions regarding when a vessel was sufficiently related to exploration, development, or production activity to become an OCS source upon anchoring to a seabed. Would, for example, an oil spill response vessel that had been stationed near a port in Washington State but was heading north to Alaska to provide support for a drill rig in Alaska be considered an OCS source if it anchored off the coast of Alaska to wait out a storm? Under Region 10’s interpretation, decision-making would be more straight-forward: 1) vessels that support an OCS source but are more than 25 miles from the OCS source are not regulated in any respect under CAA § 328; 2) the emissions of vessels that support OCS activity are considered emissions of the OCS source when within 25 miles of the OCS source; and 3) the stationary source activities of vessels that support OCS activity are regulated as part of the OCS source when they are themselves attached to the OCS source.

In addition, considering vessels that support OCS sources to be themselves OCS sources if they are anchored on the OCS could lead to more emissions. This is because the operators of support vessels might decide to avoid anchoring and instead use their propulsion engines to hold position if anchoring would render the vessel an OCS source within the meaning of 40 CFR § 55.2. For example, Shell's application states that the oil spill response vessel will be stationed near the Kulluk and there is also likely to be a quartering vessel for the oil spill response vessel, and that these vessels will anchor when practicable. See Permit Application Supplemental at 38. A determination that the oil spill response or quartering vessels are themselves OCS sources if they anchor to the seabed could encourage a decision in which such vessels continue to use their propulsion engines to maintain position within 25 miles of the Kulluk. This would result in more emissions than would occur if such vessels were anchored.

In summary and for the reasons discussed above, Region 10 does not agree that the support vessels described in Shell's application will become OCS sources if they anchor on the seabed. Region 10's has determined that these vessels are not used for the purpose of exploring, developing, or producing resources from the seabed (as those terms are used in the definition of OCS source in 40 CFR § 55.2), but instead are being used to support such activity. Region 10 made this decision based on the specific support vessels at issue in this permit being used as described in the application materials.

E. CATEGORY – OPERATIONS IN SAME SEA

Comment E.1: Commenters request that Region 10 change Draft Permit Condition D.4.8. to read: “the permittee shall not operate the Kulluk in the Beaufort Sea within the same drilling season as its operation of any other drillship or its lease of any other drillship, including the Noble Discoverer, to any other lessee with lease blocks in the Beaufort Sea.” The commenters contend that this condition is necessary to clarify two points: 1) that Shell may not operate any two drillships in the Beaufort Sea at the same time, since such operations were not contemplated by the permit and supporting documents, and 2) Shell cannot work around this permit condition by leasing its drillships to another company that also holds leases in the Beaufort Sea.

Response: Region 10 has proposed permits for Shell projects in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas. The Discoverer drillship is a major source subject to the PSD permitting program. On September 19, 2011, Region 10 issued one permit covering operation of the Discoverer in the Beaufort Sea and one permit covering operation of the Discoverer in the Chukchi Sea. In the current permitting action, Region 10 has proposed to issue Shell's Kulluk drilling unit a Title V permit for operation in the Beaufort Sea that contains “synthetic minor” limits that would allow the Kulluk to avoid the PSD permitting program and assure compliance with other applicable CAA requirements.

For two activities (such as drilling operations) to be considered one “source” for PSD applicability purposes, the two drilling operations must: belong to the same industrial grouping (“Major Group” Standard Industrial Classification code); be located on one or more contiguous or adjacent properties; and be under the control of the same person. See

40 CFR §§ 52.21(b)(5) and (6). Shell’s Discoverer and Kulluk drilling operations meet the first and third criteria. To ensure that the Kulluk would not be on “contiguous or adjacent properties” with the Discoverer’s operations and thus considered a single source with the Discoverer for PSD applicability purposes, the Kulluk Permit restricts the permittee from operating the Kulluk in the Beaufort Sea within the same drilling season as the Discoverer. See Permit Condition D.4.8.

With respect to the concern that Shell could work around this permit condition by leasing its drillships to another company that also holds leases in the Beaufort Sea, Region 10 believes the current permit language is sufficient to address this concern. This permit authorizes Shell Offshore Inc. to operate the Kulluk under the terms and conditions of this permit. See Kulluk Permit (cover page). Similarly, the permit for the operation of the Discoverer in the Beaufort Sea authorizes Shell Offshore Inc. to operate the Discoverer. A permit revision would be required for a different entity to operate the Kulluk or Discoverer under either permit, at which time Region 10 would consider whether any additional permit changes are needed to ensure compliance with all applicable requirements. See 40 CFR § 71.7(d)(1)(iv). Alternatively, a new owner or operator could submit an application for a new permit.

With respect to the concern regarding other drillships or drilling mechanisms, the permits for the Discoverer and the Kulluk only authorize the operation of the equipment specified in those permits. A new permit application would need to be submitted to obtain authorization for air emissions in the Beaufort Sea from some other drillship or drilling mechanism. If such an application is received, Region 10 would address at that time any issues regarding whether the Kulluk and such other vessel would be considered the same “source” for PSD applicability purposes and the cumulative impacts of the operations.

F. CATEGORY – REQUIREMENT TO OPERATE AIR POLLUTION CONTROLS

Comment F.1: Commenters express concern that Shell may not be able to demonstrate compliance with control requirements. As support for this concern, commenters reference Draft Permit Conditions D.6.14 and D.6.15 which specify that Shell must use uncontrolled emission factors for any period of control equipment deviations. The commenters next note that Draft Permit Conditions D.5.15 and D.6.15 allow for reporting under the emergency provisions of Draft Permit Condition A.16 when control devices do not operate according to the parameters specified in the Draft Permit. The commenters believe that this is a loophole that undermines the requirement to operate controls by enabling Shell to report deviations as emergencies. The commenters request that if Region 10 relies on the use of controls for NAAQS analysis, Shell be required to operate controls at all times, with no exception, and that if the controls fail Region 10 should consider it a violation that is not excusable under the emergency provisions in the Draft Permit.

Response: Permit Condition F.3.7 requires Shell to report to Region 10 those periods during which the selective catalytic reduction (SCR) control is not properly operating

(urea pump is not operating, the inlet temperature is 90% or less than the most recent reported average inlet temperature, or the NO_x concentration is 150% or more than the most recent reported concentration). In writing this permit condition, Region 10 inadvertently made reference to the permit's emergency provisions rather than the permit's deviation reporting obligations as was intended. This permit condition has been amended to correct the typographical error. With this correction, the SCR monitoring deviation reporting obligation is now consistent with the deviation reporting obligation for oxidation catalyst monitoring under Permit Condition F.4.7. Permit Condition F.3.7 now states:

F.3.7 Report as a deviation under Conditions A.17 and A.18 any periods during which the urea pump is not operating, the inlet temperature is 90% or less than the most recent average inlet temperature reported in Condition E.3.1.3, or the NO_x concentration is 150% or more than the most recent NO_x concentration measured in Condition E.3.

The Region also notes that an additional typographical error in the Draft Permit condition has also been addressed so that the amended condition now references Permit Condition E.3 as was intended.

Region 10 disagrees that the permit conditions cited by the commenters undermine the requirement to operate the controls at all times. Permit Conditions D.10 and D.11 require Shell to direct the exhaust from certain engines to an operating control device. Permit Conditions F.3 and F.4 further require Shell to monitor the control devices to help assure that the emission factors Shell uses to calculate emissions are representative. In the event that control device monitoring detects a deviation from normal operation Shell is required to report the occurrence to Region 10 pursuant to Permit Conditions F.3.7 and F.4.7. This reporting will help determine whether Shell remained in compliance with Permit Conditions D.10 and D.11 during the periods of time in question. In addition, emissions for any time period identified as a deviation are required to be calculated and recorded assuming that the control device achieves no emission reductions pursuant to Permit Conditions D.6.14 and D.6.15. And if those calculations indicate emissions in excess of an emission limit, Shell is required to report each occurrence as a deviation pursuant to Permit Conditions A.17 and A.18. Thus, rather than undermining enforcement, these conditions require Shell to use a higher emission factor during those periods where the control equipment may not be controlling emissions effectively, and will require Shell to report higher emissions than would be the case without this requirement.

The conditions relating to permit deviations and emergencies (Permit Conditions A.16, A.17, and A.18) are required conditions in Part 71 permits, and in Alaska minor NSR and Part 70 permits, and are therefore required to be included in the permit. Region 10 will review all deviation reports and take enforcement action as appropriate. While Shell may submit information to Region 10 pursuant to Permit Condition A.16, claiming that noncompliance with a permit condition was due to an emergency, submittal of such a claim does not mean it qualifies as an emergency. Region 10 will carefully review each claim of emergency on a case-by-case basis. Similarly, Region 10 will carefully review

each report of a permit deviation to determine if the deviation is also a violation of a permit requirement.

G. CATEGORY – ULTRA LOW SULFUR DIESEL

Comment G.1: Commenters explain that their understanding is that Shell has committed to using Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel Fuel (ULSD) for its OCS exploration activities north of the Bering Strait. The commenters characterize this as a huge reduction in anticipated sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions that will reduce not only localized emissions of SO₂ but PM_{2.5} pollution as well. However, the commenters continue, the Draft Permit does not include a requirement to use ULSD fuel for the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet. The commenters reference Draft Permit Condition D.4.5 which requires the use of liquid fuel with a sulfur content less than or equal to 100 parts per million (ppm), by weight, in any emission unit on the Kulluk or on the Associated Fleet. The commenters request that the permit require use of ULSD (15 ppm sulfur) in accordance with Shell's commitment to use ULSD and with EPA's June 6, 2006 Final Rule: Control of Air Pollution from Motor Vehicles and Nonroad Diesel Engines: Alternative Low-Sulfur Diesel Fuel Transition Program for Alaska. The commenters contend that this rule requires marine vessels to comply with a 15 ppm fuel sulfur standard as of June 1, 2010, and therefore applies to Shell's proposed operations.

The commenters note that Shell has acknowledged that, upon delivery, the fuel may have a higher sulfur content because the hull of the barge in which the fuel is transported will not be cleaned out. The commenters request that Region 10 explain how use of fuel with a sulfur content as high as 100 ppm is acceptable given the regulatory requirement to use fuel with a sulfur content of 15 ppm. The commenters further request that if the Region determines an exception must be allowed due to the logistics of transporting fuel, then the Region should fully evaluate whether Shell can comply with a limit lower than 100 ppm.

Response: Region 10 created Permit Condition D.4.5 at Shell's request. In its permit application, Shell requested the following source-wide potential to emit (PTE) restriction: "The permittee shall purchase only ultra low sulfur diesel (ULSD) and not combust any liquid fuel with sulfur content greater than 0.01 percent by weight in any emission unit on the Kulluk or a support vessel." This fuel sulfur content limit (Permit Condition D.4.5), coupled with the permitted restriction to combust only 7,004,428 gallons of diesel fuel during any rolling 12-month period (Permit Condition D.4.6), results in an SO₂ PTE of 4.9 tons per year.⁵ This is less than 2 percent of the 250 ton per year (tpy) PSD major source threshold. Limiting the fuel sulfur content further from 100 ppm to 15 ppm is not necessary to establish the permitted activity as a PSD minor source.

The NSPS regulation referenced by the commenter (Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines - subpart IIII) was revised on June 28, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 37,954), and now requires sources that operate compression ignition engines ordered

⁵ 4.9 ton SO₂/yr = (7,004,428 gal diesel/yr) x (7.0 lb diesel/gal diesel) x (1 lb S/10,000 lb diesel) x (2 lb SO₂/1 lb S) x (ton/2000 lb)

after July 11, 2005, and manufactured after April 1, 2006, to purchase diesel (beginning October 1, 2010) that meets the specification of 40 CFR § 80.510(b) which includes a fuel sulfur content of 15 ppm or less. 40 CFR § 60.4207(b). The NSPS allows a transition for engine fuel tanks with existing higher sulfur content diesel to continue burning the old fuel until it is used up as long as any additional fuel added to the tank meets the 15 ppm limit. 76 Fed. Reg. 37,961. Over time, with batches of clean fuel being added to old fuel tanks, the fuel sulfur content will eventually meet the 15 ppm sulfur content limit. The NSPS only applies to newer engines on the Kulluk and not to engines on the Associated Fleet. Statement of Basis at 27 (NSPS apply to the “OSC Source”). The permit requires, however, that all of the fuel combusted by engines on the Kulluk or the Associated Fleet must meet the 100 ppm sulfur content limit to comply with the limit requested by Shell.

The permit should ensure that all diesel fuel delivered to the Kulluk for combustion in the NSPS-subject engines (Kulluk electricity generation engines, MLC HPU engines, MLC air compressor engines and the emergency generator engine) meets the 15 ppm sulfur content limit and all fuel combusted by all engines on the Kulluk or associated fleet meets the 100 ppm sulfur limit. Region 10 agrees with the commenters that the permit fails to expressly require and make enforceable Shell’s request to be limited to purchasing ULSD for all emission units on the Kulluk and Associated Fleet. The Region has therefore included in the final permit the following condition:

D.4.9 All fuel purchased for use in the Kulluk and Associated Fleet shall have a maximum sulfur content of 15 ppm by weight for all emission units on the Kulluk and Associated Fleet.

4.9.1 Compliance with Condition D.4.9 shall be determined for each diesel fuel purchase based upon recordkeeping required by Condition D.4.9.2

4.9.2 Keep diesel fuel purchase records for each batch of fuel that documents sulfur content.

[40 CFR §§ 52.21, 71.6(a)(1) and 71.6(b), 18 AAC 50.326(a), 18 AAC 50.225, 18 AAC 50.508]

Together, Conditions D.4.5, D.4.6, and D.4.9 should better ensure that all diesel fuel delivered to the Kulluk for combustion in the NSPS-subject engines (Kulluk electricity generation engines, MLC HPU engines, MLC air compressor engines, and the emergency generator engine) meets the 15 ppm sulfur content limit and that all fuel combusted by engines on the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet meets the 100 ppm sulfur limit.

Note that NESHAP requirements (Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart ZZZZ) also apply to some equipment on the Kulluk. These requirements do not extend to the Associated Fleet because the support vessels are not part of the OCS source. Statement of Basis at 28. NESHAP ZZZZ applies to older engines on the Kulluk as discussed on page 46 of the Statement of Basis. For a subset of

these older engines, Shell is prohibited from combusting any diesel fuel other than diesel fuel that meets the requirements of 40 CFR § 80.510(b) for nonroad diesel fuel. This requirement to combust a fuel satisfying ULSD specifications as it enters the engine applies only to the deck crane engines, and compliance is required beginning May 3, 2013. See Permit Condition G.3.5 for language assuring compliance with 40 CFR § 63.6604. Compliance with the 15 ppm fuel sulfur content limit is determined based upon information gathered in accordance with monitoring and recordkeeping requirements established in Permit Condition G.3.5. Prior to the drilling season, the sulfur content of diesel fuel in each storage tank serving the Kulluk deck crane engines is to be determined and recorded. For each fuel shipment received thereafter, Shell is to determine and record the sulfur content of the shipment as received.

H. CATEGORY – PERMITTING THE KULLUK AS A MINOR SOURCE

H.1 SUBCATEGORY – IN GENERAL

Comment H.1a: Several commenters contend that the project should be permitted as a major source rather than a minor source. Commenters question why the Draft Permit authorizes Shell to operate the Kulluk as a minor source when the Discoverer was permitted as a major source subject to the PSD program. The commenters describe the Draft Permit as establishing less stringent protections and setting a precedent that will impair the Arctic environment as oil and gas activity intensifies.

Response: In its permit application Shell requested that the permit contain federally enforceable restrictions to limit its potential to emit CO, SO₂, and NO_x to below PSD major source thresholds, and its potential to emit for GHGs to below the level at which GHGs become subject to regulation under the Tailoring Rule. See 75 Fed. Reg. 31,514 (June 3, 2010). A source that would otherwise exceed the applicable PSD major source threshold, and therefore be subject to PSD requirements may, as Shell has done here, seek to avoid PSD regulation as a major source by requesting that the permitting authority impose federally enforceable limits on the source's capacity to emit. *In re Shell Offshore, Inc. Kulluk Drilling Unit and Frontier Discoverer Drilling Unit*, 12 E.A.D. 357, 391-92 (EAB Sept. 14, 2007).

The Kulluk Permit includes enforceable limits that will restrict Shell's emissions to below PSD major source thresholds. If, as suggested by the commenters, Shell is permitted as a major source subject to PSD it would not be subject to enforceable limits to ensure minor source status and instead could be authorized to emit pollutants in excess of the PSD major source threshold. For this reason, Region 10 disagrees with the commenters' characterization of the Kulluk Permit as setting less stringent protections, and the assertion that it will set a bad precedent that impairs the environment. As a PSD synthetic minor source, Shell must comply with federally enforceable limits intended to limit its emissions to levels below applicable PSD major source thresholds, whereas sources permitted as major sources subject to PSD can, depending on the permit requirements, emit pollutants at levels that exceed applicable major source thresholds.

Comment H.1.b: Commenters contend that Shell's synthetic minor source status is based on arbitrary assumptions concerning Shell's operations. To support this contention, the commenters reference the NO_x emission limit of 240 tpy and state that this limit prevents Shell from operating its icebreakers for more than 38% of the operational period authorized under the Draft Permit, or roughly 46 days. The commenters note that unpredictable Arctic conditions may require more than 46 days of icebreaking during the operational period, and that it is unreasonable and arbitrary for Region 10 to expect that Shell can pack up and leave once emissions approach the permit limitations.

Response: As an initial matter, the 240 tpy NO_x limit referenced by the commenters does not limit the operation of the icebreakers to only 38% of the operational period. The NO_x limit is a source-wide limit that applies to all emission units in aggregate. Permit Condition D.4.1. Compliance with this limit will be determined through the monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements established in the permit.

As noted by the commenters, the frequency and intensity of ice conditions in the Arctic is difficult to predict. In its application, Shell relied on multi-year ice data from 2003-2005 to estimate that its icebreakers could be conducting ice management activities within 25 miles of the Kulluk for up to 38% of the time the Kulluk is an OCS Source. Permit Application Supplement at 37. Shell used this assumption along with many others (including the assumption that icebreakers would be operating at maximum load at all times while managing ice within 25 miles of the Kulluk) to estimate the maximum expected emissions for the purpose of assessing its ability to conduct exploratory operations while at the same time limiting emissions to less than PSD major source thresholds. OCS Permit Applications, Conical Drilling Unit Kulluk, Beaufort Sea – Application Forms (Permit Application), Appendix G. Shell estimates that icebreaking activity will account for 92 of the 229 tons of allowable NO_x emissions. For additional discussion of ice management see response to comments in Category FF.

The commenters concern appears to be that the assumption Shell relied on for ice management may not reflect actual ice conditions during operations. This may be the case. However, in requesting synthetic minor limits and relying on this assumption Shell has accepted the risk that, if ice conditions are greater than assumed, Shell may be required to reduce emissions from other units or curtail its drilling season to comply with the NO_x limit. See Response to comment FF.3. Furthermore, the ice management assumption relied upon by Shell does not necessarily mean that Shell would be effectively limited to 46 days (38% of 120 days) of ice management activities. In conjunction with the 38% ice management assumption, Shell assumed the icebreakers would be operating at maximum capacity when actual operations will likely be conducted at less than maximum capacity, and actual emissions would therefore be less than assumed. In addition, Shell's Camden Bay Exploration Plan includes an Ice Management Plan that describes how it will forecast and track ice and weather conditions, and describes procedures for operational curtailment. Therefore, the Region does not think it is arbitrary or unreasonable to expect that Shell will be able to forecast ice management needs and curtail or cease operations if necessary to comply with the NO_x limit.

Comment H.1.c: Commenters express concern that restrictions on the source's PTE are not consistent with Shell's representations to other agencies. The commenters refer to EPA guidance concerning a permittee's request for limits to avoid new source review when in reality the requested limits are not how the permittee intends to conduct operations. The commenters request that Region 10 ensure Shell will abide by the restrictions in the Draft Permit and cite to representations made by Shell to BOEMRE and in its Incidental Harassment Authorization that differ from representations made in its application to Region 10. Commenters further state that, based on information submitted in the Camden Bay Exploration Plan and its air permit application, Shell could only drill one well in Camden Bay this year and ask that Region 10 either confirm Shell will drill only one well or issue a major source PSD permit to Shell.

Response: The fact that Shell's Camden Bay Exploration Plan or some other authorization might authorize operation in a different manner or for a longer period of time than authorized under the Kulluk Permit does not relieve Shell of its obligation to comply fully with the Kulluk Permit. As an initial matter, the operational restrictions on drilling in the permit are not established by days but by hours of operation. See Permit Conditions D.3.3 and D.3.4. In its permit application, Shell assumes that it is engaged in the identified drilling activity for 24 hours a day for the specified number of days. The Environmental Impact Assessment cited by the commenters already includes the five additional days to construct the MLC in the estimate of 44 drilling days for the Torpedo prospect drill site and 34 drilling days for the Sivulliq prospect site. In addition, Shell's permit application describes scenarios in which it would not drill a well to depth but might only establish the MLC or any other portion of a well. Permit Application Supplement at 25. These factors make it possible that Shell could construct wells, or portions of wells, at both the Torpedo and Sivulliq prospects in a single season. Shell acknowledged in its permit application that it could only drill as many wells, or portions of wells, as ice conditions or the requested limits in the permit allow. *Id.* For these reasons, Region 10 does not agree with the commenters that it is necessary to confirm that Shell will only drill one well, or issue a major source PSD permit in the absence of this confirmation.

The discussion in the guidance cited by the commenters is a discussion of "sham operational limits" whereby a source applies for a permit as a minor source so as to be able to begin construction without obtaining a major source permit (such as a PSD permit) and then subsequently increases its emissions once it has received a major source permit. Limiting Potential to Emit in New Source Permitting, dated June 13, 1989, at 10-11 (1989 PTE Guidance). Although Shell has requested synthetic minor source limits, there is no indication in the permit record that Shell intends to later apply to Region 10 to remove these synthetic limits. Moreover, Shell must comply with all requirements of the Kulluk Permit and failure to do so is a violation of the CAA. See Permit Condition A.3. As explained in the 1989 PTE Guidance, "attempts to expedite construction by securing minor source status through the receipt of operational restrictions from which the source intends to free itself shortly after operation are to be treated as circumvention of the preconstruction review requirements." Whether an original request for a synthetic minor

permit is a “sham” may be evaluated when a request to remove such limits is received by the permitting authority. If Shell submits an application for a major source permit after it commences operations, Region 10 will evaluate the application consistent with the 1989 PTE Guidance, as well as other authorities.

Comment H.1.d: Commenters state that the permit must include a requirement that if the synthetic minor limits are relaxed the source will be subject to the requirements of 40 CFR § 52.21(r)(4), and that if the permit limits are exceeded the source will trigger PSD requirements and should be required to obtain a PSD permit.

Response: It is not necessary to include 40 CFR § 52.21(r)(4) as a condition in the Kulluk Permit. This regulatory provision requires that if a source becomes a major source solely by virtue of a relaxation of any enforceable limitation on its capacity to emit a pollutant, the source will be subject to the PSD requirements at 40 CFR §§ 52.21(j) to (s) as though the source had not commenced construction. Region 10 has no information that Shell intends to request that any enforceable limitation be relaxed during the term of the Kulluk Permit. Shell is required to comply fully with the Kulluk Permit. If Shell requests a permit change or modification that relaxes an enforceable limit such that it becomes a PSD major source it will be subject to 40 CFR § 52.21(r)(4). In addition, Region 10 will evaluate any operation in excess of PSD-avoidance limits consistent with the 1989 PTE Guidance and the Memorandum from Eric V. Schaeffer, EPA, re: Guidance on the Appropriate Injunctive Relief for Violations of Major New Source Review Requirements, dated November 18, 1999.

Comment H.1.e: A commenter at the Barrow public hearing stated that all Region 10 permits for operations in the Arctic should require BACT.

Response: OCS sources are required to comply with the provisions of PSD program at 40 CFR § 52.21. 40 CFR § 55.13. The PSD program requires, among other things, that new or modified major stationary sources apply BACT. Shell will be a PSD minor source, not a PSD major source, and therefore is not required to apply BACT.

Comment H.1.f: Commenters at the Anchorage and Barrow public hearings stated that as a minor source Shell is not required to undergo a BACT analysis. One commenter noted that as a PSD minor source the Kulluk will have lower emissions than if it were permitted as a PSD major source, and that Shell has installed emission controls that are extensive. One commenter noted that Shell is currently replacing the main engines and other sources on the Kulluk with newer, more efficient and cleaner systems. The commenter contends that the intent of BACT is to ensure best currently available technology and that Shell has done this with the updates to the Kulluk emission units.

Response: Region 10 agrees with the commenters that as a minor source Shell is not required to conduct a BACT analysis or be subject to BACT, and may have lower emissions than if it were permitted as a PSD major source. As a BACT analysis for the Kulluk has not been conducted, the Region disagrees with the commenter’s implication that the updated emission units constitute BACT.

H.2 SUBCATEGORY – PSD APPLICABILITY THRESHOLD FOR GREENHOUSE GASES

Comment H.2.a: Commenters contend that Region 10 applied the wrong major source threshold for CO₂e in the Draft Permit. The commenters note that the Tailoring Rule provides that if a source is not major for any other pollutant the major source threshold is 100,000 tpy, but if the source is major for another pollutant the threshold is 75,000 tpy. The commenters reason that because Shell’s pre-permitted PTE for NO_x, CO, and SO₂ would make it a major source for these pollutants, the applicable major source threshold for CO₂e is 75,000 tpy.

Response: The Tailoring Rule referenced by the commenters establishes applicability criteria that determine when GHGs emitted from stationary sources and modification projects become subject to regulation under the PSD and Title V programs. 75 Fed. Reg. 31,514 (June 3, 2010). The rule provides that GHGs emitted from a stationary source will be subject to regulation if the source is a new major source for a regulated NSR pollutant that is not GHG, and emits or has the potential to emit 75,000 tpy CO₂e or more, or if the new source would otherwise emit or have the potential to emit 100,000 tpy CO₂e or more. See 40 CFR § 52.21(b)(49)(iv); 75 Fed. Reg. at 31,523-24. The Tailoring Rule also explained that in order for a source’s GHG emissions to trigger PSD or Title V requirements, the GHG emissions “must equal or exceed both the applicability thresholds established in this rulemaking on a CO₂e basis and the statutory thresholds of 100 or 250 tpy on a mass basis.” 75 Fed. Reg. at 31,518.

Under the PSD program, as applied to Shell’s stationary source, a “major stationary source” is any source which emits or has the potential to emit any pollutant subject to regulation under the CAA in amounts equal to or greater than 250 tpy. 40 CFR § 52.21(b)(1). The PSD regulations define potential to emit as the maximum capacity of a source to emit under its physical and operational design, including any physical or operational limitation on the capacity of the source to emit if the limitation is federally enforceable. 40 CFR § 52.21(b)(4).

As noted by the commenter, Shell’s pre-permitted PTE exceeds the 250 tpy threshold for non-GHG for three pollutants. However, Shell requested, and Region 10 has included, federally enforceable limitations in the Kulluk Permit that reduce the source’s potential to emit to below 250 tpy for all non-GHG pollutants subject to regulation for purposes of NSR. Accordingly, Shell is not a new major source for a non-GHG regulated NSR pollutant and thus is not subject to the 75,000 tpy CO₂e applicability threshold for such sources. Instead, Shell would be considered a major source for PSD permitting purposes if it emits or has the PTE 100,000 tpy CO₂e and 250 tpy GHG on a mass basis. Its requested limits for CO₂e keep it below the applicable threshold, therefore the source’s GHG emissions are not “subject to regulation” for PSD permitting purposes and PSD requirements do not apply.

I. CATEGORY – ENFORCEABILITY OF PTE LIMITS

I.1 SUBCATEGORY – GENERAL

Comment I.1.a: Commenters request that Region 10 add to the list of “Prohibited Activities” the operation of the vessels between December 1 and June 30 because the Draft Permit specifies that the “permittee shall only conduct exploration drilling operations in the Beaufort Sea between July 1 and November 30 each year (referred to hereafter as the “drilling season”).”

Response: The Kulluk Permit clearly states that “The permittee shall only conduct exploration drilling operations in the Beaufort Sea between July 1 and November 30 each year (referred to hereafter as the “drilling season”).” Permit Condition D.3.1. This condition adequately prohibits operation of the Kulluk as an OCS source in the Beaufort Sea between December 1 and June 30 of each year, and the additional condition suggested by the commenters is not necessary.

Comment I.1.b: Commenters state that Region 10 fails to explain why monthly limits could not be imposed in the Draft Permit and why Shell was provided 12-month rolling emission limits for certain pollutants. The commenters reference EPA guidance providing that production and operational limits must be stated as conditions that can be enforced independently of one another and that EPA recommends a one month limit as the maximum time EPA should generally accept for avoiding a PSD threshold. The commenters also point to EPA guidance and state that Region 10 should first consider the possibility of imposing month-by-month limits, and only if that is not feasible should the Region impose a 12-month rolling time period. The commenters reference the following statement that they cite as originating from the Statement of Basis: “because the annual NAAQS are set based on calendar years, the restriction can similarly apply on a calendar year basis (or, in the case of these permits, a drilling season which is limited by the permit to a specific 5-month period out of any calendar year).” The commenters contend that this statement is misleading because it implies that Shell is complying with the NAAQS and other standards during the limited drilling season instead of taking a rolling 12-month timeframe in which to document compliance.

Response: Agency guidance provides that production or operational limits expressed on a calendar year basis cannot be considered capable of legally restricting potential to emit, and that such limits should generally not exceed one month, but can include longer rolling limits (*e.g.*, on a 12-month rolling basis). 1989 PTE Guidance at 10. This guidance applies to limiting a source’s potential to emit and does not explicitly address limits established to protect the NAAQS. Region 10 believes that in this case limits imposed to ensure compliance with annual NAAQS standards can reasonably be expressed on a calendar year basis because compliance with the annual standard is determined based on calendar year or multi-year averages of calendar years.

The commenters’ concern appears to relate to the fact that the Draft Permit includes PTE limits set on a rolling basis even though Shell is prohibited from operating under the permit between December 1 and June 30 of each year. The rolling PTE limits in Permit

Condition D.4 of the Draft Permit were established assuming zero emissions during the period when operations are prohibited (December through June of each year). In addition, each of the limits in the permit applies independently. In other words, even though the limits in Permit Condition D.4 could—on their own—allow the source to emit pollutants between December 1 and June 30 of each year, Permit Condition D.3.1 prohibits operation during that time period, and the permittee must comply with both requirements.

The commenters are correct that EPA guidance does express a general preference for shorter time periods rather than 12-month rolling limits. See 1989 PTE Guidance at 9. As the commenters acknowledge, however, EPA has also recognized that longer rolling limits are appropriate for sources with substantial and unpredictable annual variations in emissions, as well as for those sources that curtail operations during part of a year on a regular seasonal cycle. *Id.* at 9-10. Such is the case here. Shell's planned exploratory operations are atypical as compared to other sources because the emission units consist of multiple engines and generators with variable emissions on the Kulluk and a fleet of numerous support vessels. Operations will vary from hour-to-hour, day-to-day, month-to-month, and season-to-season based on factors such as the number of wells drilled, the activity being undertaken (drilling mud cellar lines, other drilling activity, or activity that does not involve drilling), the depth of the wells drilled, whether emergency engines are being run for testing, and ice conditions. Given the variability in operations, and thus emissions expected from this source, and after considering a full range of options for limiting the source's potential to emit, Region 10 determined that it was appropriate to establish longer-term rolling limits. In short, the Kulluk Permit does not set PTE limits on a calendar year basis, but instead establishes rolling 365-day limits for NO_x and CO, and 12-month rolling limits for SO₂ and GHG emissions. Region 10 determined that these limits are appropriate considering the nature of the source and are consistent with the 1989 PTE Guidance. See also response to comment I.1.c.

Similar to the 2011 Revised Permits for the Discoverer, the limit on the number of days in the drilling season in the Kulluk Permit is a limit set to ensure compliance with the annual NAAQS and therefore can reasonably be established, as was done here, on a calendar year (drilling season) basis. Region 10 also notes that the statement quoted by the commenters concerning setting annual NAAQS compliance limits on a calendar year basis is not contained in the Kulluk Statement of Basis. This statement is from the Supplemental Statement of Basis for the Discoverer Permits.

Comment I.1.c: Commenters contend that the owner-requested limits and other provisions designed to limit Shell's potential to emit are unenforceable as a practical matter and unlawful. Commenters note that absent enforceable permit limitations, Shell's yearly potential to emit exceeds the applicable major source threshold of 250 tpy for NO_x, CO, SO₂, and GHG emissions. The commenters reference that Shell's pre-permitted PTE for NO_x is 2,339 tpy and that the Draft Permit limits NO_x emissions to 240 tpy determined on a rolling 365-day basis. Commenters further contend that although the Draft Permit describes how to calculate NO_x emissions it fails to specify how the emissions will be limited through an operational limit, a production limit, or the

installation of controls or other mechanisms. As a result, the commenters state that the limit is not enforceable and fails to serve the intended purpose of restricting Shell's emissions of NO_x. The commenters assert that the same is true for potential to emit limits for CO and CO₂e.

Response: The commenters are correct that, absent enforceable permit limits, Shell's yearly potential to emit would exceed the applicable PSD major source thresholds for NO_x, CO, SO₂, and GHG emissions. See Statement of Basis, p. 24. Potential to emit is defined as the maximum capacity of a 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 restrictions on hours of operation or on the type or amount of material combusted, stored, or processed, is treated as part of its design if the limitation or the effect it would have on emissions is enforceable. See 40 CFR §§ 52.21(b)(4) and 55.2. Region 10 believes that the limits established in the Kulluk Permit to restrict the source's potential to emit are both federally enforceable and enforceable as a practical matter.

Title V of the CAA and Part 71 provide a mechanism to create limits in a Title V permit that restrict a source's potential to emit. The Environmental Appeals Board (EAB) has specifically acknowledged that "Title V permits (and other permits as well) may function as vehicles for establishing such PTE limits, potentially allowing a source to avoid more burdensome permitting requirements for 'major sources' by instead qualifying as a 'synthetic minor' source for purposes of some other regulatory programs." *In re Peabody Western Coal Company*, 12 EAD 22, 31 (EAB Feb. 18, 2000). Limits established in a Title V permit are federally enforceable. See 42 U.S.C. § 7661a, 40 CFR § 71.6(b), Permit Condition A.3.4. See also 18 AAC 50.225 (COA authority to impose owner-requested limits on PTE).

Region 10 determined that, given the variable nature of Shell's proposed operations and the number, types, and location of emission sources spread across the Kulluk and Associated Fleet, the most effective means to limit Shell's potential to emit was through the application of enforceable source-wide emission limits for NO_x, CO, SO₂ and CO₂e. The proposed exploratory drilling operations will involve variable operations from well-to-well and season-to-season due to factors such as weather, sea state, remoteness of the drilling site, and the exploratory nature of the operations (i.e. the speculative nature of exploratory drilling). Emissions from many units will also vary depending on the activity being conducted. For example, emissions from drilling equipment on the Kulluk will depend on the stage of drilling activity (e.g., drilling mud cellar lines versus other drilling activities), and emissions from the propulsion engines on the icebreakers will depend on the frequency, thickness, and location of ice. Such considerations require a level of operational flexibility that makes it impractical to establish unit-specific limits or operating parameters for some pollutants that might typically be applied to limit a stationary source's potential to emit. For these reasons, Region 10 determined that, for this permit, the most effective and reliable way to limit potential to emit was through a combination of emission limits and specified emission factors, supported by stringent monitoring, frequent emission calculations, recordkeeping requirements, and operating

limitations. This approach accounts for variability in operations and emissions, yet still provides assurance that limits on potential to emit can be enforced as a practical matter.

The Kulluk Permit establishes an emission limit for SO₂ (10 tpy) that is well below the applicable PSD major source threshold as determined on a 12-month rolling basis. This emission limit is supported by operational limits on both the type and amount of fuel combusted that ensure emissions remain below the applicable emission limit. The permit restricts the sulfur content of fuel combusted on the Kulluk and Associated Fleet to 100 ppm. Permit Condition D.4.5. Compliance with this operational limit is determined by Permit Condition D.4.9 which requires that all fuel purchased have a maximum sulfur content of 15 ppm. The permit also establishes an aggregate fuel limit for all emission sources that limits the total amount of fuel combusted during any 12-month rolling period to 7,004,428 gallons. Permit Condition D.4.6. Compliance with the fuel limit is determined through stringent fuel monitoring requirements. For the majority of emission units, fuel usage is monitored continuously using a fuel flow meter. For the units where a fuel flow meter is not required (Kulluk emergency generator, seldom used sources, and OSRV work boats) the permit requires that fuel usage be measured using a fuel sight glass, tank gauge, or graduated dip stick. Under Permit Condition F.2.2.2. Shell is required to record fuel usage for each emission unit on an hourly, daily, and monthly basis. Permit Condition F.2.2. Together, the limits on the type and amount of fuel combusted, along with the fuel monitoring requirements, assure compliance with the emission limit for SO₂.

The Kulluk Permit establishes an emission limit for CO₂e (80,000 tpy) below the threshold at which GHGs become “subject to regulation” for a new stationary source under the Tailoring Rule as determined on a 12-month rolling basis. This emission limit is supported by the operational limit on the amount of fuel combusted over a 12-month rolling period and an operational limit on the amount of waste combusted each day that, together, ensure emissions remain below the applicable emission limit, so the source’s GHG emissions are not “subject to regulation” for PSD permitting purposes and PSD permitting requirements do not apply. Permit Conditions D.4.6 and D.4.7. The permit requires Shell to monitor total fuel usage, as described above, and to monitor and record the operation of the incinerators on the Kulluk and Associated Fleet. Emissions are calculated by applying emission factors specified in Tables D.2.1 and D.2.2 to the amount of fuel combusted and the assumed maximum operation of the incinerators. Each month, Shell is required to calculate and record the rolling 12-month emissions of GHGs to ensure that emissions of CO₂e remain below 80,000 tpy. For a discussion of methane emissions see response to comment I.3.b.

The Kulluk Permit establishes emission limits for NO_x (240 tpy) and CO (200 tpy) below the applicable PSD major source threshold, as determined on a rolling 365-day basis.

Compliance with the emission limits for NO_x and CO is determined by calculating daily NO_x and CO emissions from each emission unit using emission factors derived from stack testing conducted pursuant to specified requirements (Permit Condition E) or specifically identified in the permit (Permit Condition D.1). The permit requires Shell to

conduct stack tests for the majority of emission units to develop reliable emission factors for NO_x and CO. Stack testing is conducted across multiple load conditions for each emission unit or group of emission units. The highest emission factor determined through stack testing is used to calculate all emissions from the unit regardless of actual operating load conditions. For groups of the emission units, the highest emission factor observed for the group is used for all emission units in the group. For emission units that are not subject to stack testing for NO_x and CO (Kulluk emergency generator, seldom used sources, OSRV workboats, heaters and boilers), the permit specifies emission factors which are either the AP-42 emission factor or the 90th percentile value derived from source tests of corresponding emission units on Shell's Discoverer drillship and Associated Fleet. For more discussion of emission factors see response to comment I.3.a.

Compliance with the emission limits for NO_x and CO is determined by applying the relevant emission factor to the amount of fuel combusted by each emission unit (or hours of operation for incinerators). The fuel monitoring requirements, described above, and the specified emission factors for individual emission units allow for source-wide emission calculations to be made. Shell is required to calculate and record on a weekly basis the daily emissions of NO_x and CO from each emission unit, and to calculate and record on a weekly basis the daily rolling 365-day emissions of NO_x and CO. In this way, Shell is required to provide a continuous assessment of daily NO_x and CO emissions to ensure that the source complies with its PTE limits. Determining NO_x and CO emissions from each unit on a daily basis provides a reliable and timely mechanism that will allow Shell to frequently assess compliance and to determine whether it is approaching the emission limits established to limit its potential to emit and to adjust its operations accordingly.

In addition to emission limits, the Kulluk Permit includes a combination of operational limits which effectively limit potential to emit as well. In addition to the limits on the type and amount of fuel combusted, the Kulluk Permit imposes hourly operational limits on MLC drilling and overall drilling activity. Permit Conditions D.3.3 and D.3.4. Shell is required to record the date and hour the Kulluk becomes an OCS Source and the date and hour of drilling and incineration activities. Permit Conditions D.3.6 to D.3.8. To limit emissions of NO_x and CO from larger emission units, the Kulluk Permit requires the installation and operation of add-on controls. Exhaust from emission units with the highest PTE for NO_x – the Kulluk electricity generation engines and the propulsion and generation engines on both icebreakers – will be directed to an operating selective catalytic reduction (SCR) control device that is evaluated at all times the affected source is operating using a continuous monitoring system (CMS). In addition, exhaust from the Kulluk electricity generation engines, MLC HPU engines, MLC air compressor engines, Kulluk deck cranes, and the propulsion and generation engines on both icebreakers are directed to an oxidation catalyst control device that controls combustible substances such as CO and PM and is evaluated using a CMS. Permit Conditions F.3 and F.4.

The 1989 PTE Guidance recognizes exceptions to the statement that emission limits alone are not generally sufficiently enforceable as a practical matter so as to limit PTE. While the situation presented by the Kulluk and Associated Fleet was not contemplated at

the time the 1989 PTE Guidance was issued, Region 10 believes that this situation is sufficiently analogous to the rationale for recognizing the exception for the VOC surface coating. As in the case of VOC coating operations, the operational and production parameters for the emission units on the Kulluk and Associated Fleet are not readily limited due to the uniqueness of the source which includes a wide variety of emission units and varying emission factors for NO_x and CO for the various emission units, resulting from the unpredictable nature and variability of operations, and the need for operational flexibility on fuel usage. Therefore, Region 10 has required the use of emission limits and specific emission factors based on conservative assumptions, coupled with a requirement to calculate hourly and/or daily emissions, to restrict potential to emit. In this way, the combination of emission limits and specified emission factors has an effect similar to operational limits because the operational parameters that are linked to the emissions are continuously tracked and used for compliance.

Region 10 believes the permit appropriately limits Shell's potential to emit in a manner that is both legally enforceable and enforceable as a practical matter. Moreover, Shell is aware that operations must be suspended when necessary to avoid exceeding the limits. In the unlikely event that PTE limits are exceeded, not only may Shell need to apply for and obtain a PSD permit, but it may be considered to have been in violation of PSD requirements from the time it was initially constructed.

I.2 SUBCATEGORY – APPROPRIATENESS OF EMISSION LIMITS

Comment I.2.a: Commenters cite to a letter from EPA Region 9 to the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection as support for the proposition that EPA's position is that a 5-10% buffer is appropriate for synthetic minor source air permits. The commenters apply the 5-10% buffer to the potential to emit NO_x under the Draft Permit and note that the 240 tpy emission limit provides less than a 5% buffer. The commenters assert that, at the very least, the final permit needs to provide a 5% buffer, but that given the unknowns associated with the Draft Permit and the Arctic conditions, Region 10 should ensure a 10% buffer for all owner requested restrictions.

Response: The letter cited by the commenters involved a revision to a Title V permit to allow the source to install and operate additional emission units that would have increased the source's potential to emit CO above the applicable major source threshold of 250 tpy. In the draft permit, the state permitting authority established a facility-wide emission limit for CO of 249 tpy, just below the major source threshold. Region 9 did not object to the emission limit, but encouraged the permitting authority to provide a larger buffer of between 5-10% in that case.

Congress established specific thresholds to determine when a source would be considered major for purposes of PSD review. 42 U.S.C. § 7479(1). Although establishing a 5-10% buffer where an emission limit is just below the major source threshold may increase confidence that a source will not exceed the applicable threshold, the commenter does not cite anything to suggest that this is a legal requirement.

Moreover, the Kulluk Permit differs from the permit at issue in the Region 9 letter because it establishes a NO_x limit of 240 tpy, which provides a greater cushion and more confidence with respect to the PSD major source threshold than the 249 tpy limit at issue in the Region 9 letter. In addition, the permit includes requirements to ensure that emissions do not exceed this threshold, including but not limited to source testing of engines that are anticipated to generate approximately 91 percent of emissions, calculating emissions from these engines based upon worst-case emission factors (lb/gal) and continuously measuring and recording hourly the flow of diesel fuel to these engines (gal/hr). For those engines employing SCR to reduce emissions, the permit requires that a CMS measure and record operating parameters associated with the control device. On those occasions when the CMS detects operation of the control device in a manner different from that observed during stack testing, the permit requires that an uncontrolled emission factor be employed to calculate NO_x emissions. The application of a CMS and the use of uncontrolled emission factors increase confidence that the source's actual emissions will not be greater than reported.

Furthermore, the Kulluk Permit contains adequate and enforceable monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements to ensure that Shell complies with the NO_x and other emission limits. As noted in the Region 9 letter, if a major source threshold is exceeded a facility may trigger PSD requirements and may be treated as a source that should have obtained a PSD permit. Memorandum from Eric V. Schaeffer, EPA, re: Guidance on the Appropriate Injunctive Relief for Violations of Major New Source Review Requirements, dated November 18, 1999, at 5-6. For these reasons, Region 10 disagrees with the commenters that a buffer calculated as a percentage of the major source threshold is necessary in this case.

I.3 SUBCATEGORY – DETERMINING COMPLIANCE WITH PTE LIMITS

Comment I.3.a: Commenters state that limits on emissions of criteria pollutants are not practically enforceable because adequate monitoring is not in place to assure compliance. As an example, the commenters cite to the Statement of Basis (p. 38) which states: “[c]ompliance with the CO and NO_x emission limits is determined by multiplying measured fuel by periodically confirmed emissions factors.” The commenters contend that the Draft Permit authorizes the use of default emission factors until unit-specific emission factors are determined through testing, and for some emission units there is no requirement to test for unit-specific factors. The commenters state that because the permittee has failed to identify the emission units it will use, this approach creates inherent uncertainty that necessitates thorough source testing. This inherent uncertainty remains unresolved, the commenters continue, because some emission units will not be tested. The commenters contend that because there will be no way to determine whether the default emission factors are wrong, the emission limits for CO and NO_x will be unenforceable as a practical matter. The commenters further state that the failure to obtain unit-specific data for all units is particularly problematic because the AP-42 emission factors that Region 10 relies on are notoriously inaccurate. The commenters cite to AP 42, Volume I, Fifth Edition for support that EPA does not recommend the use

of AP-42 factors as source-specific permit limits and/or as emission regulation compliance determinations.

Response I.3.a: The permit requires the use of emission factors to determine compliance with both NAAQS- and PTE-based NO_x and CO emission limits and requires source-specific verification of emission factors through source testing for the emission units that make up most of the allowed NO_x and CO emissions. Some smaller or infrequently used emission units, representing a small portion of the total NO_x and CO emissions, are not required to be tested. For those units that are not required to be tested, the NO_x and CO emission factors are based on either AP-42 emission factors or, when available, source test data from Shell's Discoverer drillship and Associated Fleet.

In consideration of the comments received, and to be sure there is a reasonable margin of safety that assures compliance, Region 10 is adding a requirement to test NO_x and CO emissions from each incinerator. Permit Condition E.3.2. Given the unique applications of the incinerators on these vessels, Region 10 believes this additional emission factor verification is appropriate and reasonable. After adding this additional incinerator testing, the permit will require emission testing of emission units that constitute 91% of the total NO_x emissions and 97% of the total CO emissions.

For emission units for which the permit does not require testing (emergency generators, seldom-used sources and OSRV work boats) and that rely on NO_x emission factors based on Discoverer test data, in response to comments received, Region 10 is adjusting the emission factors to reflect very conservative 90th percentile (or higher) values from the test data. See response to comment M.2.c. The only units that rely on AP-42 for NO_x emission factors are the heaters and boilers, which constitute only one percent of total NO_x emissions. Region 10 expects AP-42 emissions factors for heaters and boilers to be a conservative representation of actual emissions. EPA expects AP-42 emissions factors for heaters and boilers to be a conservative representation of actual emissions. While AP-42 predicts an emission factor of 0.02 lb/gal for heaters and boilers, Shell testing of its boilers residing on the Discoverer shows a range of values between 0.011 lb/gal and 0.015 lb/gal.⁶

The emission units that will not be tested to verify CO emissions factors (heaters and boilers, emergency generators, seldom-used sources and OSRV work boats) rely on AP-42 emission factors. While AP-42 emission factors are considered average values for the size-specific categories of emission units the emission factors represent, Region 10 believes that the emission factors are reasonable for use in this permit given that AP-42 emission factors will represent only 3% of the total CO emissions. Actual emissions from some emission units may be higher and some lower than the AP-42 emission factors predict.

⁶ 0.11 lb/gal = (8.33 x 10⁻² lb/MMBtu) x (MMBtu/1x10⁶ Btu) x (131180 Btu/gal)
0.15 lb/gal = (1.18 x 10⁻¹ lb/MMBtu) x (MMBtu/1x10⁶ Btu) x (131180 Btu/gal) See June 16, 2011 email from Rodger Steen to Dan Meyer.

Emission testing conducted by Shell on two Discoverer boilers showed CO emissions very near what AP-42 predicts. The tests conducted by Shell resulted in CO emission factors of 0.004 and 0.007 lb/gal, while AP-42 predicts an emission factor of 0.005 lb/gal.⁷ In response to the comments received, EPA has decided to use the higher of the two test values (0.007 lb/gal) in place of the AP-42 emission factor.

According to Shell, OSRV work boats will be deployed 5 days a week for 6 hours a day to conduct exercises. See “Anticipated Kulluk Operating Maximum” in Permit Application Supplement at 326. Emissions data supplied by Shell for one of the potential work boats to be deployed suggests the actual emission factor for the propulsion engines is one-tenth the value AP-42 predicts. The engine manufacturer’s data provided by Shell suggests an emission factor of 0.006 lb/gal, while AP-42 suggests an emission factor of 0.112 or 0.125 lb/gal, depending on the engine rating.⁸ Shell intends to install a brand new emergency generator on the Kulluk; it is predicted operations will be two hours each month to exercise the generator. Seldom-used sources consist of equipment such as life boats and are, as the name suggests, expected to operate infrequently. Region 10 believes the permit strikes an appropriate balance between the need for accurate emission factors to reliably calculate emissions for comparison to permit limits and the complexity of testing numerous emission units in a short period of time.

Comment I.3.b: Commenters assert that the CO₂e emission limit of 80,000 tpy is not practically enforceable because Region 10 neglected to require monitoring or controls for emissions of methane. Commenters contend that methane is a powerful greenhouse gas with a warming potential 21 times greater than CO₂, and methane emission must be included in calculating whether a source is subject to the Clean Air Act’s greenhouse gas controls. When a rig drills into porous, the commenters state, hydrocarbon bearing rock, methane mixes into the drilling muds and is brought to the surface. The commenters state that some of this methane will be emitted through a vent, and therefore must be counted toward Shell’s potential to emit CO₂e. The commenters state that Region 10 assumes that the drilling mud system will vent no more than 399 pounds of methane per month (4 tons per month of CO₂e), and makes this assumption on assurances from Shell based on its past drilling experience. The commenters state that ConocoPhillips estimated methane emissions at 183 tons per month, which the commenters calculate as 46 times Shell’s estimate. The commenters take issue with Region 10’s determination not to require Shell to control, monitor, or report methane emissions, and assert that the lack of monitoring or reporting makes the owner-requested limit for CO₂e unenforceable as a practical matter.

Response: EPA has recognized that there are sources for which inherent physical limitations for the operation restrict the potential emissions of individual emission units.

⁷ 0.004 lb/gal = (0.0311 lb/MMBtu) x (MMBtu/1x10⁶ Btu) x (131,180 Btu/gal)
 0.007 lb/gal = (0.05 lb/MMBtu) x (MMBtu/1x10⁶ Btu) x (131,180 Btu/gal) See June 16, 2011 email from Rodger Steen to Dan Meyer.

⁸ Support Vessel Parameters, Permit Application Supplement at 154. 0.006 lb/gal = (0.155 g/hp-hr) x (hp/7000 Btu) x (lb/453.592 g) x (131,180 Btu/gal)

Where these inherent physical limitations can be documented by the source and confirmed by the permit issuer, the permit issuer has the authority to make such judgments and factor them into estimates of stationary source potential emissions. See Memorandum from John S. Seitz, EPA, re: Options for Limiting the Potential to Emit (PTE) of a Stationary Source Under Section 112 and Title V of the Clean Air Act (CAA), dated January 25, 1995 (Options for Limiting PTE) at 8.

Methane emissions from the drilling mud system are subject to operational restrictions that limit operations to 120 days between July and November, and limit drilling activity to 1,632 hours. These operational limits are accompanied by monitoring in the form of recordkeeping. See Permit Condition D.3.6. In this case, Shell calculated the potential methane emissions from the drilling mud system based upon the maximum expected capacity over the five-month period of operation taking into consideration inherent physical limitations and actual well data. See Permit Application, Appendix E. EPA has acknowledged that where inherent physical limitations exist, it may be appropriate to rely on a reasonable and realistic "upper-limit" projection in identifying the "maximum capacity" of a source for the purpose of estimating their PTE. See e.g., Memorandum from John Seitz, EPA, re: Calculating Potential to Emit (PTE) and Other Guidance for Grain Handling Terminals, dated November 14, 1995, at 4-5; Options for Limiting PTE at 8.

To add a measure of safety in issuing the Draft Permit, Region 10 assumed all of the emissions from the drilling mud system (which includes the cuttings/mud disposal barge) will be point source emissions whereas, in actuality, a significant amount of the emissions from the drilling mud system and all of the emissions from the cuttings/mud disposal barge meet the definition of fugitive emissions and do not have to be counted for this source category in determining a source's potential to emit under the PSD program. See 40 CFR § 52.21(b)(1)(iii).

In response to these comments, Region 10 contacted Shell on September 8, 2011, to discuss the methane estimation and request additional well information previously-claimed by Shell as confidential to confirm that the estimate of methane potential to emit it previously provided to Region 10 is a reasonable upper-bound estimation. Shell provided the additional documentation of actual well data. See email from Susan Childs, Shell, to Doug Hardesty, Region 10, re: Shell Mud and Cuttings Degassing Emissions, dated September 16, 2011. The information provided shows that Shell relied on actual well pressure, temperature, porosity, and depth of the hydrocarbon bearing zone from past Arctic exploration projects in its estimation.

In reviewing Shell's new information, Region 10 identified an error in the methane emission factor in the draft Kulluk permit. As in the Shell Discoverer permits, Region 10 conservatively assumed that Shell's estimation represented only one well and adjusted the monthly emission factor by a factor of four to represent four wells (a reasonable upper-bound estimate of the number of wells that could be drilled in a single season). The emission factor in the draft Kulluk permit was missing this adjustment. The final Kulluk permit will include the adjusted methane emission factor (1,596 pounds CH₄ per month) to be consistent with the Discoverer permits. Region 10 has also amended the

synthetic minor 12-month rolling diesel fuel combustion limitation (Condition D.4.6) to account for the revised estimate of CO₂e potential emissions attributed to mud degassing. Because mud degassing GHG emissions are relatively insignificant compared to fuel combustion GHG emissions, the 12-month rolling diesel fuel usage limit has only decreased 0.1% from 7,011,323 gallons to 7,004,428 gallons.⁹

As in the case of the reasonable, upper-bound projections that EPA believes are appropriate for determining the PTE of grain terminals, Region 10 believes that the emission estimate for methane emissions from Shell's mud drilling system (17 tons per month of CO₂e) assumed in the emission limit on total GHGs is a reasonable upper-bound projection for Shell's operations and is not expected to be exceeded under any reasonably anticipated operating scenario. This is especially true given the other conservative assumptions that Region 10 is applying to Shell's estimate to provide a wide margin of safety (considering both point source and fugitive emissions in the estimate and assuming the yearly estimate is emitted in each of the five months).¹⁰

For comparison purposes, EPA recommends grain terminals apply a safety factor of 1.2 to the highest of the previous five years of throughput to constitute a realistic upper-bound potential to emit. See Memorandum from John Seitz, EPA, re: Calculating Potential to Emit (PTE) and Other Guidance for Grain Handling Terminals, dated November 14, 1995, at 5. It is important to emphasize that, even with these conservative assumptions, the GHG emissions (85 tons per year CO₂e) from the drilling mud system represent only 0.11% of the total GHG emissions (80,000 tons per year CO₂e) allowed under the permit.

Region 10 believes that assuming such a conservatively high estimate of the methane emissions that would be emitted from the drilling mud system operating at its maximum design operation rate, coupled with the operational limit on the duration of the operations and other permit restrictions, are collectively sufficient to ensure methane emissions from the drilling mud system do not exceed 17 tons per month of CO₂e, and that overall CO₂e emissions do not exceed 80,000 tpy on a 12-month rolling basis. Because of the inherent limitations that exist, and considering the small contribution from the mud drilling system to overall GHG emissions from the Kulluk and Associated Fleet as a whole, Region 10 does not believe it is necessary or appropriate to monitor emissions from, or operations of the drilling mud system, aside from the monitoring already required in the permit

⁹ 79,080 ton CO₂e = 80,000 ton CO₂e (ORL) – 835 ton CO₂e (waste incineration) – 85 ton CO₂e (mud degassing)
 7,004,428 gallons = (79,080 tons CO₂e) x (2000 lb CO₂e/ton CO₂e) x (gal diesel/22.58 lb CO₂e)

¹⁰ Region 10 is aware that ConocoPhillips provided an estimate of emissions from its mud drilling system that is much higher than that provided by Shell to support this permit. Region 10 has closely examined the estimates provided by both companies along with a comparison of the methodologies offered by Shell in its September 20, 2011 comments to EPA regarding the permitting of ConocoPhillips jackup drill rig. Shell's estimate is based on well information from past arctic exploration projects. The fact that one company has chosen to rely on even more conservative assumptions in estimating its potential to emit from similar operations does not undermine the validity of another company using less conservative, but still reasonably conservative assumptions in estimating its emissions where it has a reasonable basis to do so.

including monitoring the duration of operations. Moreover, Region 10 believes that the monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting included in the permit for the limits on emissions, fuel, waste, and operations that collectively limit emissions to below the Tailoring Rule “subject to regulation” threshold for GHGs together constitute a “verifiable method to attain and maintain each limit” within the meaning of 18 AAC 50.225 of the COA regulations.

J. CATEGORY – LIMITS TO PROTECT THE NAAQS

J.1 SUBCATEGORY – ENFORCEABILITY OF EMISSION LIMITS

Comment J.1.a: Commenters state that EPA guidance provides that emission limits are “sufficient to limit potential to emit” when they include “requirements to install, maintain, and operate a continuous emission monitoring (CEM) system and to retain CEM data, and specifies that CEM data may be used to determine compliance with the emission limit.” The commenters contend that the present circumstances warrant CEM to ensure permit conditions are enforceable, and are concerned that the Region has not required CEM where permit provisions are based on a new model and new algorithms that have not been tested for the Arctic. The commenters believe that only monitoring the combustion of fuel or waste is not sufficient to protect air quality given the modeling uncertainties underlying the permit provisions.

Response: The commenters have provided no support for the assertion that fuel and waste combustion monitoring is not sufficient to protect air quality. In fact, the waste monitoring required in the permit is needed to confirm NSPS applicability rather than for monitoring compliance because waste combustion rates are conservatively assumed to be at the maximum any time an incinerator operates. For a discussion on why Region 10 believes the requirements established in the permit are both legally enforceable and enforceable as a practical matter and sufficient to limit potential to emit see responses to comments in Subcategory I.1. With respect to the concern that fuel and waste combustion monitoring is not sufficient to protect air quality, the commenters have provided no support for this assertion. Although there is some uncertainty inherent in all modeling analyses (because it is by nature predictive), Region 10 believes the modeling underlying the NAAQS requirements and the compliance assurance provisions in the permit are sufficient to ensure the NAAQS will be protected.

Continuous Emission Monitoring System (CEMS) are a means of ensuring compliance with emission limits and may be an appropriate alternative if setting enforceable operational parameters for control equipment is infeasible. See 1989 PTE Guidance at 7-8. CEMS may also be appropriate where sources are experiencing regular compliance problems. CEMS are not the only means, however, of assuring compliance with limits on potential to emit and NAAQS-based emission limits. Shell’s proposed exploratory operations are unusual as compared to other sources because the emission units consist of numerous engines and generators with numerous release points (stacks) on the Kulluk and a fleet of many support vessels. SCR and OxyCat controls are required on multiple engines on three different vessels. CEMS are expensive to purchase, maintain, and

operate, but more importantly, there are practical considerations that Region 10 had to consider in this case, including the fact that emission units, control equipment, and monitoring equipment will be operating in a remote, harsh, Arctic environment, and deck space on board the vessels is limited. Furthermore, potential to emit is determined on a source-wide basis making it less critical to be precise on an individual emission unit basis. Similarly, NAAQS compliance is in jeopardy when the total emissions impacting a receptor point are higher than allowed. Higher than expected emissions at one stack, are offset by other stacks emitting less than expected. Region 10 believes that the permit assures compliance with the PTE and NAAQS limits through an appropriate level of monitoring that reflects the unique attributes of this source.

The permit requires a regimen of stack testing and emission calculations, in conjunction with a continuous monitoring system for parametric monitoring of control equipment to ensure compliance with emission limits. This is in addition to other operational restrictions that will have the effect of restricting the source's emissions and help ensure compliance with the NAAQS-based limits. Region 10 believes that the control equipment parametric monitoring required by the permit – temperature, urea feed, catalyst activity for SCR (Permit Condition F.3) and temperature and catalyst activity for the oxidation catalyst device (Permit Condition F.4) – are effective means for ensuring that the controls are working properly and achieving the projected emission reductions. For uncontrolled emission units, the permit requires monitoring and reporting operational rates including fuel and hours of operation. The commenters have provided no information to indicate that the required monitoring of fuel, hours of operation, and control equipment will not be accurate. Multiplying the tracked fuel rates by source-specific emission factors determined by source testing for most of the emission units will provide a reasonable assurance of compliance with emission limits in the permits. The commenters have provided no information to the contrary, nor have the commenters identified any specific requirement to use CEMS in this circumstance. Contrary to the commenters' assertion, monitoring emissions using CEMS has no bearing on the accuracy of the new algorithms used by Shell for modeling. Region 10 continues to believe that CEMS are not necessary to provide a reasonable assurance of compliance with the emission limits in this permit. See also response to comment M.3.c.

Comment J.1.b: Commenters assert that limits established to ensure compliance with the NAAQS are not enforceable. The commenters take issue with the establishment of limits on pounds per hour or day, and state that it is inappropriate to assess NAAQS compliance with pound per hour calculations without any underlying, enforceable measure (e.g., operational or production limits) to assure that those emissions limits are met.

Response: The commenters have not specified why they believe it is necessary to create operational and production limits in addition to mass emission limits for NAAQS compliance, and cite no legal authority requiring such limits. The permit contains enforceable conditions to address NAAQS compliance.

The NAAQS-based emission limits are based on predicted emission rates used in modeling to demonstrate compliance with NAAQS. Compliance with the emission rates

is determined by multiplying the measured operational rates (fuel or waste feed rates) by emission factors that are specified and developed through testing under the permit. Because the emission limits are specified in the permit and the emission factors are set through procedures in the permit, the maximum amount of operation (fuel or waste feed) is effectively restricted as well.

For instance, Permit Condition 6.1.1.1 limits NO_x during drilling from emission units K-1A through K-1D to 19.0 pounds per hour. The emission factor for NO_x emissions from these same emission units, found in Table D.2.1 of the permit, is 0.049 pounds per gallon of fuel combusted. If Shell operates these units such that they combust more than 388 gallons of fuel in any hour during drilling, they will be out of compliance with the 19.0 pound per hour emission limit ($388 \times 0.049 = 19.0$).

The emission factor for these same emission units is determined through specific testing performed before each drilling season. If the same emission unit is tested the following year and the new emission factor is determined to be 0.059 pounds per gallon, then the same group of emission units will be effectively restricted to 322 gallons per hour. This type of operational limit exists for each pollutant, and the most stringent operational limit sets the overall operational limit for Shell. As long as Shell maintains their operations below the back-calculated operational rate, they will be in compliance with the emission limit.

This group of emission units will be controlled by selective catalytic reduction controls to reduce NO_x emissions. The permit requires control device monitoring including catalyst inlet temperature, urea feed rate and catalyst activity. If any of the parameters are outside the specifications set in the permit, the emission factor for NO_x from the group of emission units increases by a factor a 10 or from 0.049 to 0.49 pounds per gallon because the SCR unit is assumed to be 90% effective in reducing NO_x. The effective operational limit then becomes 39 gallons per hour to assure NAAQS are protected while the control device is not operating correctly.

Overall, Region 10 believes the permit contains terms and conditions sufficient to protect the NAAQS and that additional operational or production limits to protect the NAAQS in this permit are not necessary. The commenters have not shown why short term operating limits are a necessary addition to assure compliance with the NAAQS.

J.2 SUBCATEGORY – ADEQUACY OF PM_{2.5} LIMIT

Comment J.2.a: Commenters state that the compliance demonstration for PM_{2.5} leaves no room for uncertainty because modeled impacts are predicted to be at 97 percent of the 24-hour average PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Region 10 must be able to demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS considering a margin of error based on the accuracies of the input data. Specifically, the commenters state that compliance demonstration must account for uncertainty in stack test data used to determine the emission factors. Since the emissions inputs for the modeling analysis are based, in general, on multiplying the applicable emission factor by the associated operating factor (*e.g.*, fuel usage rate) then the accuracy

of this input is determined by the sum, in quadrature, of the fractional uncertainties associated with each factor. The commenters state that if, as has been indicated by Shell previously, the uncertainty in the stack test data is upwards of 15%, then Shell must be able to demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS considering a margin of error no less than 15 percent. The commenters calculate that this requires the predicted 24-hour PM_{2.5} concentration to be less than 29.8 µg/m³, when considering the background concentration, and the predicted 1-hour NO₂ concentration must be less than 160 µg/m³. The commenters note that the modeling prediction of the highest 24-hour PM_{2.5} was 34 µg/m³, well above 29.8 µg/m³ (114 % of the 29.8 µg/m³ level). The commenters request that Region 10 establish permit limits that demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS with a margin of error no less than the accuracy of the input data.

Response: While the commenter has indicated there will be an inherent uncertainty in the value of stack-derived emission factors, the commenter has not shown that the uncertainty will be biased low. Shell is required to operate in compliance with the permit and accepts the risk of the uncertainties involved. However, there are some additional considerations that offset the inherent uncertainty.

Given that most of the NAAQS-based emissions limits in the permit apply to groups of emission units, the relative uncertainty in any one test will be reduced. Similarly, the eventual ambient impacts are dependent on the emissions from all of the operating emission units, which again means the uncertainty of any one test or for any one emission unit will have less effect when translated to ambient impacts. Source testing is required to follow a source test protocol which will help to ensure procedural consistency from test-to-test and year-to-year.

The permit also has several conservative elements which work to protect ambient air. Testing of individual engines will be performed at multiple load levels and the emission factors from the worst-case load will be used in compliance determinations regardless of the load at which the engines actually operate. This conservatism is increased for groups of emission units because the highest emission factor of any unit in the group must be used for all units in the group. For emission units where hours of operation are tracked in place of fuel monitoring, the emission unit is assumed to be operating at its maximum operating rate. As discussed in response to comments V.1.c and V.2.a, there is additional conservatism built into the modeling analyses that will help to ensure protection of ambient air quality. All of these factors result in over-prediction of calculated emissions or over-prediction of modeled results which should result in actual emissions being lower than calculated and actual impacts lower than predicted.

K. CATEGORY – OPERATIONAL LIMITS TO MAKE PSD UNNECESSARY AND THE PROTECT THE NAAQS

Comment K.1: Commenters assert that key operating parameters relied on to calculate potential to emit and demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS must be included as permit conditions because the Region relies on these parameters to demonstrate compliance with the synthetic minor permit limits and the NAAQS. The commenters

identify the following as enforceable operating restrictions that should be included in the permit:

Table 5: Additional Required Permit Limits: Operating Parameters

Permitted Source	Permit Limit	Compliance Demonstration
Cementing and Logging Activity	1,248 hours/activity 52 days/activity	Add provisions to condition D.3 to limit hours of operation and require sufficient recordkeeping
Deck Cranes (all 3 units combined)	Shall not operate more than 30% of the time in any given day during MLC and Well Drilling Activities	Add provisions to condition D.3 to limit hours of operation and require sufficient recordkeeping
Deck Cranes (all 3 units combined)	Shall not operate more than 50% of the time in any given day during Cementing and Logging Activities	Add provisions to condition D to limit fuel usage and require sufficient monitoring and recordkeeping
Resupply Ship – in transport	Limit to 1,200 gallons of fuel 1-way	Add provisions to condition D to limit fuel usage and require sufficient monitoring and recordkeeping
Resupply Ship – in DP mode	Limited to 4,800 gallons per event	Add provisions to condition D to limit fuel usage and require sufficient monitoring and recordkeeping
OSR Vessel	Limited to 2,800 gal/day	Add provisions to condition D to limit fuel usage and require sufficient monitoring and recordkeeping
OSR Work Boats	Limited to 3,789 gal/day	Add provisions to condition D to limit fuel usage and require sufficient monitoring and recordkeeping

Response K.1: The commenters are requesting that Region 10 create operating restrictions in the permit that reflect the assumptions that were used in Shell’s emission inventory because the Region relies on the operating parameters to demonstrate compliance with the synthetic minor permit limits and the NAAQS. Contrary to commenters’ views, Region 10 is not relying on the assumed values of the operating parameters, but on the actual values of the operating parameters. The permit creates emission limits and stipulates the emission factors that must be used to demonstrate compliance. The permit also requires that specific operating parameters be monitored, recorded, and used with the specified emissions factors to confirm compliance with the emission limits.

Shell’s application described anticipated exploratory operations such that they could accurately predict emissions that were in turn used in modeling and eventually were turned into emission limits in the permit. Shell’s modeling addressed worst-case operational scenarios involving various combinations of operations to ensure that actual operations comply with the NAAQS. Where assumptions were necessary to assure

compliance under all scenarios, Region 10 created operational limits in the permit. The commenters do not explain why these additional assumptions used to predict emissions should become restrictions in the permit.

Comment K.2: Commenters state that Shell assumed certain control device efficiencies in the emissions inventory, and request that Region 10 include these efficiencies as enforceable permit limits to demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS and synthetic minor permit limits. Specifically, the commenters identify Draft Permit Condition D.11 which requires that Shell operate SCR and/or OxyCat control devices at all times for the Kulluk generators, MLC engines (including HPU and air compressor engines), Kulluk deck crane engines, and the generator and propulsion engines on the icebreakers. The commenters request that the permit conditions be expanded to include the following control efficiencies that are assumed in the inventory for the modeling and PTE calculations:

Table 6: Additional Required Permit Limits: Control Efficiencies

Control Device	Restriction	Compliance Demonstration
SCR for NO _x control	1.6 g/kW-hr	Continuous monitoring
Oxy-Cat for PM control	50%	Periodic monitoring
Oxy-Cat for CO control	80%	Periodic monitoring
Oxy-Cat for VOC/HAP (except metals) / HCHO control	70%	Periodic monitoring

Response K.2: Similar to the response to comment K.1, the control efficiencies noted by the commenter in the above table were employed to calculate emission rates that were used in modeling. Region 10 then turned the emission rates into emission limits and required testing, monitoring, and recordkeeping to assure compliance with the permit terms and conditions. Engines with control devices will be tested to establish emission factors that reflect the control efficiencies of the control devices. Specific control device monitoring is required in the permit to ensure that the control devices are operated as they were during testing which in turn assures that the emission factors developed from the tests remain representative. Unlike a PSD permit, which requires emission limits that reflect best available control technology, this permit is not required to contain control technology-based restrictions. The commenters have not explained why it is necessary to include the control device efficiencies as permit limits. The permit, as written, assures compliance with the PTE limits.

Comment K.3: Commenters state that capacity limits for source operations identified by Shell as system limitations must be included as enforceable permit conditions to ensure operations do not exceed the capacity limits. The commenters note that stack testing for many sources require testing at 100 percent capacity (with a 10 percent buffer) which indicates that these units can operate at, or very near, 100 percent capacity. The commenters are unclear what system limitations will keep the company from operating above the assumed levels, and assert that Region 10 must include provisions limiting operation to modeled capacities. The commenters believe this is critical because future modeling analyses are required to be conducted using the same assumptions as used in

the initial modeling analysis. The commenters request that the following capacity limits be included in the permit.

Table 7: Additional Required Permit Limits: Capacity Limits

Permitted Source	Capacity Limit	Compliance Demonstration
Kulluk Generators	85%	Continuous load monitoring
Deck Cranes (all 3 units combined)	40%	Continuous load monitoring
Cementing/Logging Units	60%	Continuous load monitoring

Response K.3: There are no cementing and logging engines on the Kulluk. The capacity limits noted in the above table, with the exception of the capacity limit for cementing and logging units, were employed to calculate emission rates. The commenters have not shown why it is necessary to require Shell to limit capacity as noted in the table above. The permit requires emission testing at multiple loads to identify the worst-case operating load and the emission factor that represents that worst-case operating load. That emission factor is then used to calculate emissions for all operating loads during actual operation. This approach results in a conservative recording of emissions and obviates the need for tracking actual engine load or percentage of capacity. If Region 10 had determined that the use of load-specific emission factors to calculate and record emissions was necessary, the permit would have required load tracking. Furthermore, if Region 10 determined that it was necessary to avoid a particular operating capacity, the permit would have included limits on capacity and load tracking to confirm compliance. The permit assures compliance with emission limits without the need to limit or track load or engine capacity.

L. CATEGORY – SOURCE TESTING

Comment L.1: The commenters note that the Draft Permit does not require source testing for some emission units. Specifically, source testing is not required for the boilers and heaters, the emergency generators or the seldom-used engines on the Kulluk and its Associated Fleet, or the OSRV workboats. The commenters assert that because the Draft Permit does not specify equipment make, model, and capacity, it is critical that Region 10 require source testing for all emission sources.

Response: The source testing required under the permit covers the sources responsible for the majority of emissions. See response to comments I.3.a. The Region disagrees with the commenters that source testing is necessary or required for all permitted emission units, which include seldom used sources such as life boats and emergency equipment. In addition, in most cases, knowing the make or model of an emission unit would not influence EPA’s decision to require testing because the emission factors normally represent ranges of units for any particular category of source types. Shell provided adequate information for Region 10 to apply appropriate emission factors to emission units and create enforceable emission limits. However, as discussed in response to comment I.3.a, Region 10 has imposed additional source testing requirements for incinerators and required the application of more conservative emission factors for

sources not subject to source testing. For more discussion on source testing see responses to comments in I.3.a and M.2.a-c.

M. CATEGORY – MONITORING AND RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS

M.1 SUBCATEGORY – GENERAL

Comment M.1.a: Commenters express concern about monitoring provisions with respect to pollutants for which Shell is a synthetic minor source and request that Region 10 require monitoring of actual emissions and not just fuel usage.

Response M.1.a: The commenters have provided no information to indicate that the required monitoring of operations (e.g. fuel usage) will not be adequate. Region 10 believes that the fuel monitoring requirements and use of permit-derived and specified emission factors provide a reliable basis for determining emissions and thus compliance with emission limits. For those emission units employing air pollution control equipment, Permit Conditions F.3 and F.4 require continuous parametric monitoring – temperature, urea feed, and catalyst activity for SCR and temperature and catalyst activity for the oxidation catalyst. See responses to comments J.1.a and M.3.b. Region 10 believes the monitoring prescribed is an effective means for ensuring that the controls are working properly and achieving the required emissions reductions.

Comment M.1.b: Commenters state that, in the event actual emissions are not monitored, Region 10 should require monitoring of fuel consumption using a fuel flow analyzer device.

Response M.1.b: The Draft Permit required that a fuel flow meter be employed to continuously measure fuel combusted by each combustion source or common group of combustion sources except for the Kulluk emergency generator, heaters and boilers (all vessels), seldom used sources (all vessels), and OSRV work boats. In response to comments, Region 10 has revised the fuel monitoring requirements so that Shell is now required to use a fuel flow meter to measure fuel combusted by heaters and boilers. The remaining excepted sources are expected to generate less than 10% of NO_x emissions. For the combustion sources not equipped with fuel flow meters, the permit requires Shell to quantify fuel combusted by other means as specified in Permit Condition F.2.2.2. Specifically, Shell must measure the fuel combusted using the fuel tank sight glass, by manually measuring the amount of fuel in the tank using a graduated dip stick, or by measuring the fuel combusted using a fuel tank gauge. Shell is also required to make note of the start and end times of the activity during which the fuel is consumed (Permit Condition F.2.2.3) so that a fuel consumption rate (gal/hr) can be calculated (Permit Condition F.2.2.4). The alternative methods for measuring fuel use by the small and seldom used emission units in this case are reliable and the commenters have provided no information to indicate that the required techniques for monitoring fuel usage will not be sufficiently accurate to ensure compliance with permit requirements

Comment M.1.c: Commenters note that the Draft Permit establishes hourly emission limits for NO_x and daily emission limits for PM in order to ensure compliance with the NAAQS. The commenters assert that the corresponding monitoring and reporting requirements are not adequate to demonstrate compliance with these hourly and daily limits. Specifically, the commenters take issue with the requirement that Shell report hourly and daily calculations once each week. The commenters contend that this is not sufficient to demonstrate compliance with hourly and daily limits on a weekly basis, and request that, at a minimum, compliance with PM emission limits be demonstrated on a daily basis.

Response M.1.c: Although Shell is required to calculate and record the quantity of emissions generated for a given week by the Friday following the conclusion of the week, the calculations Shell performs each week are to determine the NO_x emissions for each hour and the PM emissions for each day for the previous week. In other words, although Shell is required to perform the calculations on a weekly basis, the data generated will be in the same terms as the emission limits—hourly or daily, as applicable. Moreover, the relevant data used in the calculations is generated more frequently than weekly. For example, Shell is generally required to continuously measure and record, on an hourly basis, the fuel consumed by each emission unit or group of emission units. Data for the SCR and oxidation catalyst systems are collected once every 15 minutes to assess whether the control device is operating as intended. This means that Shell is collecting data each hour to determine emissions for that hour. Sometime each week, Shell is required to check the CO and NO_x concentration in the exhaust stack downstream of the control equipment to assure that emission reductions are being achieved that are representative of the emission factor being employed. The permit requires Shell to perform the calculations to quantify hourly NO_x emissions and daily PM_{10/2.5} emissions between Sunday morning (beginning of the following week) and Friday night. Shell is required to process data from numerous emission units across multiple vessels for 168 individual hours (24 hrs. x 7 days). Region 10 imposed the weekly requirement to allow Shell adequate time to perform all calculations, record the results, and organize the results in a central location. As soon as emission rates are recorded each Friday, Shell is required to report any exceedances as a deviation consistent with Permit Conditions A.17 and A.18. The commenters have not provided any information to show how conducting and recording calculations on a weekly basis, where the resulting calculations are in terms of the relevant emission limits, does not assure compliance with the emission limits.

Comment M.1.d: Commenters state that because the NO_x emission rates presumably vary hour by hour, using emission factors based on a one-time stack test conducted at the beginning of (in some cases only the first) the drilling season does not ensure continuous compliance with an hourly limit. The commenters assert there is no guarantee that these hourly limits can be complied with for each hour of operation and that the hourly emissions will stay at the emission rates modeled without more precise monitoring requirements.

Response M.1.d: Of the emission units required to be tested, only the deck cranes engines are to be tested only prior to the first season. All other engines that are to be tested will be tested prior to each of first two drilling seasons.

For those emission units that together constitute 91 percent of the NO_x emissions, the Region is requiring Shell to employ a stack test-derived emission factor to determine NO_x emissions. The emission factor is based upon worst-case emissions observed across three load conditions. For those engines for which Shell is not required to develop and employ a stack test-derived emission factor, Region 10 is revising the final the permit (Tables D.2.1 and D.2.2) in response to comments to require Shell to employ a more conservative emission factor. This emission factor is the 90th percentile value of stack test results for similar engines on the Discoverer and its Associated Fleet.

In response to comments, Region 10 has also reconsidered the 3 lb/ton NO_x emission factor for incinerators. The origin of this emission factor is AP-42. After further consideration, the Region is requiring Shell to stack test the incinerators to be installed at maximum capacity to determine PM, CO, and NO_x emission factors. This approach will better assure that the emission factor used to calculate emissions captures short-term fluctuations in emissions that could influence 1-hour ambient impacts.

M.2 SUBCATEGORY – EMISSION FACTORS

Comment M.2.a: Commenters notes that for emission units that are not subject to source testing, the Draft Permit relies on emission factors set forth in Tables D.2.1 and D.2.2. Because this Draft Permit does not specify equipment make, model, and capacity, the commenters believe that it is critical to require source testing for all permitted emission sources at the beginning of the drill season. In the absence of source testing for all emission sources, the commenters state that Region 10 must ensure that the emission factors are the overall worst-case emission factors in order to ensure adequate protection of the NAAQS, and to ensure a reasonable margin of safety in demonstrating compliance with the NAAQS and synthetic minor permit limits. Commenters add that if CEMS are not feasible, Region 10 must require more frequent stack testing (*e.g.*, at the beginning of *each* season from every source).

Response: The commenters are correct that the permit does not authorize construction and operation of specific emission units down to the make, model and capacity. However, Shell has provided Region 10 with information that identifies the general purpose of each unit or group of emission units and the expected capacities of each emission unit or group of units. As described in response to comments I.3.a and M.2.c, Region 10 is using reasonably conservative emission factors for calculating emissions from those units that are not required to be tested. Regarding the frequency of testing, if stack test results show 20% or more variability in the emission factor results from the most recent two tests, Shell is required to conduct stack tests every 2 years. If variability is less than 20 percent, testing shall be conducted every 5 years. In the absence of information suggesting otherwise, Region 10 believes that the testing schedule

established in the Kulluk Permit will result in updated emission factors that, when used as required to calculate emissions, will provide a reasonable assurance of compliance.

Comment M.2.b: Commenters question whether the emission factors for the boilers and heaters in Tables D.2.1 and D.2.2 of the Draft Permit will ensure adequate protection of the NAAQS. The commenters cite to the BACT limit for boilers in the Discoverer permit as higher than the NO_x and PM emission factors used in the Draft Permit. Specifically, the NO_x and PM BACT limits in the Discoverer permit are equivalent to 26.6 lb/10³ gal of NO_x and 3.1 lb/10³ gal of PM, and are based on stack test data from the actual units. In comparison, the emission factors in the proposed permit for the Kulluk are 20 lb/10³ gal of NO_x and 3 lb/10³ gal of PM, and are based on AP-42. The commenters state that it is not reasonable to assume a lower emission rate for boilers on the Kulluk and Associated Fleet when the Discoverer permit represents what the Region determined to be the best available controls for these units. The commenters assert that Region 10 must require source-specific emission factors for these units, or revise the emission factors upward to reflect the worst-case boilers that could potentially be used onboard the Kulluk and Associated Fleet.

Response: Regarding the PM emission factors, the commenters incorrectly reference the Draft Permit's PM emission factor for boilers and heaters as 3 lb/10³ gal; the emission factor in Tables D.2.1 and D.2.2 is 3.3 lb/10³ gallons which is slightly higher than the boiler and heater emission factor in the Discoverer permit. The 3.3 lb/10³ gal PM emission factor in the Kulluk Permit is also much greater than the 0.5 lb/10³ gal emission factor Shell observed while testing the boilers on the Discoverer.¹¹ The emission factor is used to quantify emissions from each specific unit. Therefore, the use of a higher emission factor will result in reporting a greater amount of emissions than may in fact be emitted. The commenters have not shown how overestimating emissions jeopardizes protection of the NAAQS.

Regarding the boiler and heater NO_x emission factor, the commenter is correct that the emission factor used in the Kulluk permit is lower than the emission factor in the Discoverer permit. Stack testing of boilers made available by Shell subsequent to the setting of the Discoverer BACT limit shows an average emission factor of 13.1 lb/10³ gal which is less than the 20 lb/10³ gal AP-42 emission factor used in the Kulluk Permit which reflects some conservatism.¹² The Kulluk emission factor is lower than the Discoverer BACT limit for similar equipment, but is higher than available test data for a similar source. This data suggests that Shell will actually be emitting less PM than reported by employing a higher emission factor. Therefore, the commenters have not shown how the Kulluk emission factor jeopardizes protection of the NAAQS.

Comment M.2.c: Commenters question whether the emission factors for the emergency generators, seldom-used engines, and oil spill response vessel (OSRV) workboats are

¹¹ $0.5 \times 10^3 \text{ lb/gal} = (3.55 \times 10^{-3} \text{ lb/MMBtu}) \times (\text{MMBtu}/1 \times 10^6 \text{ Btu}) \times (131180 \text{ Btu/gal}) \times (1000)$. See June 16, 2011 email from Rodger Steen to Dan Meyer.

¹² $13.9 \times 10^3 \text{ lb/gal} = (1.06 \times 10^{-1} \text{ lb/MMBtu}) \times (\text{MMBtu}/1 \times 10^6 \text{ Btu}) \times (131180 \text{ Btu/gal}) \times (1000)$. See June 16, 2011 email from Rodger Steen to Dan Meyer.

sufficiently conservative. Because the NO_x and PM emission factors for these units are based on stack testing for Discoverer sources, the commenters doubt that the data truly reflect the worst-case emissions sources for these source types. The commenters believe that this is particularly important considering that these units are not subject to source testing requirements. The commenters note that the sources contribute between 5-10 percent of NO_x and PM emissions, with the OSRV workboats representing a significant share of these emissions. The commenters state that considering that the maximum modeled concentration for PM_{2.5} is near the NAAQS (within 3% of the 24-hour average NAAQS) there is little room for uncertainty.

Response: In response to comments received, Region 10 reevaluated the NO_x and PM stack test results for the Discoverer and Associated Fleet, which Region 10 relied on to establish emission factors for similar units on the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet. To add a measure of conservatism to Shell's emission calculations for those engines which are not required to be tested, Region 10 has revised the emission factors for engines greater than 600 hp to reflect a value at least equal to the 90th percentile value for the tests conducted by Shell on the Discoverer and Associated Fleet. Kulluk Permit Tables D.2.1 and D.2.2. This change results in a 7.8 and 113 percent increase to the NO_x and PM emission factors, respectively, for engines greater than 600 hp. For engines less than 600 hp, Region 10 determined that the NO_x and PM emission factors in the permit already exceed 90th percentile values, which provides an adequate margin of safety.

M.3 SUBCATEGORY – CONTINUOUS EMISSION MONITORING

Comment M.3.a: Commenters contend that the only way to adequately ensure compliance with hourly limits is through the use of continuous emissions monitoring systems (CEMS), and assert that the Region must require the use of CEMS, or equivalent, for NO₂ compliance.

Response: As discussed in response to comment J.1.a, CEMS are an effective means of ensuring compliance with short-term emission limits, but CEMS are not the only means. Shell's planned exploratory operations are unusual as compared to other sources because the emission units consist of more than 50 engines and generators on the Kulluk and a fleet of numerous support vessels. There are practical considerations to requiring CEMS including that the emission units, control equipment, and monitoring equipment will be operating in a remote, harsh, Arctic environment, deck space on board the vessels is limited, and CEMS are expensive to purchase, maintain, and operate.

Region 10 is confident that the monitoring and recordkeeping prescribed in the permit assures compliance with emission limits.

Comment M.3.b: Commenters express support for the use of SCR controls, but are concerned about how the controls will function in Arctic conditions. The commenters note that Region 10 believes the SCR and OxyCat systems will be effective if inlet temperatures are high enough, the urea feed is operating, and the catalysts are active. Commenters explain that the proper functioning of these controls is essential to

compliance with the NO₂ and PM NAAQS, and request that CEMS be used for these systems instead of weekly measurements with a portable monitoring device.

Response: Region 10's determination that the monitoring required in the permit will verify that the control devices are operating properly takes into account that the Kulluk will be operating in arctic conditions. Region 10 believes that the continuous monitoring system required by the permit will ensure the control equipment is operating properly. Temperature and urea feed will be monitored. Temperature measurements will be compared against temperatures measured during emission factor verification source testing. The weekly concentration checks using a portable monitor are not considered alternatives to CEMS, but instead serve as a verification that the control equipment is operating properly. As discussed in the Statement of Basis (at 45), weekly concentration checks should be an effective frequency for confirming whether the catalysts are still active. Temperature or concentration deviations from those measured during testing must be corrected and reported. The overall monitoring strategy is a reasonable and appropriate alternative to CEMS in this specific application. See response to comments in subcategories M.1 and M.2 and response to comment O.1.

Comment M.3.c: A commenter at the public hearing requested that Region 10 require the use of CEMS. The commenter expressed concern about self-monitoring of pollution in the OCS, and cited to limits on fuel use and the amount of waste combusted. Another commenter stated that because of uncertainties in the model, Region 10 should require installation and operation of CEMS for at least nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter and carbon dioxide.

Response: Region 10 would first like to clarify that the permit does not allow Shell to consider the amount of waste combusted in calculating emissions generated by waste incineration. The permit requires Shell to calculate emissions assuming the incinerators are operating at maximum capacity for all time periods that operation is allowed. Permit Condition D.4. Contrary to the commenter's assertion, monitoring emissions using CEMS will have no bearing on the accuracy of the new model or algorithms used by Shell. See comment J.1.a regarding the need for CEMS given model uncertainty. See comment O.1 regarding Shell self-monitoring. See comment I.1.c with respect to how fuel monitoring is an integral part of a monitoring and recordkeeping system that provides for a reasonable assurance of compliance with emission limitations.

N. CATEGORY – REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Comment N.1: Commenters request that Region 10 add a condition to the permit requiring Shell to submit all of its monitoring results to Region 10, citing to Section 504(a) of the Clean Air Act. The commenters further request that, in light of the 120 day operating window for this permit, these submissions be made every 60 days (or twice) while the operations are occurring so that Region 10 has time to take enforcement action if a problem arises during the course of the operations.

Response: The permit requires the permittee to submit to Region 10 a semi-annual operating report by August 31 and February 28 of each year. Permit Condition A.19.1. That report must include reports of any required monitoring, including all emission calculations required by the permit. Permit Condition A.19.1.3. This is consistent with the statutory and regulatory requirements for Title V permits. See CAA § 504(e); 40 CFR § 71.6(a)(3)(iii)(A). With respect to the request that Region 10 require reporting twice during the period of operations so that Region 10 has timely information if problems arise during the course of operations, Region 10 notes that the permit also requires the reporting of all excess emissions and deviations from permit requirements no later than 30 days after the end of the month in which the deviation occurs, and in many cases sooner than that. See Permit Conditions A.17 and A.18. Region 10 believes these conditions ensure that Region 10 will have timely information in the event problems arise during the drilling season and that the requirement to submit monitoring reports more frequently than currently provided for in the permit is therefore unnecessary.

O. CATEGORY – COMPLIANCE MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

Comment O.1: Commenters request that Region 10 exercise its authority to inspect Shell's exploration fleet to ensure compliance with permit requirements both well in advance of and during the operating season. The commenters state that when North Slope Borough staff toured the Kulluk in March 2011, the rig was not in a drill ready condition and that upgrades and improvements that had been announced were not complete. An inspection prior to the first drilling season, the commenters continue, would provide adequate time to undertake appropriate repairs or upgrades if the inspectors identify problems with any source or equipment and would be easy to conduct because the Kulluk is currently in Seattle. The commenters contend that a robust inspection program is necessary to ensure that the air emission controls are actually implemented and effective and that there is independent verification of compliance with permit provisions.

Response: Region 10 has authority to conduct inspections of the Kulluk. See CAA § 114; 40 CFR § 55.8(a). Because Shell is not required to meet the emission limits and control requirements in the permit until the Kulluk becomes an OCS source in the Beaufort Sea, however, Region 10 does not necessarily agree with the commenters that inspecting the Kulluk before the first drilling season is the most effective use of agency resources. Such an inspection would only indicate how far along Shell is in installing identified emission units and required control equipment and would not necessarily indicate whether that equipment will meet permit requirements while the Kulluk is an OCS source.

In addition, inspections are not the only way to determine whether Shell is operating in compliance with permit requirements. The permit contains testing, monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements to provide information regarding whether Shell is operating in compliance with permit conditions. For example, the permit requires stack testing of most emission units prior to initial operation. Permit Condition E. Shell is required to report all permit deviations to Region 10 and to submit a semi-

annual operating report that includes reports of all required monitoring. Permit Conditions A.17, A.18, and A.19.

In addition, the Kulluk Permit includes mechanisms that enhance the reliability of Shell's self-monitoring. The permit requires Shell to install, maintain, and operate devices to measure and record fuel usage, operating loads, and other emissions-related data. Permit Condition F. Under Section 113(c)(2)(C) of the CAA, it is a criminal offense to falsify, tamper with, render inaccurate, or fail to install any monitoring device or method required under the Clean Air Act. All reports and records required to be submitted to Region 10 under the permits must be certified by a responsible official for Shell as to their truth, accuracy, and completeness. Permit Condition A.12. Again, Shell could be subject to criminal liability for falsifying these records or reports.

Although self-monitoring by Shell is a component of ensuring Shell is operating in compliance with the permit, as indeed it is for other sources subject to Clean Air Act requirements, Region 10 will have an active oversight role. In the event Shell violates its permit, Region 10 has broad authority under Section 113 of the CAA to issue compliance orders, assess administrative penalties, and request the Attorney General to bring a civil or criminal action, as appropriate. Region 10 intends to conduct comprehensive compliance evaluations, including on-site inspections, as appropriate and consistent with EPA policies. See Clean Air Act Stationary Source Compliance Monitoring Strategy, April 2001, <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/policies/monitoring/cmstrategy.pdf>

In addition, Region 10 has authority to observe the conduct of source tests of any emission unit and will review all source test reports to verify that the proper procedures and equipment were used to measure emissions from the emission units and to evaluate compliance with the permit terms and conditions. Region 10 will also be reviewing periodic reports and episodic (e.g. deviation) reports submitted under the permit. Key compliance information will be available via EPA's Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO) website. <http://www.epa-echo.gov/echo/> The public also has a right to request this information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552. In some instances, Region 10 may withhold all or a portion of inspection reports and other information in accordance with FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b).

Comment O.2: Commenters state that if Region 10 does not have the requisite resources to dedicate to the arctic OCS, Region 10 should coordinate with BOEMRE or other federal agencies to ensure compliance with air permit conditions.

Response: Region 10 will coordinate with other federal agencies as necessary and appropriate to ensure appropriate oversight of Shell's operations under the permit.

Comment O.2.a: Commenters request that Region 10 promptly share the records, reports, and information gained from physical inspections of the Kulluk and Associated Fleet with the public as authorized by regulation.

Response: As discussed above in response to comment O.1, key compliance information will be available via EPA's ECHO website. <http://www.epa-echo.gov/echo/> The public also has a right to request this information under FOIA.

Comment O.4: One commenter asked who was going to be monitoring Shell's operations and whether it is going to be self-monitoring. The commenter also asked whether there are going to be marine mammal or other observers.

Response: As discussed in response to comment O.1 above, monitoring of Shell's operations under the permit will be conducted through a combination of self-monitoring by Shell, inspections by Region 10, and the review of reports, source test data, and other information by Region 10. Marine mammal observers or other observers may be required by other regulatory programs or agreements but are not a component of compliance assurance under this Clean Air Act permit.

P. CATEGORY – AMBIENT AIR BOUNDARY

Comment P.1: Commenters contend that Region 10's decision to set the ambient air boundary at 540 meters from the center of the Kulluk is arbitrary and unlawful and conceals the true maximum impacts of Shell's emissions. The commenters state that, to comply with EPA's longstanding policy on ambient air, Region 10 must set the ambient air boundary at the hull of the Kulluk, noting that EPA has defined "ambient air" as "that portion of the atmosphere, external to buildings, to which the general public has access." The commenters state that, under EPA policy, an exemption from ambient air is available only for the atmosphere over land owned or controlled by the source and to which public access is precluded by a fence or other physical barriers, and that Shell does not own or control the area within the 540 meter radius (500 feet from the hull of the Kulluk) and it cannot effectively prevent public access. The commenters continue that Shell's proposal to implement a public access control program to "locate, identify and intercept the general public" does not constitute the fence or other physical barrier excluding the public that EPA's policy requires.

Response: Ambient air is defined as "...that portion of the atmosphere, external to buildings, to which the general public has access." 40 CFR § 50.1(e). Region 10 agrees with the commenters that EPA's longstanding interpretation is that "exemption from ambient air is available only for the atmosphere over land owned or controlled by the source and to which the public access is precluded by a fence or physical barrier." See Letter from Administrator Douglas M. Costle, EPA, to Senator Jennings Randolph, Chairman, Environment and Public Works Committee, re: Ambient Air, dated December 19, 1980. EPA has observed that "control" under this criterion means that "the source has certain rights to use of the land/property, including the power to control public access to it." Memorandum from Steven D. Page, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS), re: Interpretation of "Ambient Air" in Situations Involving Leased Land under the Regulations for Prevention of Significant Deterioration, Attachment at 3, dated June 22, 2007 (Leased Land Guidance). Region 10 believes that excluding the area within a

safety zone established by the United States Coast Guard from ambient air is consistent with this interpretation.

As discussed in the Statement of Basis (at p. 40), Shell modeled emissions from the Kulluk beginning 500 meters from the hull of the Kulluk and assumes that the Coast Guard will impose a safety zone of this distance around the Kulluk to exclude the public from the area in which Shell will be conducting its main operations. Shell therefore agreed that Region 10 would require as a condition of operation under the permit that Shell have in place at all times of operation as an OCS source a safety zone of at least 500 meters from the hull of the Kulluk within which the Coast Guard prohibits public access. See Permit Condition D.5 and D.6.

The conditions of the permit provide sufficient assurance that the general public will not have access to the area inside the safety zone, consistent with the two primary criteria EPA has used to determine when such an exclusion may apply. Given that the permitted activities occur over open water in the Arctic, these criteria must be adapted to some extent when applied to this environment, but they are still satisfied in this instance in a manner sufficient to effectively preclude public access from the safety zone.

Region 10 recognizes that Shell does not “own” the areas of the Beaufort Sea on which the Kulluk will be operating as might be the case for a stationary source on land. Shell has a lease authorizing the company to use these areas for the activities covered by the permit. A Coast Guard safety zone establishes legal authority for excluding the general public from the area inside the zone. EPA has previously recognized a safety zone established by the Coast Guard as evidence of sufficient ownership or control by a source over areas over water so as to qualify as a boundary for defining ambient air where that safety zone is monitored to pose a barrier to public access. Letter from Steven C. Riva, EPA Region 2, to Leon Sedefian, New York State Department of Conservation, re: Ambient Air for the Offshore LNG Broadwater Project, dated October 9, 2007 (Broadwater Letter).

To meet the second of the criteria applied by EPA and ensure the source actually takes steps to preclude public access, Shell proposed and Region 10 required as a condition of operation under the permit that Shell develop in writing and implement a public access control program to locate, identify, and intercept the general public by radio, physical contact, or other reasonable measures to inform the public that they are prohibited by Coast Guard regulations from entering the area within 500 meters of the hull of the Kulluk. Region 10 believes that, for the overwater locations in the arctic environment at issue in this permitting action, such a program of monitoring and notification is sufficiently similar to a fence or physical barrier on land such that the area within the Coast Guard safety zone qualifies for exclusion from ambient air. See Broadwater Letter at 2.

Shell therefore appropriately excluded the area within 500 meters of the hull of Kulluk from the source impact analysis it conducted to meet the requirements of the applicable CAA regulations.

Comment P.2: Some commenters contend that Region 10's approach to setting the ambient air boundary for the Kulluk is inconsistent with the approach Region 10 took in setting the ambient air boundary for Shell's Discoverer drillship in previous determinations. The commenters state that, when Shell initially applied for air permits for the Discoverer drillship, the company's application materials included an ambient air boundary of 900 meters and that Shell assumed that the ambient air would begin at this distance because it had "submitted a request to the US Coast Guard, for issuance of a safety exclusion and equipment protection zone surrounding the Discoverer" Nevertheless, the commenters state, in issuing permits to Shell for the Discoverer drillship in 2010, Region 10 required Shell to model impacts from the hull of the Discoverer, outward, yet Region 10 is now indicating that it will allow Shell to model impacts for the Kulluk starting 540 meters from the center of the Kulluk. The commenters allege that if Region 10 were to recognize that the edge of the hull is the appropriate boundary, Shell has not demonstrated that its operations will not cause a violation of air quality standards in the "ambient air" and that Shell has in fact stated that maximum modeled impacts occur on or near the 540 meter boundary, indicating likely greater impacts inside of that boundary.

Response: The commenters are correct that Shell's February 2009 application for an OCS/PSD permit for operations for the Discoverer in the Chukchi Sea did request an ambient air boundary based on a Coast Guard safety zone. Shell later withdrew that request and the 2010 Permits for the Discoverer drillship issued by Region 10 therefore did not base the ambient air boundary on a Coast Guard safety zone, but instead assumed that ambient air began at the hull of the Discoverer. In response to the remand from the Environmental Appeals Board, Shell subsequently submitted modeling for the Discoverer demonstrating compliance with the NAAQS based on a Coast Guard safety zone and the final permits issued by Region 10 for the Discoverer in response to the remand require Shell to obtain a Coast Guard safety zone as a condition of operation under the permits. See Supplemental Response to Comments for the Discoverer Drillship permits, dated September 19, 2011, at 41.

Similarly, in its application for a permit for the Kulluk, as discussed in the Statement of Basis (at p. 40), the application materials submitted by Shell modeled emissions from the Kulluk beginning 500 meters from the hull of the Kulluk and assumes that the Coast Guard will impose a safety zone of this distance around the Discoverer to exclude the public from the area in which Shell will be conducting its main operations. The permit therefore authorizes operation only if the Kulluk is subject to a currently effective safety zone established by the Coast Guard. Because the area within the safety zone is not considered ambient air, demonstrating compliance with the NAAQS within that zone is not required. Thus, Region 10 acted consistently with Shell's application materials for the Discoverer permits, Shell's application materials for this permit, legal requirements, and EPA guidance in determining the ambient air boundary based on a Coast Guard safety zone. See also response to comment P.1.

Comment P.3: Several commenters express concern that Shell had not provided and Region 10 has not required an analysis showing what air quality would be within the safety zone and state that the size of the zone is arbitrary. Commenters assert that

workers within that zone will not be protected and that the federal agencies are not working together to ensure healthy air. Commenters state that residents of the North Slope serve as marine mammal observers and members of the communications team on the drillship and will be subjected to below standard air quality. These commenters contend that emission levels throughout the OCS, including within the safety zone, should meet lawful levels and express concern that winds would take air pollution farther than 500 meters from the ship. Commenters state their concern for what this decision means for air quality on the OCS where local communities hunt and fish.

Response: Region 10's understanding is that Marine Mammal Observers will be employees of Shell or Shell contractors. 2012 Revised Camden Bay Exploration Plan at 11-4 (Marine Mammal Observers provide an opportunity for local hire). Under established EPA policy, contractors, subcontractors, and employees that are expressly granted access to a site by the entity with control over the site are not considered the general public vis-à-vis that entity, but instead are considered "business invitees." See Memorandum from Stephen D. Page, Director OAQPS, re: Interpretation of "Ambient Air" in Situations Involving Leased Land Under the Regulations for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), dated June 27, 2007, Attachment at p. 5. Their presence within the Coast Guard safety zone thus does not deprive that area from qualifying for exclusion from ambient air. See also response to comments P.1 and P.4.

Comment P.4: Commenters contend that allowing OCS sources to establish ambient air boundaries in the Arctic based on safety zones raises concerns regarding the cumulative impacts to offshore air quality that several such operations with ambient air quality boundaries would have on air quality. The commenters cite to a Government Accounting Office Report, GAO, EPA's Ambient Air Policy Results in Additional Pollution, July 1989 (available at: <http://archive.gao.gov/d26t7/139340.pdf>) and assert that that EPA has been subject to scrutiny for creating ambient air boundaries in the first instance because they allow for greater air quality deterioration. The commenters ask Region 10 to explain why this boundary works in the Arctic and how Region 10 arrived at the decision to allow more pollution instead of less, particularly in light of the heavy use of offshore areas by subsistence communities. Commenters expressed concern about what Region 10's decision means for air quality on the OCS where people hunt and fish.

Response: Safety zones are established by the Coast Guard based on safety considerations, not air quality considerations. See, e.g., 75 Fed. Reg. 803 (January 6, 2010) ("The purpose of the temporary safety zone is to protect the DRILLSHIP from vessels operating outside normal shipping channels and fairways. Placing a temporary safety zone around the DRILLSHIP will significantly reduce the threat of allisions, oil spills, and releases of natural gas, and thereby protect the safety of life, property, and the environment")(capitalization in original). However, because such a safety zone combined with Shell's public access control program has the effect of restricting the general public's access to the relevant area, as discussed in response to comment P.1, Region 10 believes the presence of a safety zone supports excluding the area inside the zone from ambient air for air quality purposes consistent with prior EPA interpretations of its regulations.

The GAO report cited by the commenters focused primarily on concerns with land acquisition to increase the size of the ambient air boundary and thus as a pollution control technique, which is not implicated in the application for and the establishment of a Coast Guard safety zone based on safety considerations. As discussed above in response to comment P.1, EPA has previously determined that a Coast Guard safety zone is an appropriate basis for establishing an ambient air boundary within which demonstration of compliance with the NAAQS is not required. As discussed in Sections 4 and 5.4 of the Statement of Basis and the Technical Support Document, emissions under this permit are not expected to cause or contribute to violations of the NAAQS in any area that constitutes ambient air, including in areas where local communities regularly conduct subsistence activities. With respect to cumulative impacts, please see the responses to comments in Category Y.

Comment P.5: Commenters request that, if the ambient air boundary remains in place, Region 10 examine options for requiring monitoring at 500 meters from the Kulluk for the first two weeks of the drilling season. The commenters state they are not aware of any reasons why it would not be technologically feasible to operate monitoring equipment from a moored vessel.

Response: Region 10 believes that the background monitoring data that have been collected in conjunction with the air quality modeling conducted to support this permit action adequately demonstrates that emissions under the permit will not cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS. The emission limits and associated monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements in the permit are adequate to verify that the NAAQS will not be exceeded and Region 10 therefore does not believe the additional monitoring requested by the commenters is warranted. Given the challenges of conducting ambient air monitoring in harsh, remote arctic conditions, Region 10 does not believe it is appropriate to require monitoring to be conducted on a vessel at the ambient air boundary. Region 10 believes collection of background air quality data within a closer proximity to a community provides more beneficial information on potential health-based exposure than a monitor located well offshore.

Q. CATEGORY – GENERAL COMMENTS ON AMBIENT AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS AND SUPPORTING DATA

Comment Q.1: Commenters state that the statute and applicable regulations dictate that Region 10 may not issue Shell a Title V operating permit unless it “includes conditions that will assure compliance with all the requirements of [the Clean Air Act] at all authorized locations, including, but not limited to, ambient standards and compliance with any applicable increment or visibility requirements . . . ,” citing to 42 U.S.C § 7661c(e) and § 7661c(a); 40 CFR §§ 71.2, 71.6(a)(1), 71.6(e)(1). These commenters contend that Shell has not demonstrated its ability to comply with all applicable requirements and that Region 10—which premised the draft permit conditions on Shell’s modeling assumptions—has not established adequate permit conditions sufficient to guarantee compliance.

Response: As discussed in the responses to comments in Categories Z and GG, in the Statement of Basis, and in the Technical Support Document, the permit includes conditions that assure compliance with all applicable requirements of the Clean Air Act at all authorized locations. Contrary to the commenters' assertion, there is no requirement that permit conditions be sufficient to "guarantee" compliance. Rather, the permit must contain terms and conditions that provide a reasonable assurance of compliance with all applicable requirements.

Comment Q.2: A commenter states that the modeling used to support the permits is unproven and asks that Region 10 ensure that the model is statistically sufficient to justify the permitting decision.

Response: The basic model used to support the permits, AERMOD, is an EPA guideline model that has been approved for use after notice and comment rulemaking. See 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W, Section 4.2.2(b). Region 10 approved two permit-specific algorithms for use with the guideline model: COARE for the pre-processing of meteorological data and the Plume Volume Molar Ratio Method (PVRM) that is considered on a case-by-case basis as a non-regulatory default option under Section 5.2.4.d of Appendix W. Approval of these alternatives was subject to rigorous review. See also the responses to comments in Category R.

Comment Q.3: Commenters state, although the amount of pollution that will be released under the permit has been greatly reduced, it is still very close to exceeding the air quality standards and there are still significant concerns about whether the permits comply with EPA's legal obligations. The commenters are concerned about the modeling that was done for this permit and that the pollution that will be emitted could potentially impact not just the 500 meters around the Kulluk itself but the communities throughout the Arctic, including the offshore areas where local communities spend much of their time throughout the year.

Response: As discussed in the Technical Support Document, the modeling that has been conducted demonstrates that the NAAQS will be protected in all areas that are considered ambient air, including areas where local communities regularly conduct subsistence activities. Although it is true that the highest modeled concentrations are close to the NAAQS for some pollutants, it is also true that these results reflect many conservative assumptions, such as the Kulluk remaining in the same location for three years, a situation that is unlikely to occur, and the use of onshore background data to reflect offshore air quality. See responses to comments V.1.c and V.2.a

Comment Q.4: A commenter states that the models show that the concentration of air pollutants in the local communities resulting from Shell's operations would be well below the national ambient air quality standards. The commenter asserts that this is true even when taking into account background concentrations of air pollutants that are not related to Shell's operations and the use of conservative assumptions such as all four proposed exploratory wells being drilled at the same location, which would not actually occur.

Response: Region 10 agrees that, considering the emissions from Shell's operations in conjunction with background air quality, concentrations will be well below the NAAQS in the onshore communities and will be below the NAAQS in all areas that are considered ambient air.

Comment Q.5: A commenter from Point Hope expressed a general concern with the air quality analysis and whether the analysis supporting the permits had considered ship traffic in the baseline. The commenter states that there was no background air monitoring being conducted in Point Hope and asks that such monitoring be conducted so the community could better understand concerns. The commenter also asserts that the results of previous nuclear tests that shows that emissions stay up in the Arctic within the jet stream and accumulate, and is referred to as Arctic Haze. The commenter also expressed concern about the impact of emissions on subsistence users and notes that other oil companies with leases have expressed interest in getting permits. The commenter also asks where the data used is from.

Response: As discussed in Section 4 of the Statement of Basis, the Technical Support Document, and throughout this Response to Comments, the permit is supported by a demonstration that the authorized emissions will not cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS in all locations that constitute ambient air, including where subsistence activities are regularly conducted. The data relied on to support these permits comes from a variety of sources, and includes background monitoring data collected by Shell and other sources, emission data from stack tests and other available sources, and meteorological data collected by Shell and other sources, including the National Weather Service. Issuance of the permit does include consideration of existing emissions in the area through the use of background air quality data in the general vicinity of the proposed operations. Region 10 notes that Point Hope is located on the southern edge of the Chukchi Sea, hundreds of miles from the locations where operations will be conducted under the permit in the Chukchi Sea. Region 10 therefore does not believe it is appropriate to rely on background air quality monitoring in Point Hope in support of this permit action. Emissions from operations of other leaseholders will be considered if and when such leaseholders apply for Clean Air Act permits, and the public will have an opportunity to review and comment on any such permits. For discussion on subsistence activities, see response to comments in Category DD.

Comment Q.6: A commenter stated at a public hearing that he had tried looking into information in regards to the inventory and had inquired about other modeling information and had not received a response.

Response: The Region received a request from the commenter for modeling information and replied by contacting the commenter to discuss the request. The Region informed the commenter that the modeling files were stored electronically on multiple hard drives comprising more than 150 gigabytes of electronic storage space. The Region provided the commenter a summary list of all the modeling files to assist the commenter in identifying specific files for review, and also informed the commenter of the large size of

the modeling files and inquired as to the best way to deliver the files to the commenter. The Region did not receive a follow-up response from the commenter, but contacted the commenter again after receiving the comment.

R. CATEGORY – CHOICE OF MODEL

Comment R.1: A commenter states that EPA’s use of the Coupled Ocean Atmosphere Response Experiment Meteorological Modeling Algorithm and the Plume Volume Molar Ration Method Nitrogen Dioxide Algorithm to predict the concentration of air pollutants emitting from Shell’s operations and in the local communities is appropriate and that EPA has approved use of these models, albeit on a case-by-case basis.

Response: As described in more detail in response to Comment R.2, Region 10 agrees with the commenter that the use of AERMOD-COARE and PVMRM is appropriate.

Comment R.2: Noting that Region 10 is soliciting comments on the use of the non-guideline AERMOD-COARE model in these proposed revised permits, commenters state that given the limited comment period and the overlap with the Discoverer permits comment period, it is not feasible to provide comprehensive and appropriately technical comments on the model. The commenters contend that new COARE model is highly involved and explain that to review the details of the model and be able to provide technical comments and broader peer review would take more time than is being provided. The commenters assert that public input on this new model would be a valuable opportunity for broad peer review of the models used but that this opportunity is lost because Region 10 did not provide adequate time for review.

Response: Consistent with the requirements of 40 CFR § 52.21(l)(2),¹³ Region 10 approved the use of the non-guideline COARE meteorological algorithm to predict air pollutant concentrations in the open-water arctic environment. Memorandum from Herman Wong, Region 10, to Tyler Fox, OAQPS, re: COARE Bulk Flux Algorithm to Generate Hourly Meteorological Data for Use with the AERMOD Dispersion Program; Section 3.2.2.e Alternative Refined Model Demonstration Approval Memorandum, dated April 1, 2011 (Region 10 AERMOD-COARE Approval Memorandum). The use of this algorithm was approved under the case-by-case alternative modeling provisions specified in EPA’s modeling guidelines, 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W, Section 3.2. Region 10 then sought and obtained concurrence from the EPA Model Clearing House on the Region’s approval. See Memorandum from George Bridgers, OAQPS, to Herman Wong, Region 10 re: Model Clearinghouse Review of AERMOD-COARE as an Alternative Model Application in an Arctic Marine Ice Free Environment, dated May 6,

¹³ As discussed in the Technical Support Document (pages 5-7), the COA rules require the use of 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W for a modeling analysis under the COA minor permit program. In addition, Region 10 believes it is appropriate to use the regulations and guidance for conducting an air quality analysis under the PSD program as a guide for an analysis submitted in connection with a Title V permit for a Title V temporary source. See *Id.* and Statement of Basis at 26-27. Subsequent references to the PSD regulations and guidance are cited for this same purpose.

2011 (Model Clearinghouse Concurrence Memo). As provided in 40 CFR §§ 52.21(l)(2) and 52.21(q), Region 10 then provided notice and an opportunity for public comment on its approval of COARE in the context of this specific permit action. This included a 46-day period for public comment, longer than the 30-day comment period provided for in 40 CFR § 71.11(d) and 124.10. As explained in the response to comments for Category C, the 46-day period complies with all legal requirements. As demonstrated by the thoughtful comments received, Region 10 believes it provided sufficient time for commenters to address the issues in the Draft Permit, including the COARE algorithm.

Moreover, this model was used in support of both the draft Discoverer permits and the Kulluk Draft Permit, and both public notices refer to the same supporting documentation. Therefore, for those who chose to comment on both the Kulluk and Discoverer permits, including these commenters, the overlap provided a total of 60 days to review AERMOD-COARE prior to submitting comments on the Kulluk Draft Permit.

Comment R.3: Commenters question whether the performance evaluations used to assess the model are representative. After looking at the results from the three tracer sites, the commenters state that there is significant variation in model performance and contend that, if there is that much difference between the California and Louisiana sites, it stands to reason that conditions in the Arctic may be a lot different. Commenters state that differences in sea surface temperature, depth of the marine layer, sea surface roughness, among other things, could give substantially different results in an arctic environment, particularly with respect to the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. Based on the results of the performance evaluation presented in the Model Clearinghouse review and because this is the first time using this nonguideline modeling approach in the Arctic, the commenters ask Region 10 to require Shell to conduct additional tracer experiments off the North Slope before the final permit is issued and to include a permit condition that requires Shell to collect data for use in evaluating the performance of the AERMOD-COARE model. The commenters cite to language in EPA's approval memo stating that the EPA Model Clearinghouse recommended further investigation to "determine if other tracer gas experiments are available to evaluate AERMOD-COARE, especially for Arctic conditions."

Response: As discussed in the response to comment R.4 below, evaluation of AERMOD-COARE using the three tracer gas experiments indicate that the meteorological variables such as those mentioned by the commenters do not bias the model towards underestimates. Section 3.2.2.e in Appendix W states that an alternative refined model may be used provided that five criteria are met, including (a) that the necessary data bases (*e.g.*, tracer gas experiments) be available (Element 3); and (b) that appropriate performance evaluations have shown that the alternative refined model (*e.g.*, AERMOD-COARE in this case) is not biased toward underestimation (Element 4). 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W, § 3.2.2(e)(iii)-(iv). Region 10 determined that the tracer gas experiments conducted at Cameron, Louisiana, and Carpinteria and Pismo Beach, California, are representative of arctic conditions. The basis for this finding is that the experiments simulate over water dispersion, tracer gas concentrations were measured at the shoreline, and there was a range of positive air-sea temperature differences (*i.e.*,

stable conditions) like what would be expected in the Arctic. Consequently, Region 10 concluded that these three tracer gas experiments were adequate for the AERMOD-COARE performance evaluation. Region 10 AERMOD-COARE Approval Memorandum, Section B.3; see also Model Clearinghouse Concurrence Memo.

Regarding the commenters' concern that the tracer gas experiments were not conducted in the Arctic, Region 10 recognizes that there are not tracer gas experiments for every geographic region, climatic region, or synoptic region for use in a performance evaluation. Region 10 AERMOD-COARE Approval Memorandum, Section B.3. This is particularly true for the Arctic given the harsh environmental and meteorological conditions in which such an experiment would have to be conducted. Nevertheless, Region 10 concluded that the tracer gas experiments relied on to support approval of the model are acceptable based on the similarity of the tracer gas experiments and the marine arctic air-sea temperatures. *Id.*

After evaluating Shell's demonstrations with respect to the five elements under Section 3.2.2.e in 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W, Region 10 approved the AERMOD-COARE model as an alternative refined model to estimate emission impacts from marine located combustion sources. AERMOD-COARE was subsequently used by Shell to make the required modeling analysis.

When approving Shell's use of this model, Region 10 determined that "Approval to use this alternative model is made on a case-by-case basis. Should a project proponent desire to use AERMOD-COARE in an Arctic marine ice free environment air permit project, a request must be made to R10 prior to the submission of an ambient air quality impact analysis...." Region 10 AERMOD-COARE Approval Memorandum, Section C.1. Hence, should other OCS projects be proposed in the Beaufort or Chukchi Seas, Region 10 will require each project proponent to justify the use of AERMOD-COARE and, if necessary, update the elements under 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W, Section 3.2.2.e.

The commenter is correct that Region 10 recommended additional investigations to determine if other tracer gas experiments are available to evaluate AERMOD-COARE, particularly for arctic conditions, but none to date have been identified that have occurred in an arctic environment. Region 10 has accepted the Section 3.2.2.e demonstration and determined that the existing experiments provide an adequate basis for accepting the alternative model. Region 10 therefore does not believe it is reasonable to require Shell to conduct a tracer gas experiment in the Arctic followed by another performance evaluation.

Response to comment R.4 discusses the performance criteria and goals for an acceptable performance evaluation

Comment R.4: Commenters state that it is unclear from the permit record whether Shell tuned the COARE model with the available data sets and then used the same tuned model in the performance evaluation and that Region 10 must ensure, and make it known to the public, that Shell tested the model with an independent data set. The commenters assert

that there is very little discussion of performance goals in the modeling evaluation so it is difficult to assess the model performance presented by Region 10. The commenters assert that, from a scientific perspective, the use of AERMOD-COARE is far superior to the OCD model, but state that does not necessarily mean it is accurate in this particular application. The commenters state that Region 10 must make it clear, from the outset, what the acceptable performance results must be, based on the available data (*e.g.*, is it good enough to get within a factor of two or are the data good enough to demand results within 30 %) and be able to clearly demonstrate that the model is accurately predicting impacts to a reasonable degree and that the model is not under-predicting impacts.

Response: The commenters do not provide specific cases or examples of what they mean by tuning. The meteorology associated with Pismo Beach, California, and Cameron, Louisiana tracer gas experiments are shown in Table 2 and Table 4, respectively, of the Region 10 AERMOD-COARE Approval Memorandum. For example, in the Revised Air-Sea Temp (K) column, there are several hours of values highlighted in red because of inconsistencies between the air-sea temperature difference and the virtual temperature potential lapse rate. The virtual potential temperature lapse rate sometimes indicates a stable boundary layer (positive) when the air-sea temperature difference is unstable (negative). Either there was a low mixed layer not reflected by the mixing height measurements in the tables, or one of the measurements is not representative of the boundary layer profile. The previous Ocean Coastal Dispersion (OCD) model evaluation relied on a measured vertical temperature lapse rate and, so to be consistent with the earlier studies, this performance evaluation adjusted the air-sea temperature difference to be at least as stable as indicated by the virtual temperature lapse rate. Region 10 agreed that this adjustment by Shell was appropriate. This adjustment to the two data sets was carried over to all of the performance evaluations. Region 10 is not aware of other adjustments and the commenter has not identified any others.

As in previous model evaluations and analyses, Region 10 followed certain design criteria to determine model acceptability. In this particular case, the predicted AERMOD-COARE model concentrations, and the Cameron, Louisiana, and the Carpinteria and Pismo Beach, California, tracer gas experiment measurements were sorted and plotted as well as statistically analyzed. These plots and statistical analyses were used by Region 10 to conclude that AERMOD-COARE is not biased towards underestimates as provided in Element 4 in Section 3.2.2.e under Appendix W of 40 CFR Part 51. The procedures are used to evaluate how well the modeling method explains the frequency distribution of the observed concentration and measures the model's ability to explain the temporal variability of the observations. Generally, the approach with the least scatter would be preferred. See Region 10 AERMOD-COARE Approval Memorandum, Section B.4.b for additional description of the statistical evaluation procedures.

The texts, tables and graphics of the performance evaluation for five cases conducted by Shell using the three experiments are included with the Region 10 AERMOD-COARE Approval Memorandum in Section B.4. Table 1 lists the five cases. The graphics or figures reflect the scatter of the prediction-to-observation ratio results, including over

predictions and under predictions, when comparing the model results to actual predictions. Quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plots are shown in Figures 6 to 19 and details a 1:1 line and a factor of 2 line (i.e., $0.5 < \text{ratio} < 2.0$) about the 1:1 line for prediction-to-observation ratios. A ratio on the 1:1 line reflects a perfect match. Ratios between the factor of 2 lines are preferred by EPA. The four plots in Figures 20 to 23 display the bias of the geometric mean (MG) and against scatter (VG). In each plot, there is MG = 1 line and a factor of 2 lines (i.e., $0.5 < \text{MG} < 2.0$). On the horizontal axis, the MG = 1 separates model ratios (in terms of over prediction and under prediction). Table 8 provides a statistical summary of each data set (including all three data sets combined) for the five cases. The statistics analyzed and presented included geometric mean, standard deviation of geometric mean, bias about the geometric mean, scatter, geometric correlation coefficient, fraction within a factor of 2, and robust highest concentration (RHC). The RHC is frequently used by EPA to assess the model's ability to characterize the upper end of the frequency distribution. Section B.4.c in the Region 10 AERMOD-COARE Approval Memorandum summarizes the results in text format. Based on the plots and statistical analyses for the five cases, Region 10 believes AERMOD-COARE is not biased towards underestimates and better represents over water transport such as in the Beaufort Sea as compared to the OCD model. Region 10 agrees with the commenter that AERMOD-COARE is a "far superior" model from a scientific perspective.

With respect to concerns with the adequacy of time to review the model, please see response to comment R.2.

Comment R.5: Commenters state that the AERMOD-COARE model does not account for platform building downwash. Because the Kulluk is described as a conical drilling platform, the commenters assert, Region 10 must ensure that the model sufficiently stimulates cavity effects next to the Kulluk.

Response: The permit authorizes air emissions only from the equipment identified in the permit and the underlying applications, and no platform is included in these documents. Therefore, AERMOD-COARE does not need to account for platform building downwash in this application. In regards to potential cavity effects, AERMOD-COARE uses the same Plume Rise Model Enhancement (PRIME) algorithm as used in AERMOD for calculating impacts within a cavity zone. However, the issue is not relevant in this permitting action because the 500-meter safety zone precludes the need for modeling ambient impacts next to the Kulluk.

Comment R.6: Commenters state that the AERMOD-COARE model does not account for shoreline fumigation. The commenters also assert that it is not clear whether those conditions were included in any of the tracer data sets. The commenters contend that shoreline fumigation can cause higher short-term concentrations and that, given the proximity of the Kulluk's operations to on-shore communities along the Beaufort Sea coast (14 kilometers from the closest lease block to Kaktovick), Region 10 must include an assessment of potential shoreline fumigation impacts on pollutant concentrations.

Response: Shoreline fumigation occurs when a plume from a tall stack travels in an over-water stable layer and reaches the land-sea interface, resulting in the plume being mixed down to the ground in an unstable layer. The commenters are correct that AERMOD-COARE does not account for shoreline fumigation and that shoreline fumigation can cause higher short term concentrations. In Shell's case, its stacks are not near the shoreline (greater than 3 miles or 4.8 kilometers) and the highest concentrations are predicted to occur closer to the Kulluk. In response to a Region 10 Second Information and Data Request dated March 7, 2011 asking Shell to address this issue, Shell responded as follows in a submittal dated March 11, 2011:

Shell has presently made no provisions for this analysis within the COARE-AERMOD approach. However, it should be noted that the distance between the drilling locations and the shore where potential fumigation could occur is over 50 kilometers for all locations in the Chukchi Sea and for the Beaufort Sea, the locations are still on the order of many kilometers from any of the villages. The AERMOD model has no provision for fumigation calculations. Further AERMOD has no provision for the internal boundary and subsequent changes in mixing that might occur due to changes in land use for terrestrial applications. Given the long distances to the villages, it seems appropriate that the CALPUFF model should be used in the event EPA requests that this issue be addressed. The CALPUFF model does contain an algorithm for addressing fumigation or spatial changes in terrain, land use or meteorology in general. Another factor to be considered is that the real purpose of fumigation analyses is to treat cases where very elevated plumes are mixed rapidly to the ground when passing over a change in surface regime (i.e.; from stable to unstable boundary layers). The classic fumigation case is a power plant located on a coastline. For exploratory drilling sources, however, not only are the sources located far from the shoreline, but also, the plumes from Shell's sources are relatively low and would be expected to have reached the surface by the time they reach the shore.

Region 10 agrees that there was no need to address shoreline fumigation in connection with Shell's air quality analysis given the vessels and their locations at issue in this permit.

It is true that, in approving the model, Region 10 recognized that, "While AERMOD-COARE is acceptable to R10 for the current application in the Arctic marine ice free environment, it lacks two features found in OCD: platform building downwash and a shoreline fumigation algorithm. These two features should be coded into the AERMOD dispersion program for wider application in lieu of using OCD." Region 10 AERMOD-COARE Approval Memorandum, Section 3.2.2.e. That the AERMOD-COARE model currently does not account for shoreline fumigation is irrelevant for purposes of this permitting action, however, because the conditions giving rise to shoreline fumigation are not present in the project to be authorized in this permitting action.¹⁴

¹⁴Fumigation studies were conducted during the Carpinteria, California, tracer gas experiment on October 1, 3, 4 and 5, 1985. Bureau of Ocean, Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, Development of the Next Generation Air Quality Models for Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Application, Final Report:

S. CATEGORY – PRORATING IMPACTS

Comment S.1: Commenters note Region 10’s statement that:

Shell prorated the period averages in order to estimate the annual average impacts. For example, to estimate the annual average NO₂, PM_{2.5} or SO₂ impacts, Shell multiplied the 120-day average impact by 0.329 (120 drilling days out of 365 days in a year). Shell’s approach for estimating the annual average impact is reasonable since the impact during non-drilling periods will be zero.

The commenters disagree that period averages can be prorated, particularly for pollutants such as NO₂ that have rolling 12-month emissions limits. The commenters contend that the permit cannot rely upon a 12-month period in which to demonstrate compliance with air quality standards and at the same time prorate those very same emissions. By allowing the prorating, commenters continue, Region 10 is allowing Shell to average out the impacts of its air emissions twice. The commenters request that Region 10 update the permit analysis so that the impacts for NO₂, PM_{2.5}, and SO₂ are not prorated and then update any relevant permit conditions as necessary to ensure compliance with relevant standards.

Response: The use of the term “prorated” in the Technical Support Document has introduced some confusion about what Shell actually did. Shell modeled each of the 120 drilling days using the estimated emissions for each day. Shell did not model the remaining 245 days since there are no emissions from the Kulluk or the Associated Fleet during these days (*i.e.*, the modeled concentration would be zero). Therefore, multiplying Shell’s period average by 0.329 (120 period days divided by 365 calendar days) provides the same annual average value as what would occur if one added 245-days worth of zeros to the 120-days worth of modeled concentrations, and then divided the total by 365 days. The equivalency is illustrated below, where the term “Sum” means the total modeled concentration over the 120 days that Shell modeled. As illustrated by these equations, the period average times 0.329 *is* the annual average concentration.

$$\frac{\text{Sum}}{120} \times 0.329 = \frac{\text{Sum}}{365}$$

Shell then added the resulting annual average value to the annual average background concentration to determine the total annual average impact. Because the modeling approach reflects concentrations based on permitted emissions and provides estimates of

Volume I dated March, 2006. Hence, while Region 10 continues to believe that a shoreline fumigation algorithm is not needed in the modeling supporting this permit, a tracer gas experiment is available for a project proponent to evaluate shoreline fumigation when the situation arises.

the annual average impacts, Region 10 does not believe any additional modeling analysis is needed. The permit requirements ensure compliance with the relevant annual standards and use the appropriate averaging period for the modeling analyses. The fact that the annual emission limits are 12-month rolling limits does not in any way authorize Shell to operate outside of the five month drilling season. See response to comment I.1.b.

T. CATEGORY – METEOROLOGICAL DATA

Comment T.1: Commenters contend that Region 10’s statement that Shell’s Reindeer Island data are site specific data is not consistent with EPA’s own guidance and past practice. According to the commenters, EPA guidelines state that site specific data are data collected on-site (citing to EPA, Ambient Monitoring Guidelines for Prevention of Significant Deterioration at 48 (May 1987)) and the data collected at Reindeer Island do not satisfy this condition because they are not within any of Shell’s leases and do not represent open water conditions. The commenters contend that Region 10’s own past statement confirms this understanding because many of these data Shell and Region 10 are relying on here were available in 2010 when Region 10 was considering Shell’s Discoverer permit for the Beaufort Sea, yet Region 10 maintained that they were not site-specific or characteristic of the open Beaufort Sea. See 2010 Discoverer Beaufort Sea Statement of Basis at 102 (“Because meteorological data representative of the open Beaufort Sea was not available, Shell used screening meteorology”).

Response: The meteorological measurements relied on in the modeling analyses include numerous site specific components that were supplemented as appropriate by representative National Weather Service (NWS) data, consistent with Section 8.3.3.2(c) of Appendix W to 40 CFR Part 51. The analysis included surface measurements of wind, temperature, delta-T, solar radiation, and pressure from Reindeer Island, buoy data from Reindeer Island and Sivulliq, profiler data from Endeavor Island, and NWS upper air data from Barrow.

At the outset, it is important to emphasize the unique challenges of collecting any data in this environment. Temperatures are extremely cold, winds can be strong, and the drilling operations are occurring miles offshore. This harsh, remote environment presents obvious challenges to the siting and installation of data collection instruments, the operation of those instruments, and the collection of complete, quality-assured data. The scale of the area in which activities are to be authorized under these permits is also unique. Shell’s lease blocks in the Beaufort Sea cover an area of more than 1145 square miles. The sets of meteorological data used in these analyses were also designed to account for an issue of representativeness that is somewhat unique to this area, *i.e.*, the influence of ice vs. ice-free conditions on “over-water” dispersion.

The issue of representativeness of meteorological data is complex and its determination will depend on several factors, including the four factors listed in Appendix W: 1) the proximity of the monitoring site to the area under consideration; 2) the complexity of the terrain; 3) the exposure of the monitoring site; and 4) the period of time during which the data are collected. See 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W. § 8.3(a). Representativeness may

also vary greatly across different meteorological parameters. For example, upper air soundings used in calculating mixing heights are generally considered to be representative over a much larger geographical area than measurements taken near the surface. Among the surface meteorological parameters, representativeness can also vary significantly. For example, surface ambient temperatures (nominally measured between about 2 and 10 meters above ground) are generally representative over a larger area than surface wind speed and direction (nominally measured about 10 meters above ground).

Section 8.3(b) of Appendix W to 40 CFR Part 51 indicates that “[m]odel input data are normally obtained from the National Weather Service or as part of a site specific measurement program.” Section 8.3.1.2 of Appendix W also recommends that “[t]he meteorological data should be *adequately representative*, and may be site specific or from a nearby NWS station” (emphasis in original). While Section 8.3.3.1(a) of Appendix W states that “[s]patial or geographical representativeness is best achieved by collection of all of the needed model input data in close proximity to the actual site of the source(s),” it further clarifies that “while site specific measurements are frequently made ‘on-property’ (*i.e.*, on the source’s premises), acquisition of adequately representative site specific data does not preclude collection of data from a location off property. Conversely, collection of meteorological data on a source’s property does not of itself guarantee adequate representativeness.” Since Appendix W recommends in section 8.3.1.2(a) that meteorological data should be adequately representative, regardless of whether NWS or site specific data are being used, the main distinction between the two types of data is the length of record provided for in section 8.3.1.2(b), which states that “[t]he use of 5 years of NWS meteorological data or at least 1 year of site specific data is required. If one year or more (including partial years), up to five years, of site specific data is available, these data are preferred for use in air quality analyses.”

The commenter’s statement that site specific meteorological data must be collected “on site” because of EPA’s PSD Ambient Monitoring Guidelines is simply incorrect. The guidance document cited by the commenters dates from 1987 and does refer to one year of “on site data” That guidance document has been revised on this issue, however, by revisions to Appendix W in 2003. Prior to promulgating those revisions, EPA solicited comment on the terminology and meaning of “site-specific” meteorological data, and based on public comments subsection 9.3.3.1 (renumbered to section 8.3.3.1 in 2005) was revised “to clarify that, while site-specific measurements are frequently made ‘on-property’ (*i.e.*, on the source’s premises), acquisition of adequately representative site-specific data does not preclude collecting data from a location off property. Conversely, collection of meteorological data on property does not of itself guarantee adequate representativeness.” 68 Fed. Reg. 18,444, 18,446 (April 15, 2003). Specifically, the term “on-site” in reference to meteorological data has been removed from Appendix W. Because Appendix W modified the recommendations of the 1987 guidance after notice and comment and is the later statement from EPA on this issue, it is not true that site specific data must be collected on site.

The Reindeer Island station was specifically established to collect representative meteorological data for this permitting action and other Shell permitting actions in the

Beaufort Sea. Reindeer Island is located about 10 kilometers (roughly 6 miles) offshore and approximately 15 kilometers (roughly 10 miles) southeast of the nearest lease block where Shell is authorized to drill under this permit. The offshore distance is greater than the nearest offshore distance of some lease blocks. The Reindeer Island site is the most distant offshore meteorological station to date that has operated year-round in the extremely harsh Beaufort Sea environment. Given the lack of topographical influence, the minimal meteorological influence of the gravel bar itself, and wide homogeneous nature of offshore surface conditions, the station is representative of the meteorological conditions expected over an extremely large offshore area.

Region 10 recognizes that the distance between the Reindeer Island station and portions of Shell's proposed operations in the Beaufort Sea are far greater than in most other cases where monitoring sites have been considered to be site specific or representative. Region 10 believes that the scale of the area in general as well as the scale of the area over which operations are to be authorized under this permit are relevant and unique factors such that, in conjunction with the other factors discussed above, the data from Reindeer Island are appropriately considered both adequately representative and site specific within the meaning of Appendix W. One final point worth noting when considering the proximity and representativeness of the collected meteorological data in this permitting application is that there is less directional dependency in the modeling analysis in these applications as compared with most other cases since the modeled ambient air boundary distance is uniform (a circle of 500 meters from the hull of the Kulluk) and there are no directionally dependent terrain features near the source, thus limiting the importance of some of the key aspects of representativeness of wind direction in the modeling analysis.

Regarding the 2010 Statements of Basis for the Discoverer Permits referenced in the comment, although the data collection began in 2009, the complete measured meteorological data used in the Kulluk modeling analysis were not available to Shell for use at the time Shell submitted its Beaufort Sea application for the Discoverer on January 18, 2010. Consequently, for the Discoverer Permits, Shell used the ISC-PRIME model with screening meteorology and upper end scaling factors to derive averaging period concentration estimates for periods greater than one hour for compliance with the NAAQS. Region 10 has determined that a sufficient and adequately representative set of meteorological data are now available to support a refined dispersion modeling analysis using AERMOD, and therefore use of a screening technique is not necessary or appropriate for modeling the Kulluk and Associated Fleet.

Comment T.2: Commenters assert that Shell has not met minimum regulatory requirements for the amount of site specific meteorological data that Shell must obtain to demonstrate that Shell's operations will not violate air standards. The commenters point to 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W, § 8.3.1.2, which Region 10 also cited in the Technical Support Document. That section states, under the heading "Recommendations," that "The use of 5 years of NWS data or 1 year of site-specific data is required."

Response: Shell's meteorological monitoring effort at Reindeer Island has been on-going since April 25, 2009, and Shell therefore had more than one year of site specific

data to support its permit application and air quality analysis. See also response to comment T.1.

Shell only used the July through November portions of the meteorological data since they are only authorized to operate within this period. See Appendix W, Table 8.2, fn. 2 (discussing that if a source is subject to an enforceable limitation on hours of operation, only the hours of authorized operation are to be modeled with emissions from the source). Because the meteorological data is only used in connection with modeling emissions from the permitted source, meteorological data collected from times other than during the periods of authorized operation are not used in the modeling analysis. Region 10 believes that even if Shell did not have meteorological data for the periods they did not model (i.e., December through June), Shell would still have data of sufficient duration for purposes of Section 8.3.1.2(b) of Appendix W because the data collection period covers one year's worth of the period of authorized operation. In this case, five months worth of data covering July 1 through November 30 is one year of data within the meaning of that section. Since the permit only authorizes operations from July 1 to November 30, emissions and hence contributions to ambient air quality, will both be zero during the remainder of the year.

Comment T.3: Commenters state that the meteorological data Shell has collected do not meet the standard set by EPA's guidelines for the required time period because the buoy data only cover the period from mid-August to mid-October, meaning that Shell has no over-water data for July or November.

Response: Shell deployed the instrumented buoys during the open-water periods. Shell could not collect "over-water" data during those periods when there was no over-water data to be collected (*i.e.*, during those periods where there is no open water due to the presence of ice). It is important to note that while AERMOD-COARE requires the air-sea temperature difference and relative humidity data collected by the buoys, the Guideline version of AERMOD – which Shell used to estimate ambient impacts when sea ice is present – does not. Therefore, Shell collected the meteorological parameters needed by each model for those periods that the given model was used. Because Region 10 considers the data to be site specific, one year's worth of data is sufficient to support Shell's analysis. See the response to comments T.1 and T.3.

U. CATEGORY – BACKGROUND AIR MONITORING DATA

Comment U.1: Commenters question Region 10's initial assumption that the use of onshore data is "conservative" because "onshore monitoring stations will be influenced by local sources that are not present in the vicinity of Shell's offshore operations." The commenters explain that emissions from Shell's operations will be influenced by local sources which include the associated vessels that are stationed more than 25 miles from the drillship, barge and shipping traffic in the Arctic OCS, as well as scientific research vessels and accompanying ice breakers and other vessels. The commenters conclude that the presence of these local sources of offshore emissions undermines expectations that onshore data is automatically conservative. The commenters assert that this is an

important consideration because the most conservative background data was not necessarily used for the modeling.

Response: Region 10 agrees that emissions from vessels operating in the vicinity of Shell's exploratory operations will contribute to the air pollution levels in the area. However, Region 10 disagrees that this would mean that the concentrations measured onshore would not be conservative for offshore locations where Shell will be operating under the permit. First, the Kulluk is a portable source and will be at different locations during any drilling season and during subsequent drilling seasons. It is not possible to determine where and for how long the Kulluk will be operating near other vessels in the area so trying to determine the background contribution of vessels operating near the Kulluk would be difficult. Second, other vessels will also be moving in relation to the Kulluk so their contribution to the ambient levels in the immediate vicinity of the Kulluk when it is at a drillsite will be transitory. The effect of these two overlapping scenarios, along with the statistical form of the relevant short-term NAAQS, is that the contribution to background concentrations from vessel activity at the location of the Kulluk's maximum impacts is expected to be minimal, if anything. The concentrations measured by the onshore background monitoring locations, however, are regularly impacted by nearby sources, including mobile sources and other fuel combustion sources, such as the villages' diesel generators. The concentrations at on onshore monitoring locations that are regularly impacted by nearby sources are expected to be significantly higher than the concentrations at a drillsite that would be occasionally impacted by passing vessels. Region 10 has therefore determined that the concentrations measured onshore at monitoring sites are conservatively representative of concentrations offshore at the project locations.

Comment U.2: Commenters assert that there is significant confusion in the permit record regarding the datasets used for different background concentrations, most notably the datasets for background concentrations of NO₂. The commenters refer to the air quality impact analysis for the draft permit in which Region 10 proposes using NO₂ data from the Prudhoe Bay A-Pad monitoring site as representative of background concentrations for both the 1-hour and annual NAAQS. The commenters also refer to Region 10's June 23, 2011 determination of background concentrations for the Beaufort Sea which states: "Since some of the lease blocks for the Kulluk permit are very near to the Prudhoe Bay area it was deemed appropriate to utilize the Deadhorse PM_{2.5} data set for determining a background value and CCP for NO₂ and SO₂." The commenters contend that there is no further discussion about the NO₂ dataset from the Prudhoe Bay CCP monitoring site, and that the Region must use the CCP data if they represent a more conservative background dataset. The commenters state that annual average NO₂ concentrations from the CCP site are one and a half times higher than those monitored at the A-Pad location, and conclude that it is like that the hourly average concentrations are also higher. The commenters conclude that Region 10 must use the dataset with the highest monitored 1-hour average and annual average NO₂ concentrations, particularly for the 1-hour average NAAQS if the modeling will be based on an analysis of data paired in time.

Response: As Region 10 explained on page 29 (footnote 7) of the Technical Support Document, the monitoring site ultimately used for the NO₂ analysis (A-Pad) is different than the site recommended in the June 23, 2011 memo (CCP). The requirements for the background data used in an air quality modeling analysis are described in Section 8.2 of the Guideline on Air Quality Models (40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W). There is no requirement that the data be conservative and there is certainly no requirement that it must be the most conservative of available data. In this case, there is no offshore ambient air data, so an onshore site was used to represent the background concentrations expected within the vicinity of the Kulluk lease blocks. However, as discussed below and in the response to comment Y.2, the onshore monitoring site used in this analysis is expected to be impacted by similar natural and distant man-made sources, but more heavily impacted by the local sources than what would likely occur at the project locations. As such, Region 10 believes that it is conservatively representative of the background concentrations at the project location.

The requirements for the background data used in an air quality modeling analysis are described in Section 8.2 of the Guideline on Air Quality Models (40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W). Section 8.2.2.b and c provide:

- b. Use air quality data collected in the vicinity of the source to determine the background concentration for the averaging times of concern....
- c. If there are no monitors located in the vicinity of the source, a “regional site” may be used to determine background. A “regional site” is one that is located away from the area of interest but is impacted by similar natural and distant man-made sources.

The A-Pad and CCP monitoring sites are located in close proximity to the onshore sources in the Prudhoe Bay area so both are conservatively representative of offshore concentrations at the Kulluk lease blocks. Background concentrations from both locations reflect contributions from the onshore sources in varying amounts depending upon their location with respect to those onshore sources. The CCP monitor is located within 100-meters of the CCP facility, which has just over 14,000 tpy of potential NO_x emissions. The adjacent CGF facility (which is part of the CCP/CGF stationary source) has almost 11,000 tpy of potential NO_x emissions. The air quality impacts of these facilities are also strongly dominated by downwash of the plumes, which leads to the maximum impacts occurring in the immediate area. This conclusion can be deferred from existing documentation regarding this monitoring effort and source. For example, the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) for the CCP and A Pad monitoring stations states:

The CCP monitoring site is located between the Central Compressor Plant and the Central Gas Facility; approximately 100 meters west and southwest of the CCP [reference to figures]. This site is located at or near the point identified by dispersion modeling as the maximum NO₂ impact receptor...”

Quality Assurance Project Plan for the Prudhoe Bay Unit Facilities Ambient Air and Meteorological Monitoring Project, February 2011, at 27.

As another example, in the Technical Analysis Report (TAR) issued for Construction Permit AQ0270CPT04 (CGF) and AQ0166CTP04 (CCP), ADEC stated, “The maximum cumulative impacts (for the given H₂S and fuel-sulfur assumptions) occur in the CGF/CCP near-field” (Exhibit B, pg 14). While the statement related to H₂S related impacts, the same finding would be true for NO_x impacts since combustion-related plumes do not vary by pollutant.

The CCP monitoring station was therefore sited close to the CCP/CGF facilities in order to capture the maximum impact of these facilities. As such, CCP data would be overly conservative for representing the background concentrations at offshore locations. Even the A-Pad monitoring site, which Region 10 relied on, is expected to be a conservative representation of the background air quality concentration at the offshore locations where Shell will be operating.

Comment U.3: Commenters express concern about the use of different background concentrations for the Shell Beaufort Discoverer and Shell Kulluk permits, and express support for use of the Kulluk permit datasets which the commenters state are more conservative. The commenters provided the following table to show the difference in background values between multiple permits:

Table 8: Information from "EPA Region 10 Determination of Appropriate Background Values for the Chukchi and Beaufort Sea OCS Permits" (June 23, 2011)

	Shell Kulluk	Shell Discoverer Beaufort	ConocoPhillips Jackup Rig	Shell Discoverer Chukchi
PM2.5 24hr	Deadhorse	Badami	Wainwright permanent	Wainwright permanent
PM2.5 annual	Deadhorse	Badami	Wainwright permanent	Wainwright permanent
PM10 24 hr	Prudhoe Bay CCP	Prudhoe Bay CCP (Same as Kulluk)	Wainwright permanent	Wainwright permanent
NO2 1 hr	Prudhoe Bay A Pad	Badami	Wainwright temporary	Wainwright temporary
NO2 annual	Prudhoe Bay CCP (text) Badami (chart)	Badami	Wainwright temporary	Wainwright temporary
SO2	Prudhoe Bay CCP	SDI	Wainwright temporary	Wainwright temporary
CO	SDI	SDI (same as Kulluk)	Wainwright temporary	Wainwright temporary
O3	No information	No information	No information	No information

The commenters provided the following table to show the different background concentrations used for the Kulluk and Discoverer:

Table 9: Comparison of Background Concentrations from Maximum Modeled Impact Charts from the Kulluk and Discoverer Statement of Bases

Air Pollutant	Shell Kulluk	Shell Discoverer Beaufort
NO2 1-hour	41	9
NO2 annual	11	1
PM2.5 24-hour	17	6
PM2.5 annual	4	3
PM10 24-hour	53	53
SO2 1-hour	29	13
SO2 3-hour	29	11
SO2 24-hour	22	4
SO2 annual	4	2
CO 1-hour	1,742	1,742
CO 8-hour	1,094	1,094

The commenters contend that Region 10's justification for the use of different data is unconvincing. Commenters reference a Region 10 statement that “some of the lease blocks for the Kulluk permit are very near to the Prudhoe Bay area” making it “appropriate to utilize the Deadhorse PM2.5 data set.” However, the commenters contend, the lease blocks that were “removed from [the Kulluk] application” are those that are closest to Prudhoe Bay, while some of those same lease blocks (lease blocks 6562, 6512, 6510) are still included the draft Discoverer Beaufort permit. Therefore, the commenters conclude that Region 10 should have used the Prudhoe Bay data for both the Kulluk and the Discoverer Beaufort permits.

Response: The comments regarding the data used for the Discoverer permits are not relevant to this permit action and Region 10 is therefore not responding to them in this action. The Discoverer permits and this action are separate permitting actions, covering different lease areas, and supported by separate analyses.

Region 10 did rely on the Prudhoe Bay data for the Draft Permit and therefore there is no need to respond to these comments in this permit proceeding. Region 10 does want to note that lease blocks 6562, 6512, and 6510 are included in both the Discoverer and Kulluk permits (they were not removed from the Kulluk permit). These three lease blocks are the closest lease blocks to the Prudhoe Bay area included in the Discoverer permit and they are over 80 kilometers from Deadhorse. The Kulluk Permit, however, authorizes Shell to drill on lease blocks which are as close as 44 kilometers from Deadhorse, and 42 kilometers and 35 kilometers, respectively, from the A-Pad and CCP monitoring sites (which sites are almost 100 km from the leases included in the Discoverer permit).

Comment U.4: Commenters express support for the use of the highest dataset to represent background concentrations because modeling must be based on a worst-case scenario in order to allow for the flexibility in the sources used by Shell, and because the background concentrations must represent secondary pollutant formation and other offshore background sources that are not modeled. The commenters state that these background offshore sources include significant shipping traffic in the area, the associated fleet when it is beyond 25 miles from the drillship, and emissions associated with the Kulluk and Associated Fleet before the Kulluk is determined to be an OCS source. The commenters believe that Region 10 must use the highest values as representative of background concentrations and must not exclude certain days in a monitoring record that may be due to onshore sources (e.g., emissions events due to wind-blown dust, fire, etc.). The commenters state that Region 10 is using PM_{2.5} data from Deadhorse “to better account for the potential impacts from existing onshore sources,” but discounts days with high recorded concentrations due to these events such as wind-blown dust and fire. The commenters conclude that if high value concentrations are discounted, Region 10 must include impacts from the additional offshore sources that are not included in the background concentrations monitored onshore.

Response: Region 10 disagrees with the commenter that an ambient air quality impact analysis must use the highest background concentrations from any monitoring site across a broad area or that it must be based on a worst-case scenario. Such conservative assumptions may be appropriate for a screening analysis, but they are not necessary for a refined impact analysis where more representative background concentrations and more reasonable operating scenarios are appropriate. As stated in the Technical Support Document (pages 28-29), Region 10 believes that any of the onshore monitoring sites are conservatively representative with respect to the concentrations we expect to see at the offshore locations where the maximum impacts from Shell’s operations would occur. The choices as to which onshore sites were used as background in the Kulluk modeling analysis were not based on the relative concentrations at each site but rather on which sites would best represent the contributions of existing (onshore) sources which were not explicitly included in the modeling analysis. Finally, although Shell excluded days in calculating the background concentrations for its analysis, the Deadhorse PM_{2.5} background values that Region 10 ultimately used in its impact analysis did not exclude any days with events such as wind-blown dust or forest fires. All valid data was included in the calculation of the PM_{2.5} design values reflected in the Technical Support Document and Section 4 of the Statement of Basis. Memorandum from Christopher Hall, Region 10, to Herman Wong, Region 10, re: EPA Region 10 Determination of Appropriate Background Values for the Chukchi Sea and Beaufort Sea OCS Permits, dated June 23, 2011 (Background Data Memo).

Comment U.5: Commenters note that a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) was approved for the monitoring station in Kaktovik in May-June of 2011. The commenters request a comparison between the datasets from the Badami and Endicott monitors, and the data from the Kaktovik monitor to determine whether the Badami and Endicott data sets accurately represent background concentrations of air pollutants in Kaktovik. The

commenters also request a similar comparison of the recent air quality monitoring data collected from Nuiqsut.

Response: Even though a QAPP was approved for the Kaktovik monitoring station in May-June 2011, the site did not begin collecting data until July 1, 2011. The site does not have data yet for a complete drill season or a calendar year, so there is not enough data to use in a NAAQS analysis. Only a few weeks of data would have been available at the time Region 10 proposed the Draft Permit even if it had been submitted to Region 10 for review. With respect to monitoring data from a site operated by ConocoPhillips at Nuiqsut, this data has not be submitted to Region 10 for review or use in a regulatory analysis.

Comment U.6: Commenters express concern that the most conservative data from the North Slope is not being used. The commenters cite as an example data from Point Lay which the commenters characterize as showing much higher background levels of certain pollutants.

Response: Both Wainwright and Point Lay are on the Chukchi Sea, not the Beafort Sea. The data that was used in the Chukchi Sea (presumably for the Discoverer PSD permits) is not relevant to the air quality impact analysis for the Draft Permit, which only authorizes operations in the Beaufort Sea. This comment appears to relate to the recently issued permit for the Discoverer and, as such, Region 10 is not responding to it here.

V. CATEGORY – AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS FOR 1-HOUR NO₂ NAAQS

V.1 SUBCATEGORY – IN GENERAL

Comment V.1.a.: Commenters state that the new 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS was set at a level recognizing the substantial body of scientific evidence demonstrating that the previous annual NO₂ NAAQS was alone sufficient to protect human health. The commenters also state that short term spikes in NO₂ concentrations are associated with a range of negative human health effects. The commenters note that the new 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS includes a new “form” for the standard that is based on the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the yearly distribution of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations. The commenters conclude that Shell has not demonstrated that it will comply with the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS and that Region 10 therefore cannot issue the permits.

Response: As discussed in Section 4 of the Statement of Basis and in the Technical Support Document, when operating in compliance with the terms and conditions of this permit, emissions authorized under the permit will not cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS, including the NO₂ NAAQS. The NAAQS are health-based standards, set at a level to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

Comment V.1.b: Commenters acknowledge EPA’s new “data handling conventions for NO₂” whereby NAAQS compliance is “based on the 3-year average of the 98th percentile

of the yearly distribution of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations,” but assert that the new data handling convention is specific to determining “area-wide” compliance with the revised NAAQS. The commenters contend that there is no basis in the Clean Air Act or the new standard itself for the permitting approach that Region 10 has adopted here which allows a proposed new source to discount its highest projected impacts. The commenters conclude that such an approach ignores both the importance of the absolute value of the NAAQS standard—which they assert must be set at the requisite level to protect human health—as well as the Title V requirement that a proposed permit include sufficient conditions to prevent a NAAQS exceedance, citing to CAA § 165(c) and (e), 40 CFR §§ 71.2, 71.6(c)(a)(1) and 71.6(e)(1).

Response: The commenters appear to be arguing that a source must demonstrate that the impact of its emissions does not exceed the level of the NAAQS. Region 10 disagrees with this position.

Shell’s modeling analysis for the 1-hour NO₂ standard is consistent with the form of the NAAQS and EPA guidance on demonstrating compliance with the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. See Memorandum from Stephen Page, OAQPS, re: Guidance Concerning the Implementation of the 1-Hour NO₂ NAAQS for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program, dated June 29, 2010 (June 2010 1-hour NO₂ Modeling Guidance); Memorandum from Tyler Fox, OAQPS, re: Additional Clarification Regarding Application of Appendix W Modeling Guidance for the 1-Hour NO₂ NAAQS, dated March 1, 2011 (March 2011 1-Hour NO₂ Modeling Guidance). The commenters have provided no specific information showing how Shell’s approach “discount[ed] its highest projected impacts” in a manner that is inconsistent with the form of the NAAQS.

Although it is true that the modeling showed individual 1-hour impacts higher than the 100 ppb (188 µg/m³) level of the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS, the 98th percentile point of the annual distribution of daily maximum 1-hour concentrations does not exceed 100 ppb (188 µg/m³) at any location that constitutes ambient air. The commenters cite to CAA § 165 and 40 CFR §§ 71.2, 71.6(c)(a)(1) and 71.6(e)(1) in support of their argument that the permittee must demonstrate that the level of the NAAQS is not exceeded. The cited statute, however, applies to issuance of PSD permits, not to Title V permits such as this, and the regulation promulgated by EPA to implement that statutory provision plainly states that a source must demonstrate that it will not cause or contribute to “a violation of” any NAAQS, and does not refer to “an exceedance.” See 40 CFR § 52.21(k)(1). The Title V regulations cited by the commenters do not support the commenters position, and the commenters have provided no other information to support their contention that, for an air quality analysis submitted in connection with a Title V permit application or an Alaska minor source permit application, the applicant must establish that they will not cause or contribute to ambient concentrations that exceed the level of a NAAQS.

Comment V.1.c: Commenters state that Shell has understated maximum 1-hour NO₂ impacts by failing to accurately calculate the multiyear average of the 98th percentile of the annual distribution of daily maximum 1-hour values. The commenters continue that EPA estimated that, when evaluating the measured concentrations for a year’s worth of

monitoring data, the 98th percentile would be equivalent to the 7th or 8th highest daily maximum for the 365-day period. In calculating its compliance with the 1-hour NO₂ standard, the commenters assert, Shell selected the 8th highest daily maximum but that this is an underestimate of the true 98th percentile associated with its operations because Shell's drilling season is only 120 days long, and it modeled only that many days. The commenters conclude that selecting the 8th highest daily maximum from 120 days corresponds roughly to the 93rd percentile, not the 98th percentile, and that Shell has therefore failed to demonstrate that its proposed operations will not cause a violation of the NAAQS.

Response: Region 10 continues to believe that the air quality analysis performed by Shell in connection with the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS is consistent with 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W (Guideline on Air Quality Models) and EPA guidance for implementing the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. In practice, a modeling analysis performed for the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS can generally be summarized as a three step process involving the collection and preparation of appropriate background data, pairing background data with modeled impacts, and finally comparing the resulting total concentration to the NAAQS. Because the form of the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS is the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour averages, there can be a certain number of hourly values each year that exceed the NAAQS threshold. In Shell's analysis, two years of monitoring data are available and one year of modeled results are available and were used in the modeling analysis.

For the first step, Shell calculated diurnal hourly background values (that is, a background value for each hour of day) for the drilling season (a 5 month period) using background monitoring data collected in 2009 and 2010 for the Beaufort Sea. Shell took all available hourly NO₂ data during the drilling season period for a particular hour and calculated, for that hour, the 98th percentile NO₂ concentration recorded for that hour in each of the two years of available monitoring data. 40 CFR Part 50, Appendix S, Table 1 prescribes the rank associated with the 98th percentile value based on the number of available valid samples within a period.¹⁵ Following this procedure for determining a 98th percentile of the monitoring data for each hour, Shell used a 2nd, 3rd or 4th high, depending on the number of available data points, to determine the hourly 98th percentile value (*i.e.*, if 153 hourly values were available, the 4th high represented the 98th percentile for this hour, while a data set with only 100 hourly values would use the 2nd high to represent the 98th percentile for that hour). For each hour, the 98th percentile result for each year is averaged and this average hourly value is then used to pair with the respective modeled result for that hour. The result of this approach is a generic day's worth of NO₂ background data that represents the 98th percentile value for each hour in a drilling season. Results of this procedure are found in a spreadsheet entitled "Shell_Diurnal_NO2_Background_Kulluk_04182011-stats.xls" submitted by Shell's consultant on May 4, 2011. The spreadsheet was part of a larger submittal transmitted under a technical memorandum entitled "UPDATES TO AIR QUALITY IMPACT ANALYSIS – KULLUK DRILLSHIP." Region 10 determined that this approach

¹⁵The 1-hour NO₂ standard is based on the 98th percentile (8th highest) of the annual distribution of maximum daily 1-hour values. March 2011 1-Hour NO₂ Modeling Guidance at 1, fn. 1.

followed EPA guidance and provides a representative monitored hour by season diurnal profile for the drilling season.

For the second and third steps, Shell paired, for each modeled hour and receptor location (again, over a 5 month period), the result of the modeled impact with the hourly monitored background value for that hour calculated in step 1 above. The highest hourly total concentration (paired modeled and monitored impact) in a calendar day was then calculated, and the 8th highest paired modeled/monitored impact for each receptor was used to compare with the NAAQS. Using the 8th highest value that occurred over the 5 month drilling season is appropriate because emissions from Shell's operations during periods other than the drilling season are zero (so the total concentration consists only of the background value, yet the form of the standard is a 3-year average of the 98th percentile daily 1-hour maximums). The time period during which no drilling will be occurring is therefore considered in determining the annual 98th percentile value for each year and the 3-year average of annual 98th percentile values, but, because there will be no emissions from Shell's operations in the total concentration during the periods of no drilling, the 8 highest total concentrations for a given year are not predicted to occur during this period, but instead are predicted to occur during the drilling season for that year. In other words, although there are 365 days used in the 98th percentile calculation, the majority of these days (7 months worth) will have no Shell impacts because Shell is not permitted to operate outside of the 5 month drilling season. Because of this, the 8 highest values, and thus the 98th percentile value, are all days that fall within the drilling season. The commenters have not identified any day outside of the drilling season that would have had a higher total concentration than the 8th highest total concentration during the drilling season.

In summary, Region 10 disagrees with the commenters that selecting the 8th highest daily maximum from 120 days corresponds to the 93rd percentile, not the 98th percentile. For the monitored background data, Shell was required to use a 2nd, 3rd, or 4th high value depending on the available data because the monitored data relied on in the modeling analysis consisted of less than a year (approximately 5 months). For the modeled impacts, which are paired with the monitored data, however, Shell appropriately used the 8th high modeled-plus-background value, which is the 98th percentile among the 365 days of the year (the timeframe averaged as part of the standard) and evaluated this value against the NAAQS. This approach is consistent with EPA guidance for the 1-hour NO₂ standard. March 2011 1-Hour NO₂ Modeling Guidance at 2 (discussing the procedure for demonstrating compliance with the NAAQS) and 17-21 (describing the appropriate methodology for incorporating background concentrations into a 1-hour impact analysis).

It is important to note that there are several conservative assumptions that will likely result in substantially lower total concentrations than those predicted by the model. One such assumption is that the modeling assumed the Kulluk will be located at the same drill site for the entire three year period considered in the modeling analysis for the 1-hour NO₂ standard. In the more likely event that Shell will be operating at a different drill site in each of the three years (and possibly more than one drill site in each year), the expected 3-year average of the 98th percentile concentrations at each drill site would be

much lower. Another conservative assumption underlying the modeling analysis is the fact that the background data used to represent offshore conditions was collected onshore, where it is influenced by local sources. See response to comments in Category U.

Comment V.1.d Commenters contend that Region 10 has failed to ensure that Shell's modeling assumptions reflect actual operating conditions because Shell does not establish that its modeling captures all realistic combinations of allowable operations, background levels, and meteorological conditions that may result in maximum impacts. In modeling its effect on 1-hour NO₂ standards, the commenters assert, Shell assumes a perfect choreography of closely-timed events and favorable conditions and lines up events and conditions in an unrealistically precise manner by varying—for every hour of its proposed 2,880 hours of operation— meteorological conditions, background concentrations, and fleet operations. This method of modeling operations, the commenters continue, is therefore likely not representative of actual operating conditions, does not capture a full, realistic range of potential operations and conditions, and is vulnerable to missing maximum impacts. Thus, the commenters conclude, Shell has not demonstrated compliance with applicable standards, including the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. For example, the commenters state that Shell has used day to day meteorological conditions from 2009 and 2010 to determine the future positions of its ships hour by hour, rotating its vessels in accordance with the wind direction from those prior years, but that it is unlikely the wind will behave in the same manner on a daily basis in future years and that by shifting the position of its vessels, Shell could be diluting concentrations in a way that masks even greater impacts. For example, the commenters continue, Shell will miss maximum 24-hour PM_{2.5} impacts if Shell assumes the ships will be shifting position every hour when in fact the wind is steady and the vessels operate in one position. The commenters assert that Shell's modeling should be based instead on scenarios in which meteorological conditions, background concentrations, and vessel operations combine to maximize impacts and reproduces the full range of operating scenarios and impacts.

Response: Region 10 believes the combinations of operating conditions modeled by Shell accurately reflect the expected emissions that will occur with the permitted operations. It is not possible to model all potential combinations of emissions scenarios, thus the need to select conservatively representative emissions scenarios that conform to the permitted emission rates.

Region 10 carefully reviewed the emissions scenarios and required several model iterations using two different drilling start times such that all hours during the drilling season are accounted for. While Region 10 acknowledges the actual operations will not exactly mirror what was modeled, the approach taken is expected to conservatively represent permitted emissions during a drilling season. The comment does not identify any realistic range of potential operations and conditions that have not been captured in the conservatively representative emissions scenarios used in the modeling supporting these permits.

Region 10 also disagrees that there is a "perfect choreography of closely-timed events and favorable conditions" and that Shell's modeling "lines up events and conditions in an

unrealistically precise manner.” The emissions sequences used in the modeling reflect the general sequence of drilling operations as they would be expected to occur. Obviously, the sequence will not exactly mirror that modeled but the general order is correct and reflective of what is allowed in the permit. The other conditions the commenters discuss, such as lining up meteorological and background values, are reflective of actual collected data which, when coupled with conservative assumptions, such as orienting the Associated Fleet with hourly modeled wind direction and using emission release characteristics based on actual meteorological conditions, result in a conservative analysis which has demonstrated compliance with the NAAQS. The meteorological data relied on by Shell adequately reflects representative meteorological conditions. Applicants are not required to demonstrate compliance under non-representative conditions. The commenters present a hypothetical concern regarding persistent wind directions, but they do not provide information showing that this concern is realistic and, if so, whether it is a condition that was not represented in the modeled data set. Moreover, the wind roses provided in Shell’s application shows the frequency of winds from any given direction. See Permit Application Supplement, Figure 3-5, at 61. As shown by these figures, the meteorological data used by Shell contains frequent easterly winds. Therefore, the concern expressed by the commenters was in fact, addressed in Shell’s modeling analysis.

Moreover, as discussed in response to comment V.1.c and V.2.b, there are several other conservative assumptions underlying the modeling that are not related to the operating scenarios. These assumptions, in conjunction with the reasonable operating scenarios modeled by Shell, make it very unlikely that actual impacts will in fact cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS.

Comment V.1.e: Commenters state that Shell has not demonstrated that it will comply with the health based standards for NO₂ and that Shell's own modeling shows that its operations could cause pollution levels to reach 81% of allowable concentrations of NO₂. The commenters also note that high levels can cause breathing problems, particularly asthma, and impacts the elderly and small children.

Response: See response to comment V.1.a. By stating that Shell’s modeled emissions (which in this case include background concentrations) could cause pollution levels to reach 81% of allowable 1-hour concentrations of NO₂, the commenters appear to concede that emissions from Shell’s proposed operations will not cause or contribute to a violation of the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS.

Region 10 also notes that in its permit application Shell requested an aggregate limit for the three Kulluk deck cranes. However, the modeling initially provided by Shell did not support aggregate limits. During the public comment period, Shell again requested an aggregate limit for the Kulluk deck crane engines and provided modeling to support this request. This modeling, which was reviewed by Region 10, showed a minimal increase in the maximum modeled concentration to 86% of the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. This change does not increase the source’s potential to emit. For additional discussion of the modeling and revised limit see response to comment HH.4.

V.2 SUBCATEGORY – BACKGROUND DATA FOR 1-HOUR NO₂/ USE OF PAIRED DATA

Comment V.2.a: Commenters note that Shell used day-to-day meteorological conditions from 2009 and 2010 to determine the future positions of its ships, rotating its vessels in accordance with wind direction from those prior years. The commenters state that the wind will not behave in the same manner on a daily basis in future years, and that by shifting the position of the vessels, Shell could be diluting concentrations in a way that masks even greater impacts. As an example, commenters state that Shell would miss maximum 24-hour PM_{2.5} impacts if it assumes the ships will be shifting position every hour, when in fact the wind is steady and the vessels operate in one position.

Response: While Region 10 acknowledges the actual operations will not exactly mirror what was modeled, the approach taken is expected to conservatively represent permitted emissions during a drilling season. The commenters present a hypothetical concern regarding persistent wind directions, but they do not present information showing that this concern is realistic and, if so, whether it is a condition that was not represented in the modeled data set. See response to comment V.1.d.

Comment V.2.b: Commenters state that Shell has understated 1-hour NO₂ impacts by using background data in a manner that understates health and environmental risks and does not demonstrate compliance with the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS because Shell has used background ambient air data in a manner that systematically understates the impact of its operations. The commenters contend that Shell has neglected to use the highest background pollution levels measured in the vicinity of its proposed operations and has instead adjusted background ambient air data by using multiyear averages of the 98th percentile background concentrations for each hour of the day. The commenters argue that Shell has made two downward adjustments: in addition to discounting the highest concentrations caused by its operations, Shell has assumed that such concentrations will not occur at a time when background concentrations are at their highest observed levels. The commenters contend that this has the effect of “compounding” the 98th percentile adjustment, thereby understating the true maximum impacts that may occur as a consequence of Shell’s operations. Although acknowledging that EPA has indicated that this technique may be appropriate in some circumstances, the commenters contend that this guidance is not consistent with the 1-hour NO₂ standard itself, which they claim is evaluated with a single adjustment for the 98th percentile, and that even that adjustment may not be applicable to this permitting action. According to the commenters, Shell’s manner of selecting 1-hour NO₂ background data for use in its model disregards the highest possible background levels, underestimates the true maximum impact of Shell’s operations, and fails to demonstrate that it will not cause a violation of air quality standards.

Response: The 98th percentile of the monitored background concentrations based on the Deadhorse monitors along the Beaufort Sea is a conservative estimate of the background levels at the location of the 98th percentile of the modeled concentrations, and therefore provides a conservative estimate of cumulative NO₂ impacts from Shell’s operation. Using background concentrations from onshore monitors is a conservative estimate of

offshore NO₂ concentrations, where Shell's operations will be located because the onshore monitors are influenced by local sources. See responses to comments in Category U.

The modeled to monitored pairing approach is also appropriate as there may be changes in NO₂ values throughout the season or time of day. Take, for example, space heating using propane or diesel, which will occur more during the colder months than in the 5 month season of July through November when operations are authorized under the permits. Combustion of propane or diesel for space heating may cause higher monitored NO₂ values in onshore locations (and thus higher background values reflected in the background monitoring data incorporated into Shell's analysis), and this may occur during the 7 month period Shell is not authorized to operate under the permit. Conversely, there may be more activity of other types during the summer months associated with NO₂ emissions. If this is the case, this should be reflected in the background monitoring data incorporated into the modeling analysis. These simple examples help illustrate why, consistent with EPA guidance on modeling for the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS, using a seasonal monitored value is appropriate for this NAAQS standard. A similar argument will hold for hourly readings during the day. At any one time, a monitor may be impacted by a single source. For that impact to occur and be captured by the monitor the wind has to move or transport the emissions from the source to the monitor. At this point in time the monitor may read a high value, but another location in the vicinity may be experiencing no impacts. By using an average 98th percentile by hour of the day, Region 10 is attempting to account for systematic variations in activities and transport that may be occurring and that would lead to a higher or lower monitoring concentration in any one hour. Region 10 is also attempting to use an appropriate background monitoring value for the entire offshore modeled area. The averaging approach by hour and season used by Shell provides a more realistic but still conservative background value to use for such a large area.

It is also important to consider the form of the standard, which is based on probability. The modeling/monitoring pairing approach used by Shell uses a background concentration for all receptors, again, that is based on a two-year average of the annual 98th percentile value by hour and season. In reality, the actual NO₂ monitoring data indicates there are many hours with zero monitored concentrations. So the pairing approach Shell has used is already increasing the probability of a high modeled value corresponding to a relatively high background value, when in reality the actual monitoring values show many hours of zeros. When this pairing approach is coupled with other assumptions, such as the Kulluk remaining at a single drill location for 3 years, which also increases the probability of high modeled results at a receptor, the end result is a conservative analysis. Even with these conservative assumptions, the analysis has demonstrated that the NAAQS is protected.

Finally, there is no requirement that even a PSD modeling analysis for compliance with the NAAQS be based on "the true maximum impacts that may occur," and using the overall highest 1-hour monitored 1-hour NO₂ concentration as a background value would be overly conservative in this case. Region 10 strongly disagrees with the commenter

that compounding adjustments have occurred which will understate the potential maximum impacts. Region 10 believes instead that it is more likely that compounding assumptions actually increase the probability that the analysis Shell submitted would overstate actual impacts at any single receptor. These assumptions include such things as a single well location for three years, having the Associated Fleet always aligned with the prevailing wind directions, not averaging across three years of meteorological data, and using onshore monitoring data to represent overwater locations while using a diurnal pattern of background monitoring values for all hours when monitoring shows many hours of lower concentrations. All of these assumptions compound to form an analysis weighted towards conservatism. See also responses to comments V.1.c, V.2.b, and U.2.

Comment V.2.c: Some commenters support Region 10's decision not to allow a PM_{2.5} modeling analysis that pairs modeled data with monitored data (in time) to determine compliance with the NAAQS, and contend that EPA has in the past said, that pairing data does not ensure protection of the air quality standards, citing to a letter from EPA Region 8. The commenters assert that this approach is needed to ensure that a violation will not occur in the future, not simply to determine that a violation occurred over the period of time modeled. The commenters state that even in recently allowing limited, case-by-case situations where paired data can be modeled to demonstrate compliance with the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS, EPA is admitting that this type of analysis results in "a less conservative" estimate of impacts, citing to EPA's March 1, 2011 NO₂ Modeling memo. Although these commenters support Region 10's decision not to allow pairing of NO₂ data as Shell originally proposed (*i.e.*, hour-by-hour pairing of modeled concentrations with background concentrations), the commenters do not agree that the diurnal pairing of the 2-year average of the 98th percentile NO₂ concentrations by hour (based on the number of samples) between July 1 and November 30 with corresponding modeled concentrations for that hour is protective enough of the NAAQS. The commenters state that a more protective approach would be to use the 98th percentile of the annual distribution of daily maximum 1-hour average values averaged across the 2-year meteorological data period used in the dispersion modeling and that a more conservative approach is warranted in this case given the fact that the modeling is not based on source specific data and Shell may be under-predicting impacts. The commenters conclude that the use of diurnal pairing results in a less conservative analysis and, given that modeling is based on generic source parameters, this approach does not seem warranted.

Response: The pairing approach used in the 24-hour PM_{2.5} modeling analysis uses the maximum modeled 24-hour PM_{2.5} concentrations averaged over modeled drilling seasons 2009 and 2010, and this value is paired with a representative 98th percentile monitored background concentration for evaluation against the NAAQS. This approach follows EPA guidance and is conservative.

Concerning pairing for the 1-hour NO₂ standard, Region 10 acknowledges the approach taken is potentially "a less conservative" approach than using the 98th percentile annual distribution. The Region believes the approach taken, however, is still protective of the NAAQS and is consistent with EPA guidance. The commenters also fail to address the difference between the two standards, mainly the averaging period of 1-hour versus 24-

hours, and offer no explanation why the pairing approach used for the 1-hour NO₂ standard is not valid and conservative. In addition, it is appropriate to account for diurnal (daily) and seasonal patterns in pairing modeled concentrations with monitored background concentrations. Pairing the 98th percentile of the annual background with the 98th percentile modeled contribution, irrespective of these diurnal or seasonal patterns, may impose additional conservatism that is not warranted. The seasonal pattern is especially relevant in this case because the permits limit operations to a defined period (or season.) Please also see response to comments V.3.a and V.3.b.

V.3 SUBCATEGORY – NO₂/NO_x RATIO

Comment V.3.a: Noting that that the Plume Volume Molar Ratio Method (PVMRM) algorithm used in the ambient analysis to determine the atmospheric conversion of NO_x to NO₂ requires estimates of in-stack ratios of NO₂/NO_x, some commenters assert that these in-stack ratios appear to be important parameters in the modeling. The commenters go on to state that Region 10 must therefore ensure the ratios used are protective of the NAAQS since small changes to the ratios used could have a significant impact on modeled concentrations. The commenters contend that this is especially important in this case given the fact that Shell is requesting approval for the least-conservative options for modeling 1-hour NO₂ impacts (*i.e.*, using the non-regulatory-default PRVRM option – a Tier 3 application under Section 5.2.4, App W that requires Regional approval – and pairing NO₂ data in time.

Response: While EPA has placed greater emphasis on the in-stack NO₂/NO_x ratios required for the PVMRM and OLM Tier 3 options in relation to the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS as compared to the annual NO₂ NAAQS, due to both the increased stringency and 1-hour daily maximum form of the new standard, the relative importance of this parameter will vary from one application to another. Region 10 cautions against overstating the importance of this input parameter. The relative importance of the in-stack ratios will depend on several factors, including source characteristics, meteorological conditions and background ozone concentrations, but the commenters have provided no support for their broad statement that “small changes to the ratios used could have a significant impact on modeled concentrations.” In the extreme case, in terms of the relative importance of the in-stack ratio, with significant ozone-limiting conditions, stable worst-case meteorological conditions and very close ambient air boundary, a small change in the in-stack ratio would only result in a correspondingly small change in the modeled concentrations.

The commenters are correct that Region 10 required Shell to do several iterations of modeling with varying in-stack ratios based on engine testing (*See* 4/29/11 Shell modeling submittal *Alternate_NO₂_Modeling_Disco_04_29_2011.pdf*). This additional analysis did not indicate significant changes in the modeled 1-hour NO₂ concentrations. Region 10 believes Shell has demonstrated the ratios used are protective of the NAAQS.

See also response to comment V.3.b.

Comment V.3.b: Commenters state that Region 10 must reject Shell's use of Plume Volume Molar Ratio Method (PVMRM) to demonstrate compliance with the 1-hour NO₂ standard because, the commenters assert, in predicting ambient air impacts, the PVMRM significantly understates the extent to which nitric oxide (NO) will convert to NO₂ in the presence of ozone. The commenters note that Region 10 has specifically requested public comment on Shell's use of the PVMRM as a component of its ambient air modeling. The commenters contend that PVMRM fixates on the short-term rates of conversion, even though nearly all NO is eventually converted to NO₂. In reaching this conclusion, the commenters state that the NO_x emissions created during combustion (as occurs in Shell's ship engines and other equipment) are emitted partly as NO and partly as NO₂. Once in the atmosphere, the commenters continue, NO interacts with ozone and is ultimately converted to NO₂, but compliance with the final 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS is calculated by measuring NO₂ alone. The commenters assert that the use of PVMRM also contradicts and undermines the underlying assumptions of the NO₂ standard itself. Although NO₂ was chosen as the indicator, the commenters state that EPA intended for the 1-hour standard to not only reduce NO₂ levels, but to provide a corresponding reduction in other harmful nitrogen oxides as well. The commenters contend that PVMRM is necessarily unacceptable because it allows modelers to hide other harmful nitrogen oxides in low NO₂/NO_x ratios, resulting in a substantial understatement of total concentrations. Thus, in order to maintain consistency with EPA's declared purpose of using NO₂ as an indicator to reduce total NO_x, the commenters conclude, Region 10 must reject Shell's use of PVMRM.

Response: The modeling conducted by Shell is consistent with EPA's June 2010 1-hour NO₂ Modeling Guidance recognizing PVMRM as a Tier 3 modeling approach. The commenters have provided no information to show that Shell's use of PVMRM is inconsistent with that guidance. Moreover, the commenters have provided no information to support the assertion that "PVMRM significantly understates the extent to which NO will convert to NO₂ in the presence of ozone." The statement that "PVMRM fixates on the short-term rates of conversion" is incorrect. PVMRM determines the amount of available ozone on a receptor-by-receptor basis, which means the resulting NO₂ to NO_x ratio can vary on a receptor-by-receptor basis and on an hourly basis. PVMRM also includes an assumed upper limit of 0.9 for the resulting ambient NO₂ to NO_x ratio, which means "nearly all" of the NO could be converted to NO₂ under certain circumstances.

Concerning the commenters' concern with NO in connection with the NO₂ standard itself, this issue is beyond the scope of this permitting action. NO is not included directly in the regulatory NAAQS analysis because the NAAQS is written in terms of NO₂ and not NO. This analysis has considered conversion of NO to NO₂, which meets the regulatory permitting requirements at issue in this permitting action.

Comment V.3.c: Commenters assert that Region 10's reliance on the NO₂/NO_x ratios obtained from the Discoverer tests is not reasonable. A comparison of the emission units on the Discoverer and the Kulluk demonstrates that even if Shell potentially could use data from other vessels as source specific data—which it cannot—it would nevertheless

be barred from doing so by an absence of similarity. The commenter notes that some of the Discoverer's and Kulluk's emission units are not only of different size and make, but also have varying emission controls installed – something that Shell found affects NO₂/NO_x ratios. For instance, the Discoverer's deck cranes have catalytic diesel particulate filters installed, while the Kulluk's cranes have oxidation catalyst installed.

Response: Region 10 disagrees that there is an absence of similarity between the Discoverer emission units and the Kulluk emission units. Emission units have similarity at a much higher level than the very specific make/model level. Emission units are routinely classified and grouped by scholars, industry, and EPA according to what the units are or how they operate. Examples of these various groupings can be found throughout technical literature, including engineering textbooks or even EPA's *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors* (AP-42). Units can be grouped in this manner because of known similarities in one or more factors.

Shell used commonly used groupings in developing their NO₂-to-NO_x ratio approach. They classified their emission units as: reciprocating engines with post-combustion controls; reciprocating engines without post-combustion controls; boilers (without post-combustion controls); and incinerators (without post-combustion controls). While not highlighted in their application, it is important to note that all units within each classification also burn the same fuel (diesel).

Shell's level of classification would not be adequately refined for all aspects of a permit application. However, it is suitable for purposes of developing an NO₂-to-NO_x ratio for purposes of submitting a modeling analysis for the probabilistic 1-hour NO₂ standard. The probabilistic form of the standard creates a challenge when modeling emission units with numerous and variable exhaust parameters (including the NO₂-to-NO_x ratio). The March 2011 1-Hour NO₂ Modeling Guidance provides that the in-stack NO₂-to-NO_x ratio could be accepted "provided some reasonable demonstration can be made..." Shell has made this demonstration by using the in-stack ratios obtained from 90 sources tests of similar emission units. This is a much larger data set than what Region 10 has seen from any other applicant. Region 10 therefore considers it adequate for purposes of modeling 1-hour NO₂ impacts.

A sensitivity analysis conducted by Shell in support of the Discoverer permit adds further credence for using the Discoverer data for the Kulluk. Region 10 asked Shell to compare the 1-hour NO₂ impacts from an analysis using Shell's generic ratios, derived in a similar manner as what was done for the Kulluk, with the 1-hour NO₂ impacts from an analysis using the actual tested ratios for individual permitted equipment. The modeled results were not only similar between the two runs, but it was actually the generic ratios that provided the higher modeled concentrations in the worst case (the Chukchi Sea). With all the testing Shell has performed for similar engine types, it is reasonable to conclude, using professional judgment and experience, that Shell's in-stack ratios are representative of the proposed emission units, especially in light of the conservative nature of their other modeling assumptions.

Given the probabilistic form of the standard and the large number of engines involved, even though the testing shows varying ratios it is very unlikely that all the engines that are permitted to operate concurrently would operate at their individual worst case ratio, while at the highest permitted emission rate, during worst case meteorological conditions, over three consecutive years. The conservatism of these assumptions becomes even greater considering that the Kulluk is unlikely to be operating at the exact same location for three consecutive drilling seasons.

Comment V.3.d: Commenters state that Shell failed to demonstrate that its stack tests generated reliable data for the Discoverer operations, and therefore Shell cannot claim the data are reliable for use with the Kulluk operations. The commenters contend that Shell's Kulluk and Discoverer operations both would be highly complex, involving a large number of emission units and many operating scenarios, and that the NO₂/NO_x ratio for each emission unit could vary widely depending on the load at which Shell operates it. Yet, the commenters continue, Shell conducted only 90 stack tests to determine the various NO₂/NO_x ratios associated with the Discoverer operations. The commenters note that Region 10 required Shell to perform additional modeling for the Discoverer, but that these tests were insufficient to reveal the full range of emission ratios that might actually occur during Shell's operations. The commenters state that even Shell admits that its results are not trustworthy, stating that its results contained unexplained high ratios. The commenters state that Shell compounded this problem by averaging the high ratios with the lower ratios, rather than performing more tests to either explain the results or actually gather real source-specific data. Thus, the commenters believe that Shell's ratios are not dependable for use with its Kulluk operations because they are not even dependable for use with its Discoverer operations.

Response: Region 10 disagrees with the comment. As noted in our response to comment V.3.c, 90 is an unusually large number of source tests to support a permit application. While more data is always desirable, this data pool is adequate for purposes of deriving in-stack NO₂-to-NO_x ratios for the Discoverer and the Kulluk emission units. Region 10 further notes that while some of the results may be unexplained, that does not make those data points wrong. In addition, the probabilistic form of the 1-hour NO₂ standard is explicitly intended to mitigate the impact from possible outliers, and on that basis alone it would be inappropriate to combine a worst-case in-stack ratio with a worst-case emission rate as the basis for demonstrating compliance with the NAAQS in the absence of a clear linkage between the in-stack ratio and emission rate for a particular source that would justify such an approach.

Region 10 asked Shell to perform additional modeling for the Discoverer in order to determine how sensitive the 1-hour NO₂ modeling results are to small variations in the in-stack ratios. Shell's analysis showed that generic ratios and actual ratios provide similar results. This analysis further confirms that Shell's reliance on the generic conclusions obtained from the Discoverer sources tests is reasonable and does not compromise the adequacy of the 1-hour NO₂ modeling analysis conducted for the Kulluk.

Comment V.3.e: Commenters contend that Region 10 and Shell have not provided any basis for concluding that the NO₂/NO_x ratios used in Shell's modeling are representative of the ratios that actually may result from Shell's operations. Due to the importance of these ratios to assessing 1-hour NO₂ impacts, the commenters state, Shell cannot say that it has demonstrated compliance with the standard. The commenters request that, if Shell refuses to gather source-specific data, Region 10 direct Shell to use the default in-stack ratio of 0.5.

Response: As stated in EPA's March 2011 1-Hour NO₂ Modeling Guidance, EPA recommends 0.5 as a default in-stack ratio *in the absence of more appropriate source-specific information on in-stack ratios* (emphasis added). EPA did not state, or intend, that only unit-specific source test data may be used to justify a non-default value. The guidance clearly indicates a preference for the use of "more appropriate source-specific information (emphasis added)" when available, and also acknowledges that "well-documented data on in-stack NO₂/NO_x ratios is still limited for many source categories (emphasis added)." As discussed in Region 10's response to comments V.3.c and V.3.d, the Kulluk emission units are not only similar to the Discoverer emission units, but the large number of Discoverer source test data provides a very adequate basis for justifying the Kulluk in-stack ratios as being "more appropriate source-specific information" than the default ratio used in these modeling analyses.

Comment V.3.f: Commenters note that Region 10 relied on the source-specific test data from the Discoverer for the Kulluk as a reasonable approach given the similarity in emission units. The commenters disagree that source-specific test data from a source applying BACT is sufficiently representative of the range of possible units used as part of the Kulluk operations. The commenters contend that because the Kulluk permit does not specify equipment make and model, Region 10 must use the most conservative generic ratio to represent the worst-case operating scenario. Commenters note that when source-specific data is not available, EPA recommends the use of 0.50 as a default in-stack ratio for purposes of modeling 1-hour NO₂ impacts. In the Technical Support Document Region 10 claims that Shell is using the preferred approach of obtaining source-specific data, rather than the 0.5 default. The commenters further state that Region 10 contradicts this statement by relying on data from source tests of the Discoverer's drillship and associated fleet.

Response: The commenters have not shown why the in-stack ratio must be make/model-specific, or why source-test data from similar emission units would be inadequate when demonstrating compliance with the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. As previously noted in response to comment V.3.e, EPA said that the 0.5 in-stack ratio should be used "in the absence of more appropriate source-specific information." EPA did not rule out the use of class- or category-specific data as an allowed source of more appropriate information. See also the other responses to comments in this Subcategory V.3.

Comment V.3.g: Commenters state that it is unclear how the generic ratio compares to the ratios used in Shell's modeling for the Kulluk that is based on source testing from the

Discoverer drilling operations. The commenters contend that there are no supporting data presented in the air quality impact analysis for the Kulluk or included in the administrative record files that specify the ratios used in the Kulluk modeling. The commenters note that the source test data provided as part of the revised Discoverer permits (and included in the administrative record files for the Kulluk) shows that the equipment-specific ratios are consistently significantly lower than the generic value of 0.5. Given the significance of this parameter in the modeling, the commenters believe that Region 10 should use the most protective values and request that the Region use the generic ratio value of 0.5 for the PVMRM modeling algorithm.

Response: The 0.5 value is characterized in EPA’s guidance as “a reasonable upper bound based on the available in-stack data” from a *wide variety* of source categories that can be used without additional justification. EPA never stated that 0.5 is “representative” of *all* source categories. Therefore, it is not surprising that actual source test data from any given sub-set (e.g., diesel-fired reciprocating engines without post-combustion controls) leads to a smaller value, as is the case here. The March 2011 1-Hour NO₂ Modeling Guidance also clearly indicates a preference for the use of “more appropriate source-specific information” when it is available.

With respect to the comment regarding the lack of supporting data, Shell provided the Discoverer source test data as part of the Kulluk application (as acknowledged by the commenter). They summarized the data and source group averages at pages 125-128 of the Permit Application Supplement, and provided a discussion regarding these data and how they were applied to their NO₂ modeling analysis in Section 3.9.2 on pages 67-68 of the Permit Application Supplement.

V.4 SUBCATEGORY – AREA POLYGONS

Comment V.4.a: Commenters assert that Shell’s use of area polygons to model the emissions of associated vessels underestimates impacts and that Shell has therefore not demonstrated compliance with applicable NAAQS and increments, as required by the Title V program. The commenters state that Shell’s modeling dilutes Shell’s associated vessel emissions over a large area, artificially reducing projected maximum impacts and that Region 10 should direct Shell to remodel impacts using a method that does not bias modeled impacts in this manner. Commenters assert that Shell’s use of area polygons rather than volume sources to represent the emissions of associated vessels results in the distribution of associated vessel emissions over large areas and that the ice breaker emissions appear to be distributed over an area of roughly eight square kilometers, while the emissions of other support vessels distributed over four square kilometers. By treating the associated vessel emissions in this manner, the commenters continue, Shell likely overestimates how much its ships will be moving and, further, underestimates short-term impacts to air quality. The commenters contend that the potential for underestimating impacts is particularly significant with short term standards like the 1-hour NO₂ standard.

Response: Region 10 carefully considered the assumptions and model settings used in Shell’s air quality analysis. In any modeling analysis, the applicant has choices in

configuring the model inputs to best reflect its operations. In AERMOD, there are various ways to characterize emissions, such as a point, volume, area circle, area polygon, open pit, or flare. The applicant must choose how to best characterize all their permitted emissions, and the permitting authority conducts a review to ensure the applicant's approach appropriately characterizes emission sources.

An area source is generally used to model low-level or ground level releases with no plume rise (such as storage piles, lagoons, etc), while a volume source is used to characterize releases from building roof vents, conveyer belts, etc. In this case, Shell chose to characterize its moving Associated Fleet as an area source, or more specifically, as an area polygon. The only difference between an area source and an area polygon is the ability to specify an arbitrary shape in the case of the area polygon.

Conceptually, the effect of using an area polygon is that the source's emissions during a given hour are treated as if emitted equally across the area of the polygon, rather than at a single point in the polygon. When applied to the Associated Fleet, this treats the vessels in the fleet as moving during an hour such that each vessel spends an equal portion of the hour in each possible position in the polygon. It appears that the commenters believe that each vessel should have been assumed to hold a single position during the hour, and that these positions be ones that would maximize the Associated Fleet's aggregate impact on 1-hour concentrations by aligning the vessels in the Fleet with each other and with the Kulluk's emissions along the same wind path. Alternatively, the commenters suggest that if an area polygon is used the size of the polygon should have been smaller so that the emissions from the Associated Fleet would have been more concentrated spatially, causing higher ambient concentrations.

Because the Associated Fleet emissions are associated with engines that have plume rise, which as stated above is not addressed in an area source configuration, Shell also had to characterize area source release parameters for every hour for their area polygons. Shell did this by running AERMOD in diagnostic mode using the lowest ice management vessel stack height with a line of receptors extending out to 5 km from the Kulluk. Shell then took the resulting plume height and sigma Z values for the maximum modeled receptor and used these parameters as the initial inputs for the area polygon sources. While this approach is novel and would not generally be performed due to the complexity of its implementation, Region 10 believes it does provide an accurate characterization of the Associated Fleet, which is an unusual source. The area polygon configuration was one of the areas carefully reviewed and considered. Region 10 believes the area polygon configuration along with the hourly emissions release characterizations provide an accurate representation of the moving Associated Fleet and will result in a conservative impact analysis that is protective of the NAAQS.

It would be inappropriate to require Shell to use fixed positions for vessels in the Associated Fleet or to use an area polygon configuration that is so small as to not reflect the reality of a moving support fleet. In fact, Shell states in its application that OSR vessels would generally operate within 1 to 5 km from the Kulluk, but were modeled as if they only operated within a 2 km by 2 km area. Shell stated, "This source

characterization is conservative since the OSR sources are continuously located much closer to the *Kulluk* than what would occur in reality.” Permit Application Supplement at 50. In addition, for each hour the polygons—both for the ice management vessels and OSR—are aligned with the modeled wind direction using the maximum permitted emissions with worst case release characteristics as described above, which results in a conservative analysis. Given that the vessels in the Associated Fleet have particular tasks to perform whenever they are within 25 miles of the Kulluk, it is unreasonable to assume that they all would hold fixed positions for a full hour. In addition, as discussed above in response to comments V.1.c and V.2.b several conservative assumptions, such as a single drilling location over a period of three years, underlie Shell’s modeling analysis.

Comment V.4.b: Commenters contend that due to the size of the area sources, associated vessels will never be modeled directly upwind or downwind of major Kulluk emission units. The commenters believe that the configuration of the area source prevents an accurate assessment of the maximum impacts that would be expected during alignment of the Kulluk and associated icebreakers.

Response: The size of the area sources reflects the expected range of operation for the Associated Fleet. It is unreasonable to assume that the vessels will only be located in a line immediately upwind or downwind of the Kulluk for the entire period of operation.

W. CATEGORY – AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS FOR PM_{2.5} NAAQS

W.1 SUBCATEGORY – IN GENERAL

Comment W.1.a: Commenters state that the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS was set at a level due to the large body of evidence that fine particulate is harmful to human health. The commenters also state that EPA found that PM_{2.5} exposure causes cardiovascular problems and can even cause death. The commenters note that the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS is based on the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the 24-hour concentrations. The commenters conclude that Shell has not demonstrated that it will comply with the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS and that Region 10 therefore cannot issue the permits.

Response: As discussed in the Statement of Basis and the Technical Support Document, the permit includes terms and conditions to ensure that emissions authorized under this permit will not cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS, including the PM_{2.5} NAAQS. The NAAQS are health-based standards, set at a level to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

Comment W.1.b: Commenters state that Shell has not demonstrated compliance with NAAQS because it unlawfully underestimated its maximum impacts. In issuing the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS, the commenters contend, EPA determined that NAAQS compliance would be based on “the 98th percentile of the annual 24-hour concentrations at each population-oriented monitor within an area, averaged over three years,” citing to 71

Fed. Reg. 61,144, 61,164 (Oct. 17, 2006). The commenters assert that EPA repeatedly indicated that this form was specific to determining area compliance by reviewing data from population-oriented monitors, and that there is no basis in the Clean Air Act nor the 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard itself for the permitting approach Region 10 has adopted here, namely, allowing a proposed new source to discount its highest projected impacts. The commenters continue that such an approach ignores both the importance of the absolute value of the NAAQS standard—which they state must be set at the requisite level to protect human health, as well as the Title V program requirement that a proposed permit include sufficient conditions to prevent a NAAQS exceedance. Commenters state that this issue is important because Shell’s modeling indicates it could cause pollution concentrations to exceed the NAAQS limit of 35 µg/m³ because adding Shell’s maximum modeled impact of 20.5 µg/m³ to Shell’s background value of 17.0 yields a value of 37.5 µg/m³.

Response: The commenters appear to be arguing that a source must demonstrate that the impact of its emissions does not exceed the level of the NAAQS. Region 10 disagrees with this position for the reasons discussed in response to comment V.1.b.

Comment W.1.c: Commenters state that Shell’s emissions of particulate matter could exceed health based limits and increments, and also contribute to climate change. The commenters state that Shell's modeling indicates that the particulate matter emissions could cause pollution levels to reach 97 % of health based standards and almost double the fine particulate matter increment.

Response: The modeling does indicate that Shell’s emissions, when added to background concentrations of PM_{2.5}, may come close to the NAAQS at the point of maximum modeled impacts, but the modeling also demonstrates that Shell is not expected to cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS at any location that constitutes ambient air. As discussed in the response to comments in Category Z, the permit does not need to assure compliance with the PM_{2.5} increment as a condition of obtaining this permit. With respect to climate change, please see the responses to comments in Subcategory BB.4.

Comment: A commenter states that they are not sure how the ocean air is going to distribute the particulates and expressed concern about the modeling.

Response: The modeling conducted in this case took into account the impact of Shell’s emissions in over water conditions. Technical Support Document at 27-28.

W.2 SUBCATEGORY – BACKGROUND DATA FOR 24-HOUR PM_{2.5} NAAQS

Comment W.2.a: Commenters state that, in its 24-hour PM_{2.5} analysis, Shell has understated its 98th percentile impact. Even if Shell could calculate its 24-hour PM_{2.5} impact by finding the 3-year average of its 98th percentile impacts, the commenters continue, Shell has not calculated that value correctly because, in selecting the background value for its 24-hour PM_{2.5} modeling, Shell eliminated days that had “high

windblown dust values.” The commenters state that Shell has not offered persuasive reasons for excluding these values which only may be excluded by EPA itself and only pursuant to the requirements of EPA’s “exceptional events rule” (citing 72 Fed. Reg. 13,560 (Mar. 22, 2007)), which Region 10 has not invoked here. After eliminating these days, the commenters assert, Shell then selected the 98th percentile value of the remaining days. The commenters conclude that Region 10’s apparent approval of this method plainly underestimates even the 98th percentile impact and that, instead of obtaining representative data and then finding the true 98th percentile, Shell has used unrepresentative data and then used the low quality of these data as an excuse to eliminate measurements until Shell gets the result it wants.

Response: Region 10 acknowledges that Shell excluded certain days from its determination of PM_{2.5} background values. However, Region 10 did not rely on Shell’s background values for its determination of compliance with the PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Rather, Region 10 independently determined the annual and 24-hour PM_{2.5} background values for the Deadhorse monitoring site (as well as the Badami monitoring site). While Shell’s approach of excluding days that were impacted by either wildfire or windblown dust might be appropriate depending on the circumstances, Region 10 took the more conservative approach of including those days in the dataset. As described in the Memorandum from Christopher Hall, Region 10, to Herman Wong, Region 10, re: EPA Region 10 Determination of Appropriate Background Values for the Chukchi Sea and Beaufort Sea OCS Permits, dated June 23, 2011 (Background Data Memo), and shown in Table 6 of that memo, as well as in Table 11 of the Technical Support Document (at 33), Region 10 used background values of 17 ug/m³ and 4 ug/m³ for the 24-hour and annual standards, respectively, calculated according to EPA’s regulations and guidance.

In conclusion, Region 10 did not exclude days with windblown dust events in determining the appropriate background concentration in connection with its review of the ambient impacts of Shell’s operations. Region 10 therefore disagrees with the commenter that the ambient impact analysis has understated the impact of Shell’s PM_{2.5} emissions.

W.3 SUBCATEGORY – SECONDARY PM_{2.5} FORMATION

Comment W.3.a: Commenters state that Region 10’s analysis of potential secondary PM_{2.5} formation remains insufficient because, despite the EAB’s clear direction on the issue, neither Shell nor Region 10 has performed a proper analysis of Shell’s potential contribution to secondary PM_{2.5}. Noting the EAB remanded the permits for the Discoverer to Region 10, in part, based on deficiencies in Region 10’s analysis for secondary PM_{2.5}, the commenters state that Shell cannot demonstrate compliance with NAAQS until it has performed a sufficient secondary PM_{2.5} analysis. The commenters contend that, in remanding the permitting decisions for the Discoverer to Region 10, the EAB specifically instructed that “the Region should . . . provide an explanation of why modeling secondary PM_{2.5} is necessary or not after determining whether PM_{2.5} precursors will be emitted in significant quantities.” The commenters conclude that Region 10 has ignored the EAB’s order noting that the Technical Support Document states that “Region

10 has not made a determination of whether PM_{2.5} precursor emissions from the project are significant” The commenters state that Region 10’s refusal to make a finding on the significance of Shell’s precursor emissions is noteworthy given that the Technical Support Document states that Shell’s emissions will exceed the regulatory “significant emission rate” for the precursor NO_x by many times and that Shell’s modeling already indicates it may cause 24-hour PM_{2.5} concentrations to reach 97% of the NAAQS. The commenters contend that Region 10’s approach does not provide any margin of safety in the PM_{2.5} NAAQS modeling analysis because the draft permit allows for only an additional 1 µg/m³ (an additional 3%) before the impacts of the Kulluk operations would be at the level of the NAAQS so a relatively small amount of secondary formation could cause a violation. The commenters also assert that, if Region 10 does not determine whether those precursor emissions are significant, it certainly cannot accurately estimate the amount of potential secondary PM_{2.5} formation and that Region 10 must assess directly whether Shell will emit a significant quantity of PM_{2.5} precursors. Instead, the commenters contend, Region 10 has based its determination primarily on a rough comparison of Shell’s potential emissions to North Slope emissions and the observations that North Slope sources do not currently appear to be contributing to substantial secondary formation in onshore communities. If a quantitative assessment of secondary PM_{2.5} impacts is not completed, the commenters assert, then Region 10 must, at the very least, provide for NAAQS compliance with a greater margin of safety that better reflects the uncertainty in secondary PM_{2.5} contributions to overall PM_{2.5} concentrations and is sufficient to ensure that potential secondary PM_{2.5} impacts would not cause or contribute to NAAQS violations.

Response: The EAB order referred to by the commenters is an order issued in connection the EAB’s remand to Region 10 of permits for Shell’s Discoverer drillship. See Shell Gulf of Mexico, Inc and Shell Offshore, Inc., Frontier Discoverer Drilling Units, OCS Appeal Nos. 10-01 through 10-04, Order on Four Additional Issues dated March 14, 2011 (Remand Order II). It is therefore not directly applicable to this permit proceeding. In any event, Region 10’s determination that secondary PM_{2.5} formation associated with precursor emissions from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet is not expected to cause or contribute to a violation of the PM_{2.5} NAAQS is consistent with current EPA guidance for addressing PM_{2.5} precursor emissions and the EAB Orders.

Acknowledging that EPA’s preferred dispersion model for near-field PM_{2.5} modeling (AERMOD) does not account for secondary formation of PM_{2.5}, EPA issued guidance on appropriate modeling procedures for demonstrating compliance with the PM_{2.5} NAAQS that relies upon ambient monitored concentrations to adequately account for the contribution of secondary PM_{2.5} to the cumulative impact assessment for demonstrating compliance with the NAAQS, in most cases. Memorandum from Stephen D. Page, OAQPS, re: Modeling Procedures for Demonstrating Compliance with PM_{2.5} NAAQS, dated March 23, 2010, at 9 (March 23, 2010 PM_{2.5} Guidance Memo). In issuing this guidance, EPA took into consideration the regional nature of secondary PM_{2.5} levels, and the fact that peak ambient impacts due to facility emissions of primary PM_{2.5} and secondarily-formed PM_{2.5} due to facility emissions of PM_{2.5} precursors are not likely to be well-correlated in space or time. The portion of EPA’s guidance at issue here states

that “[w]hile representative background monitoring data for PM_{2.5} should adequately account for secondary contribution from background sources in most cases, 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.

There are several points worth highlighting in relation to the March 23, 2010 PM_{2.5} Guidance Memo. Firstly, and at issue here, EPA does not explicitly define what “significant quantities of PM_{2.5} precursors” means in this context. In addition, EPA indicated in the March 23, 2010 PM_{2.5} Guidance Memo that “[w]e plan to issue separately additional guidance regarding this issue.” Id. In light of these considerations, Region 10 believes that the appropriate place to explain when “some assessment” of “potential” secondary PM_{2.5} contributions “may be necessary” is in the upcoming guidance that EPA plans to issue. As that guidance has not yet been issued, Region 10 here took a conservative approach by presuming that the Kulluk and Associated Fleet do emit “significant quantities” of PM_{2.5} precursors, and then assessing the potential contributions of PM_{2.5} precursor emissions to the formation of secondary PM_{2.5}.

In addition, Region 10 disagrees with the commenters’ inference that the reference in the March 23, 2010 PM_{2.5} Guidance Memo to “some assessment” of the source’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts implies a requirement that modeling be conducted. The fact that the guidance refers to “some assessment” rather than a “modeling demonstration” indicates that an “assessment” could be comprised of qualitative and/or quantitative analyses, including a modeling demonstration if appropriate, but it is certainly not limited to nor dependent on a modeling demonstration.

The commenter is correct that, in issuing the Draft Permit, Region 10 did not make an explicit determination of whether the project emits “significant quantities” of PM_{2.5} precursors as that term is used in the March 23, 2010 PM_{2.5} Guidance Memo. See Technical Support Document at 21, fn.4. Instead, Region 10 took a conservative approach and presumed that the Kulluk and Associated Fleet do emit “significant quantities” of PM_{2.5} precursors, and then conducted an assessment of the potential contributions of PM_{2.5} precursor emissions to the formation of secondary PM_{2.5}, consistent with the March 23, 2010 PM_{2.5} Guidance Memo. Region 10 then concluded for the reasons explained in the Technical Support Document that modeling is not necessary to demonstrate that secondary PM_{2.5} formation from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet is not expected to cause or contribute to a violation of the PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

In support of the Draft Permit, Region 10 provided a detailed explanation for why it believes that modeling secondary PM_{2.5} emissions is not needed in order to determine that emissions of PM_{2.5} precursors from the Kulluk and Associated Fleet would not, together with emissions of primary PM_{2.5}, cause or contribute to a violation of the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. The factors Region 10 relied on to reach this conclusion include:

- 1) The background PM_{2.5} monitoring data considered in the air quality analysis is quality assured, quality controlled data from Deadhorse that includes impacts from onshore sources. This monitor is expected to have accounted for much of the

secondary formation from existing regional emission sources that will occur in the Beaufort Sea region. Available monitoring data from onshore communities along the Beaufort Sea and in potential transport areas where monitoring is performed show low levels of daily PM_{2.5}, generally in the range of 2 µg/m³, with the higher PM_{2.5} values generally occurring on days where windblown dust or fires are believed to be contributing factors. Thus, there is no indication that secondary formation of PM_{2.5} from existing sources in the North Slope is currently causing or contributing to exceedances or a violation of the PM_{2.5} NAAQS in the onshore communities.

- 2) Modeled primary PM_{2.5} impacts from the Kulluk and Associated Fleet that, when using a conservative “First Tier” approach to combining modeled primary PM_{2.5} impacts with monitored background PM_{2.5}, concentrations are below the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. As the commenters note, the maximum modeled concentration is 97% of the PM_{2.5} NAAQS at the assumed ambient air boundary (500 meters from the hull of the Discoverer), but the levels decrease as the distance from the Kulluk decreases.
- 3) Secondary PM_{2.5} impacts associated with the Kulluk and Associated Fleet precursor emissions are expected to be low near the emission release points where modeled concentrations associated with primary PM_{2.5} emissions are highest, because there has not been enough time for the secondary chemical reactions to occur. Conversely, secondary PM_{2.5} impacts are more likely to be higher farther from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet where impacts from primary PM_{2.5} emissions from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet are expected to be lower. This makes it unlikely that maximum primary PM_{2.5} impacts and maximum secondary PM_{2.5} impacts from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet will occur at the same time (paired in time) or location (paired in space). See March 23, 2010 PM_{2.5} Guidance Memo at 9.
- 4) The relatively small amount of NO_x emissions (a PM_{2.5} precursor) that will be authorized under this permit in comparison to existing NO_x emissions in the North Slope area in general, together with the generally low levels of PM_{2.5} recorded at monitoring stations in the area, make it unlikely that NO_x emissions from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet would cause or contribute to a violation of the PM_{2.5} NAAQS.
- 5) The background concentrations of certain chemical species that participate in photochemical reactions to form secondary PM_{2.5}, including ammonia and volatile organic compounds, are expected to be negligible in the offshore air masses where the Kulluk will be permitted to operate. The emissions authorized under this permit of approximately 40 tpy of VOC along with the minimal expected ammonia increases (2.16 tpy) would also not be expected to result in the conversion of significant quantities of NO_x emissions to secondary particles in the areas impacted by primary PM_{2.5} emissions.

- 6) There are several other conservative assumptions incorporated in the modeling of primary PM_{2.5} emissions. These include the conservatism inherent in using a “First Tier” approach to combining modeled primary PM_{2.5} impacts with monitored background PM_{2.5} concentrations; assuming that the Kulluk will be operating in a single drilling location for 3 years, when it is more likely that the Kulluk will operate in a different location each year (if not more frequently); orienting the Associated Fleet with hourly modeled wind direction and using emission release characteristics based on actual meteorological conditions; and the fact that the background monitored data used to represent offshore conditions was collected onshore, where it is influenced by local sources, and is therefore likely to be a conservative estimate of background PM_{2.5} levels in the area of maximum impact near the Kulluk.

Based on these factors, and consistent with current guidance, Region 10 believes that an adequate and conservative assessment has been made to demonstrate that the PM_{2.5} NAAQS will be protected, accounting for primary PM_{2.5} impacts and potential contributions due to PM_{2.5} precursors from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet, and that it is not necessary to use a photochemical model to further evaluate secondary PM_{2.5} formation in these permitting actions.

Comment W.3.b: Commenters state that, in analyzing potential secondary PM_{2.5} formation, Region 10 should address additional factors. In particular, commenters assert that Region 10 acknowledges that secondary PM_{2.5} formation can occur at a different time and place than where the precursors were emitted and that Region 10 must therefore account for the emission of precursors from Shell’s operation before it has technically become an OCS source and after it has stopped being one, since these non-OCS source emissions could react with OCS source emissions.

Response: Even if Region 10 were to require Shell to conduct photochemical modeling for PM_{2.5} precursors, Shell would not be required to include emissions from vessels before Shell becomes an OCS source. See response to comment Y.1. On-going monitoring for PM_{2.5} that is expected to continue on the North Slope will assist Region 10 in evaluating the significance of secondary formation of PM_{2.5} on a broader scale in the North Slope region.

X. CATEGORY – AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS FOR OZONE NAAQS

Comment X.1: Commenters state that additional information is required for this permit regarding ozone and ask Region 10 to undertake a regional ozone air quality analysis. Noting the causes and health impacts of ozone, the commenters state that Shell will be emitting 240 tpy of NO_x and 40 tpy of VOC, and that other OCS sources permitted this year and possibly in future years will add to these numbers. The commenters contend that Shell’s decision not to model ozone is not justified given that Region 10 has stated that “point sources in the North Slope oil and gas fields near Deadhorse contribute approximately 65,000 tpy of NO_x and 1,100 tpy of VOC. Given this level of activity, and the predicted emissions of ozone constituents, commenters assert that Region 10

should be assessing the cumulative impacts of permitting activities together with documented background concentrations. The commenters further state that research conducted on air quality in Nuiqsut (in light of the pollution generated by Alpine Oil Field and Prudhoe Bay) showed elevated ozone levels in the winter months.

Response: Region 10 stands by its decision that regional photochemical modeling for this project is not required. As described in the Statement of Basis and Technical Support Document, Region 10 reviewed ozone monitoring data along with existing precursor emissions that will impact ozone formation. Based on this review, Region 10 determined further analysis of ozone was not warranted. The most recent monitoring data for all pollutants is summarized in a memorandum included in the administrative record. See Background Data Memo. This memo summarized the 2009 and 2010 ozone data from Shell’s and ConocoPhillips’ Wainwright and Point Lay monitoring sites as well as 2006 to 2009 ozone data from two other industry run sites in the Prudhoe Bay area (A Pad and CCP) which had recently been reviewed and approved by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation. As shown in the data below from the Background Data Memo, the most recent data continue to show that ozone levels at sites along the Alaska Arctic Ocean are well below the ozone NAAQS.

Averaging Period	Wainwright	Point Lay	CCP	A Pad
1-hour	0.039 ppm	0.040 ppm	0.040 ppm	0.078 ppm
8-hour	0.037 ppm	0.040 ppm	0.032 ppm	0.034 ppm

Region 10 disagrees with the commenters’ statement that arctic ozone levels are high because the available ozone monitoring data does not support this statement. With respect to the research on air quality in Nuiqsut and the comment stating that the monitoring data that showed elevated ozone levels in the winter months, the commenter has provided no information for consideration that would change Region 10’s conclusion regarding the necessity of conducting modeling for ozone. The maximum 8-hour ozone levels shown in the referenced document (Attachment 2) are monthly maximums and are not comparable to the NAAQS, which is based on the 98th percentile of annual values. In addition, the maximums are far below the value of the NAAQS and the 98th percentile would be even lower than the monthly maximums. The reference to “elevated ozone levels in the winter months” appears to be referring to the fact that the levels in the winter are higher than in the summer, not that the levels are “elevated” in comparison to some other reference point, such as the NAAQS.

Comment X.2: Commenters emphasize the importance of Region 10’s conclusion that no further evaluation for ozone is needed in light of EPA’s decision to revise the 8-hour standard. The commenters note that, EPA had proposed to adopt a new primary 8-hour standard of between 0.060-0.070 parts per million (ppm) this summer, lower than the existing 8-hour standard of 0.075 ppm. The commenters ask Region 10 to ensure compliance with the new 8-hour standard for ozone because they allege that 1) current background concentrations of ozone are already as high as 0.050 ppm (8-hour average) on the North Slope and the formation of additional ozone as a result of offshore oil and

gas operations could take the North Slope out of attainment; 2) the new 8-hour standard is an important health based standard and this standard should be the one that Shell seeks to comply with in its proposed years of future operations in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas because the proposed air permits are not time limited and thus support the need for compliance with the most recent legal requirements; and 3) both BOEMRE and Shell rely upon the NAAQS to mitigate the impacts of the air emissions associated with Shell's exploration plans on air quality, marine mammals, and other resources so it is particularly critical that compliance with these emerging standards is ensured.

Response: EPA had proposed to reconsider the 0.075 ppm ozone NAAQS set in 2008 and requested comment on a range between 0.060 and 0.075 ppm. 75 Fed. Reg. 2,935 (January 19, 2010). EPA has recently announced, however, that at the President's direction, EPA will not be taking final action on its current proposal to revise the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. EPA instead intends to consider revisions to the ozone NAAQS in connection with the 5-year mandated revision of the ozone NAAQS in 2013. Statement by the President on the Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard, September 2, 2011. There is no requirement that an OCS or Title V permit ensure compliance with requirements that have not even been promulgated at the time of permit issuance.

In any event, based on the most recent ozone data, current ozone levels at the four monitoring sites are well below even the low end of the range of the NAAQS EPA had proposed (0.060 ppm). See also response to comment BB.3 for a discussion of the environmental justice considerations in connection with the proposed 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

Y. CATEGORY – CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Comment Y.1: Commenters are concerned that the air quality analysis relied upon by Region 10 in issuing the permits does not account for what the commenters contend is the potentially significant contribution of pollutants from vessels/mobile sources that will operate in the same vicinity as the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet. The commenters allege that the air quality analysis does not account for emissions from the Kulluk, the Icebreakers/Anchor Handlers, or the any of the other Associated Fleet before the Kulluk is determined to be an OCS Source and that such emissions are not represented in the existing background air quality data. The commenters also contend that the modeling conducted by Shell and Region 10 fails to account for the emissions from other nearby mobile sources. Over all, the commenters continue, the air quality analysis fails to account for these potentially significant sources of air pollution, which may result in inaccurate predictions of impacts to air quality. The commenters ask Region 10 to clarify whether and how the air quality analysis incorporates the potential emissions from mobile sources related to the drilling program that are not captured in the PTE calculations for the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet. In this regard, the commenters state that they are concerned both with respect to the impacts on short-term standards, including the 1-hour NO_x, but also the annual air quality standards.

Response: Region 10 disagrees with the commenters that emissions from the Kulluk when it is not an OCS source, from vessels in the Associated Fleet when they are more than 25 miles from the Kulluk while it is an OCS source or when it is not an OCS source, or from other mobile sources in the area, whether related or unrelated to Shell's operations, need to be addressed in the air quality analysis for the OCS/Title V permit for the Kulluk. Although some such emissions may occur as a result of the activities of the OCS source, they are emissions from mobile sources. The Clean Air Act and EPA's implementing regulations for PSD, which Region 10 has used as a guide in issuing this permit, are clear with respect to the treatment of mobile source emissions in the PSD permitting process. In the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act, Congress clarified that a stationary source does not include emissions from mobile sources. See CAA § 302(z). In the 1990 amendments, Congress also added the OCS provision (CAA § 328), which includes the requirement that emissions from support vessels are considered to be direct emissions from the OCS source when within 25 miles of the OCS source, but does not change any other provisions of the stationary source permitting programs for OCS sources as they relate to mobile sources.

While neither the OCS regulations nor the Part 70/Part 71 regulations specifically address how mobile sources are to be treated in the permitting process, for this permit, Region 10 believes it is appropriate to follow the modeling requirements and guidance for EPA's PSD regulations (which have been incorporated by reference into the OCS regulations at 40 CFR § 55.13(d)) as to what sources of emissions must be included in considering whether Title V permit terms and conditions for a Title V temporary source assure compliance with the NAAQS, as applicable requirements for such sources. 40 CFR § 52.21(k) requires that:

...the owner or operator of the proposed source or modification shall demonstrate that allowable emission increases from the proposed source or modification, in conjunction with all other applicable emissions increases or reductions (including secondary emissions), would not cause or contribute to air pollution in violation of:

- (i) Any national ambient air quality standard in any air quality control region; or
- (ii) Any applicable maximum allowable increase over the baseline concentration in any area.”

EPA's regulations define “secondary emissions” at 40 CFR § 52.21(b)(18) as:

...emissions which would occur as a result of the construction or operation of a major stationary source or major modification, but do not come from the major stationary source or major modification itself. Secondary emissions include emissions from any offsite support facility which would not be constructed or increase its emissions except as a result of the construction or operation of the major stationary source or major modification. Secondary emissions do not include any emissions which come directly from a mobile source, such as

emissions from the tailpipe of a motor vehicle, from a train, or from a vessel.”
(emphasis added).

Therefore, consistent with the analysis that would be conducted in connection with an ambient air quality analysis submitted to support a PSD permit, emissions from mobile sources, specifically vessels that are not part of the Associated Fleet because the vessels are beyond 25 miles from the Kulluk when the Kulluk is an OCS source or vessels from the Associated Fleet when the Kulluk is not yet an OCS source, are not secondary emissions and Region 10 does not believe they are appropriate for consideration in issuing this permit.

Comment Y.2: The commenters state that Shell has not demonstrated that its operations will ensure protection of NAAQS because it has not considered cumulative impacts. The commenters contend that Region 10 must require Shell to perform a full impact analysis that considers numerous local sources of pollution as well as pollution generated by Shell before the Kulluk becomes an OCS Source. As support for this contention, commenters identify source of pollution near the leases on which Shell is seeking approval to drill including BP’s Central Compression Plant, BP’s Central Gas Facility, and 14 other sources. The commenters also cite to EPA guidelines on air quality modeling which states that “[a]ll sources expected to cause a significant concentration gradient in the vicinity of the source or sources under consideration for emission limit(s) should be explicitly modeled.” 40 CFR Part 51, App. W § 8.2.3. The commenters continue that Shell has not complied with the guidelines because it has not properly determined which sources may cause a significant concentration gradient, but instead determined that its background measurements are overly conservative and therefore account for the potential effects of other sources. The commenters also reference Shell’s statement that the largest source on the North Slope—BP’s Central Compression Plant—is 11.5 kilometers from the monitoring location Shell uses for determining background pollution levels, and that there is no source that could be that distance or less from Shell’s operations. From this, Shell asserts that no source could affect pollution levels at its drill site as much as BP’s Central Compression Plant affects pollution levels at the background monitoring location, and that as a result no cumulative effects modeling is necessary. The commenters state that Region 10’s approval of Shell’s method of determining significant gradient areas is arbitrary because the method fails to take into account the grouping of sources and local meteorological conditions. The commenters request that Region 10 determine which sources could have overlapping emissions with Shell’s source, and direct Shell to model those sources.

Response: Contrary to the commenter’s allegation, Region 10 did consider the local meteorological conditions and source groupings. The Central Compressor Plant (CCP)/Central Gas Facility (CGF) complex is the largest NO_x source in Prudhoe Bay. A Pad lies in the predominate downwind direction of this complex. Since the A Pad station measures the impacts that occur from the CCP/CGF complex at a downwind distance of 11.5 kilometers, and since there are no lease blocks within this distance of the CCP/CGF complex, A Pad does account for the possible impacts from CCP/CGF.

The use of A Pad data does even more than account for the impacts from CCP/CGF. Located in-between A Pad and the CCP/CGF complex lies Gathering Center 3 (GC-3) and the Central Power Station (CPS). The potential NO_x emissions from GC-3 is just under 2,900 tons per year. The potential NO_x emissions from CPS are just under 4,000 tons per year. Therefore, the A Pad station not only measures the downwind impacts from CCP/CGF, it also measures the downwind impacts from two other substantive stationary sources. This is the worst-case alignment of Prudhoe Bay stationary sources. Since the distance between A Pad and CCP/CGF represents the nearest distance between any lease block and North Slope source, the data measured at A Pad does in fact represent the worst-case impact from off-site sources. Thus, Region 10 did consider local sources of air pollution in concluding that the permit will assure compliance with the NAAQS. With respect to emissions from Shell's operations before the Kulluk becomes an OCS source, please see response to comment Y.1.

Comment Y.3: Commenters contend that Region 10 has not assessed the combined impact of multiple drilling operations and question why EPA is assessing permit applications separately. The commenters characterize this as a partial, not complete, analysis and request that the Region assess the cumulative effects of the Kulluk, Discoverer, and ConocoPhillips operations. One commenter stated that these drilling operations could be functioning together in real life but that the draft permits for these operations do not reflect the other operations. The commenter requested that Region 10 take a comprehensive look at the cumulative impacts of all permits.

Response: Region 10 disagrees with the commenter that it is not assessing the cumulative impacts of the three drill rigs. As explained at the informational meeting, the Clean Air Act permitting programs are essentially "first come, first served" programs and each subsequent permitting action needs to account for all of those that went before but not any actions that will occur subsequent to that action. The permits for the Discoverer drill ship in the Chukchi Sea and Beaufort Sea are the first permits in their respective vicinities and they only need to assess their impacts on the existing air quality situation.

The Kulluk drill rig in the Beaufort Sea is the second permit and EPA has addressed cumulative impacts by including conditions in the permit that prevent Shell from operating the Kulluk drill rig and the Discoverer drill ship in the Beaufort Sea during the same drilling season. Permit Condition D.4.8. As such, only one of the two drill rigs can operate in the Beaufort in any year so there will be no overlapping impacts with respect to compliance with short term NAAQS. And since the modeling analyses show that each drill rig individually would not violate ambient standards if they operated in the Beaufort Sea for three consecutive years, any combination of years would also not violate annual NAAQS.

As discussed above, ConocoPhillips has withdrawn its permit application for operation of a jack-up drill rig in the Chukchi Sea.

Z. APPLICABILITY OF PSD INCREMENT AND VISIBILITY PROTECTION

Z.1 IN GENERAL

Comment Z.1.a: Although commenters support Region 10's determination that the Kulluk is a Title V temporary source, commenters state that the draft permit for the Kulluk is unlawful because it does not include conditions that will assure compliance with all applicable requirements of the CAA at all authorized locations. In particular, the commenters contend, Region 10 has failed to assess whether emissions from Shell's Kulluk operations will exceed applicable air increments. The commenters assert that, through the creation of limits called "increments," Congress designed the CAA not only to clean up dirty air but also to prevent the degradation of clean air. The commenters cite to language in CAA § 504(e) and similar language in 40 CFR Part 71 stating that no operating permit shall be issued to a temporary source "unless it includes conditions that will assure compliance with all the requirements of [the Clean Air Act] at all locations, including, but not limited to, ambient standards and compliance with any applicable increment or visibility requirements" The commenters continue that Region 10 has both identified an offshore "baseline area" to assess increments in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas and identified a "minor source baseline date" (namely, July 31, 2009) for SO₂, NO₂, and PM. Because the minor source baseline date has passed, the commenters assert, the CAA "places strict limits on aggregate increases in pollution within the baseline area whether the increases come from minor or major sources," citing as support *Great Basin Mine Watch v. EPA*, 401 F.3d 1094, 1096 (9th Cir. 2005), *Reno-Sparks Indian Colony v. U.S. E.P.A.*, 336 F.3d 899, 903 (9th Cir. 2003), and 75 Fed. Reg. at 64,864, 64,868 (October 20, 2010) ("After the minor source baseline date, any increase in actual emissions (from both major and minor sources) consumes the PSD increment for that area.") (parenthetical added for emphasis). The commenters state that increments are thus applicable to all sources—both major and minor. The commenters further assert that EPA's interpretation that a demonstration of compliance with increments is not required to issue Title V permits to temporary sources that are not PSD major source is inconsistent with the statutory language of CAA § 504(e), EPA's own Part 70 and Part 71 regulations, and the preamble to the Part 70 regulations. The commenters also state that Region 10 is only interpreting a part of the statutory language, therefore missing both the meaning and the intent behind the provision pertaining to temporary sources. Because Region 10 did not analyze Shell's compliance with applicable increments or impose permit conditions to ensure compliance with them, the commenters conclude, the draft permit does not ensure compliance with increments and the permit violates CAA § 504(e).

Response: EPA agrees with the commenters that all emission increases and decreases from both major and minor sources (with only a few exceptions provided for in the PSD statute¹⁶) occurring after the minor source baseline date is triggered, will consume or expand available increment. However, EPA does not agree that the CAA and regulations applicable in this instance require that Shell demonstrate that the Kulluk will not cause a

¹⁶ See CAA § 163.

violation of the PSD increments in order to obtain the type of permit issued by EPA in this case.

The fact that minor source emissions consume increment does not necessarily mean that a minor source permit applicant is required to demonstrate that its proposed action will not cause or contribute to a violation of the increment to obtain a minor source construction permit. The criteria that must be met to obtain a minor source construction permit in this case are principally based on the terms of the minor source permitting program approved by Region 10 as part of the COA regulations. In this instance, the applicable Alaska regulations approved by EPA (18 Alaska Administrative Code (AAC) 50.502) do not require that a minor source permit applicant demonstrate that it will not cause or contribute to a violation of the PSD increment in order to obtain this type of permit.

The CAA and EPA regulations do not require that state minor source permitting programs contain criteria that require a minor source permit applicant to demonstrate that proposed construction will not cause a violation of a PSD increment. This is something states have the discretion to require, but is not a mandatory requirement under the provisions of the CAA or EPA regulations applicable to minor source permitting programs.

Section 110(a)(2)(C) of the CAA sets forth the basic requirement for preconstruction permits for both major and minor sources. Specifically, Section 110(a)(2)(C) states that the implementation plan shall:

(C) include a program to provide for the . . . regulation of the modification and construction of any stationary source within the areas covered by the plan as necessary to assure that national ambient air quality standards are achieved, including a permit program as required in parts C and D;

The permit program required in Part C of the CAA applies to major emitting facilities as defined in Section 169(1) of the CAA and the permit program required in Part D of the CAA applies to major stationary sources as defined in Section 302(j) of the CAA and in the various pollutant specific subparts of Part D. Only the major emitting facilities subject to the Part C permitting program (also referred to as the PSD permitting program) are expressly required under the CAA to demonstrate compliance with applicable PSD increments in order to obtain a permit to construct. See CAA § 165(a)(3)(A). New and modified stationary sources that are not major emitting facilities subject to the Part C permitting program are only required to demonstrate that the NAAQS will be achieved unless the applicable implementation plan provides otherwise. See CAA § 110(a)(2)(C); 40 CFR §§ 51.160(a)(2) and (b)(2).

For non-PSD sources, a state air quality management authority has a responsibility to ensure that its state implementation plan contains measures to prevent significant deterioration of air quality in accordance with section 161 of the CAA and 40 CFR §§ 51.166(a)(1) of EPA's implementing regulations. However, these provisions leave states with the discretion to determine whether it is necessary to require minor sources to

demonstrate that they will not cause a violation of any PSD increments as a condition of obtaining a minor source permit. In this instance, Alaska has not adopted minor source permit program regulations that require a showing that a minor source will not cause a violation of an increment in order to obtain the appropriate construction permit. Thus, the minor source COA regulations applicable to this source do not require a source to demonstrate compliance with PSD increments.

Furthermore, as discussed in the Statement of Basis (at 26), EPA does not interpret CAA § 504(e) to create new permitting requirements for temporary sources with respect to demonstrating compliance with increments beyond what would otherwise be applicable to such sources under applicable CAA construction permitting programs. The statute states in relevant part that:

The permitting authority may issue a single permit authorizing emissions from similar operations at multiple temporary locations. No such permit shall be issued unless it includes conditions that will assure compliance with all applicable requirements of this chapter at all authorized locations, *including but not limited to ambient standards and compliance with any applicable increment or visibility requirements under part C of subchapter I of this chapter.*

CAA § 504(e) (emphasis added).

The difference in phrasing here is important: ambient standards are referenced without qualification, whereas increment and visibility requirements are prefaced with “any applicable” and followed by “under part C of subchapter I of this chapter.” Based on this distinction, EPA reads this provision of the Clean Air Act to require that all Title V temporary sources¹⁷ demonstrate that the source will not violate ambient standards (NAAQS) at all authorized locations but that such a source need only assure compliance with increment at all locations where the source is otherwise required to show it will not cause of violation of increments under part C of subchapter I of this chapter, such as through section 165(a)(3) of the CAA and the applicable PSD permitting program in the case of major sources or other provisions in an implementation plan or COA regulation that implement Section 161 of the Act and may also apply to minor sources.

The language used in Section 504(e) is consistent with the provisions in the CAA and EPA’s regulations described above that make the ambient standards (the NAAQS) applicable to all stationary sources (both minor and major) at the time of construction permitting, but that make the increment requirements in Part C only applicable to certain stationary sources, that is PSD major sources or minor sources when applicable under an applicable minor source permitting program. This reading of the statute gives meaning to the different language that Congress used when referring to the ambient standards on the one hand and the Part C requirements for increments on the other hand.

¹⁷ This term includes any source that would move more than once during the life of its Title V operating permit. See Memorandum to Docket A-90-33, re: Docketing of Detailed Responses to Comments on the Part 70 Operating Permit Regulations, at 6-34. It thus includes both PSD portable sources and PSD temporary sources.

Similarly, there is no indication in EPA's promulgation of the regulations implementing Section 504(e) that EPA interpreted that section of the CAA to impose on Title V temporary sources that are not also PSD major sources a direct requirement to demonstrate compliance with increment in the Title V permitting process. The thirteenth item in EPA's definition of "applicable requirement" in the Part 70 or Part 71 Title V regulations reads as follows: "Any national ambient air quality standard or increment or visibility requirement under part C of title I of the Act, but only as it would apply to temporary sources permitted pursuant to section 504(e) of the Act." 40 CFR § 70.2; 40 CFR § 71.2. The last clause makes clear that the NAAQS, increment, and visibility requirements are applicable requirements for Title V applicants only to the extent required under section 504(e) of the Act. Thus, this provision of the regulations was clearly not intended to require more than the cited provision of the Clean Air Act would otherwise require. As discussed above, because the reference to the increment in section 504(e) of the CAA is modified by the phrase "any applicable," the regulatory language EPA adopted in section 71.2 is likewise limited to requiring a Title V temporary source to demonstrate compliance with the increment where otherwise applicable under construction permitting programs.

Comment Z.1.b: Commenters state that, in the Statement of Basis (at 25), Region 10 attempts to justify its wholesale failure to address compliance with increments by suggesting that they are applicable only where a source "would otherwise be subject to PSD" and that Region 10 bases this conclusion on the observation that the word "applicable" precedes "increment" in CAA § 504(e). The commenters assert that this interpretation is wrong as a matter of law because, once triggered by a major source permit application in an area, increment limits apply to both major and minor sources. The commenters contend that Section 504(e) does not create a different rule for Title V temporary sources and, indeed, states that a Title V permit shall not be issued to a temporary source "unless it includes conditions that will assure compliance with all the requirements" of the CAA. The commenters state that the term "applicable" as used in CAA § 504(e) is not a reference to the applicability of general PSD requirements to a particular source, but rather refers to whether a major source application has triggered increment requirements for the relevant baseline area within which the temporary source is expected to operate and thus made such requirements "applicable." As support, the commenters state that, in promulgating its Title V implementing regulations, EPA declared that "NAAQS and the increment and visibility requirements under part C of title I of the Act are applicable requirements for temporary sources . . ." Because in this case, previous major source applications have triggered the increment requirements in the area, the commenters state that Region 10 must ensure that the permit meets those requirements.

Response: EPA agrees that, once a minor source baseline date is triggered, emission increases and decreases of all sources, including minor sources after the minor source baseline date, will consume or expand increment. However, the increments themselves are not directly applicable as permitting criteria for sources that are not otherwise required to demonstrate compliance with increments to obtain a construction permit. As

discussed above the state air quality management authority is required under Section 161 of the CAA and 40 CFR §§ 51.166(a)(1) of EPA's implementing regulations to adopt measures in its SIP to prevent significant deterioration. States have the discretion to determine the types of measures that are needed to meet this objective and are not expressly required to mandate that minor sources demonstrate they will not cause a violation of an increment to obtain a construction permit. When an air pollution authority finds that these measures have not been successful and an increment violation has occurred, it must revise its SIP to adopt emission limitations or other control measures to remedy the violation. 40 CFR § 51.166(a)(3).

As discussed in the response to comment Z.1.a above, EPA does not interpret section 504(e) and EPA's Part 71 regulations to require non-PSD sources to demonstrate compliance with increments in order to get a Part 71 operating permit when the applicable state or federal implementation plan does not otherwise require such a demonstration. The commenter quotes the thirteenth item in the definition of applicable requirement, but neglects to reference the last clause of this provision, which reads as follows "but only as it would apply to temporary sources permitted pursuant to section 504(e) of the Act." As discussed above, this clause indicates that EPA's regulations do not create any additional requirements for stationary sources beyond what the Act would require. Thus, EPA is not persuaded by commenter that the "any applicable" language that precedes the reference to increments is only intended to reference circumstances when a major source permit application has triggered increment requirements in a baseline area.

If, at any time after the Kulluk begins operation under its Title V/OCS permit, Region 10 determines that the actual emissions increases from the permitted OCS source cause or contribute to an increment violation,¹⁸ Region 10 has authority to adopt additional requirements to ensure that increments are not violated. See CAA §§ 301 and 328; 40 CFR § 55.13(h). However, as shown in the Technical Support Document (Table 11, at 33) and confirmed by the comments of the North Slope commenters' (see Table 3 at page 13), the modeling analysis for this project shows that the allowable emissions would not cause or contribute to a violation of any increment where the minor source baseline has already been triggered. And, as discussed below in the response to comment Z.2.a, PM_{2.5} emissions from the Kulluk will be part of the baseline concentration and will not consume any of the available PM_{2.5} increment. So, although EPA does not believe that CAA § 504(e) and 40 CFR Part 71 require a demonstration of compliance with increments in this Title V permit issuance process, the modeling analysis supporting this permit actually demonstrates that PSD increments will not be violated.

Comment Z.1.c: Commenters state that EPA's regulations fail to support the interpretation that increment and visibility are not "applicable requirements" for minor sources under CAA § 504(e) and 40 CFR Part 71. According to the commenters, EPA's regulations explain that "[p]ermits for temporary sources shall include the following: (1) Conditions that will assure compliance with all applicable requirements at all authorized

¹⁸ 40 CFR § 52.21(b)(13) (definition of "baseline concentration" is in terms of actual emission increases and decreases).

locations,” citing to 40 CFR § 71.6(e). The commenters continue that the Part 71 regulations also include a definition of “applicable requirement” that includes thirteen requirements, including “(2) Any terms or condition of the preconstruction permits issued pursuant to regulations approved or promulgated through rulemaking under title I, including parts C and D, of the Act” and “(13) Any national ambient air quality standard or increment or visibility requirement under part C of title I of the Act, but only as it would apply to temporary sources permitted pursuant to section 504(e) of the Act,” citing to 40 CFR § 71.2 (definition of applicable requirement). The commenters contend that EPA’s interpretation of this definition reads the thirteenth requirement out of the regulations because, under Region 10’s interpretation, the thirteenth requirement is subsumed by the second requirement. Thus, the commenters conclude, an interpretation that requires temporary sources to comply with the NAAQS, increments, and visibility standards is the only reading that gives meaning to all the regulatory provisions in the definition of applicable requirement. Commenters also cite to language in the preamble to the final Part 70 rule which states that “Temporary sources must comply with these requirements because the SIP is unlikely to have performed an attainment demonstration on a temporary source.”

Response: EPA disagrees with the commenter’s assertion that its interpretation of the thirteenth requirement does not give meaning to all of the regulatory provisions in the definition of “applicable requirement.” The commenters argue that EPA’s interpretation would be subsumed by the second requirement – that the permit include the terms and conditions of any preconstruction permit. However, the commenter fails to recognize that the permit for a portable (temporary) source that would be issued pursuant to the PSD regulations, specifically 40 CFR § 52.21(i)(1)(viii), is not required to assure compliance with the NAAQS or increments at all future locations. Rather, the PSD permit must only ensure that, at future locations, emissions from the permitted source would not impact a Class I area or an area where the increment is known to be violated. The PSD permit for a portable source would not thus not be required to ensure that the PSD portable source would not cause a new increment violation at a future location or that it would not have a local visibility impact at a future location. So while EPA’s interpretation is that Title V temporary sources that are not PSD sources do not need to demonstrate compliance with PSD increments and visibility requirements unless otherwise required by the applicable implementation plan, Region 10’s interpretation does result in the imposition through the Title V permit of additional requirements on PSD sources beyond the conditions that would be included in a PSD preconstruction permit under 40 CFR § 52.21. Region 10’s interpretation thus maintains the basic premise of the CAA preconstruction programs—that PSD major sources are subject to NAAQS and increment in the permitting process, where as non-PSD sources are subject only to the NAAQS unless the applicable minor source program also includes the increment—yet still has meaning by imposing on Title V temporary sources the requirement to demonstrate at subsequent locations that they continue to comply with those underlying applicable preconstruction requirements at each subsequent location.

With respect to the language in the preamble to the final Part 70 rule cited by the commenters with respect to Title V temporary sources, there is nothing in that language

to suggest that EPA interpreted Section 504(e) of the Clean Air Act to change the basic premise of the Clean Air Act permitting scheme for PSD sources versus non-PSD sources, namely, that PSD sources are directly subject to NAAQS and increment requirements, whereas non-PSD sources are not required to show they will not cause a violation of the increment unless the applicable implementation plan otherwise requires it for such sources. If a non-PSD Title V source applied for a preconstruction permit at one location and then applied for a new preconstruction permit to move to a new location, the source would have to demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS at each location as a condition of obtaining a permit, but would not have to demonstrate compliance with increment at either location absent a similar requirement for minor sources in the applicable implementation plan. In contrast, a PSD source that applied for a preconstruction permit at one location and then applied for a new preconstruction permit to move to a new location would have to demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS and increment at both locations. EPA believes the intent of the Title V temporary source provisions is to relieve sources of the burden of applying for Title V permits for each new location, while at the same time, assuring compliance with all requirements to which the source would be subject if it were a new source at each such new location.

Comment Z.1.d: Commenters assert that, in light of the statutory and regulatory language and the special treatment given to temporary sources in the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act, it is appropriate that compliance with both the increments and visibility requirements is ensured for these permits. The commenters state that this is particularly critical because of the proximity of these operations to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, (ANWR) and that the OCS regulations provide that EPA “shall not issue a permit to operate to any existing OCS source that has not demonstrated compliance with all applicable requirements of this part.”

Response: See the response to comments Z.1.a-Z.1.c above in general with respect to the applicability of increments to Title V temporary sources that are not PSD major sources. EPA has determined that visibility is similarly not an applicable requirement for Title V temporary sources that are not PSD major sources for the reasons set for in the Statement of Basis and response to comments Z.1.a-Z.1.c. In addition, ANWR is not a federal Class I area and as such, the increment and visibility requirements of Part C that apply to federal Class I areas are not relevant for ANWR.

Comment Z.1.e: Commenters state that EPA’s regulations for SIPs provide that “[in accordance with the policy of Section 101(b)(1) of the CAA and for the purposes of section 160 of the Act, each applicable State Implementation Plan and each applicable Tribal Implementation Plan shall contain emission limitations and such other measures as may be necessary to prevent significant deterioration of air quality.” 40 CFR § 51.166(a). This regulatory provision, the commenters continue, supports the need for the SIP to protect increments. Therefore, the commenters contend, even though the SIP would not have accounted for the temporary sources in assuring protection of the increments, any Title V temporary source permitted under Part 71 must demonstrate compliance with the increments in order to ensure all SIP requirements are met. Commenters contend that the Part 70 regulations pertain to State Implementation Plans

and that the oil and gas companies have advocated that such requirements only apply in the inner OCS (*i.e.*, within 25 miles of the State's seaward boundary). The commenters assert, however, that CAA § 328 makes it clear that EPA “shall establish requirements to control air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf sources located offshore ... to attain and maintain Federal and State ambient air quality standards and to comply with the provisions of the PSD program.” The commenters therefore assert that, because the goal of CAA § 328 is attainment of air quality standards, it matters little whether the source is located on the inner or outer OCS, because in both cases the relevant SIP will not have performed an attainment demonstration for such sources. Because the preamble to the Part 71 regulations relies upon the reasoning put forth by EPA in developing the Part 70 regulations, especially in discussing applicable requirements, the statutory and regulatory language for Part 70, as well as EPA's regulatory preambles, all support a finding that the NAAQS, increments, and visibility requirements are all applicable to temporary OCS sources under Part 71.

Response: See the other responses to comments in this Subcategory Z.1 with respect to the applicability of increments and visibility requirements to Title V temporary sources that are not subject to PSD permitting. Region 10 agrees that, in general, there is no intention for the Part 71 federal operating permit program that applies on the outer OCS to be different from the onshore Part 70 operating permit program that Region 10 has incorporated by reference in the COA regulations for application in the inner OCS (the only differences would be the result of differences between the State adopted program and EPA's Part 71 regulations). In this case, the requirements for Title V temporary sources in the inner OCS and outer OCS off of Alaska are the same because Alaska has adopted EPA's Part 71 rules with respect to Title V temporary sources by reference for application onshore and Region 10 has in turn adopted these requirements into the COA regulations for application in the inner OCS.

Region 10 does not agree with the rationale put forth by the commenters, however, that in both cases the relevant SIP will not have performed an attainment demonstration because there is no SIP (or implementation plan equivalent) for the outer OCS. Section 328 does not require EPA to establish an implementation plan or other comprehensive air quality management program for the outer OCS. It only requires EPA to adopt regulations for OCS sources and even then, only for certain purposes. Nonetheless, as discussed in response to comment Z.1.e, EPA does have authority to address violations of increment on the inner and outer OCS.

Z.2 SUBCATEGORY – PM_{2.5} INCREMENT

Comment Z.2.a: Commenters state that the Kulluk operations, as proposed, do not comply with the 24-hour average Class II PSD increment for PM_{2.5}. Commenters note that on October 20, 2010, EPA adopted a final regulation that went into effect on December 20, 2010 and that establish new PSD increments for PM_{2.5} that went into effect on October 20, 2011. The commenters assert that Section 328 states that “[n]ew OCS sources shall comply with such requirements on the date of promulgation,” citing to CAA § 328. The commenters state that, as a “new OCS source” yet to commence operation,

Shell's proposed arctic drilling operations must comply with all NAAQS and PSD program requirements that pre-date commencement of operations, including the new PM_{2.5} increments, citing to 42 U.S.C. §§ 7411(a)(2), 7475(a), 7627(a)(1) and (a)(4)(D). Moreover, with respect to OCS sources, the commenters continue, Congress clearly prohibited grandfathering by directing that even "existing OCS sources shall comply on the date 24 months" after promulgation of standards. Commenters state that application of the PM_{2.5} increment is important for Shell's permit because Shell's modeling indicates that Shell's emissions could increase the 24-hour PM_{2.5} concentrations by 17 ug/m³, which substantially exceeds EPA's newly enacted PM_{2.5} increment of 9 ug/m³.

Response: For a discussion of why PSD increments are not applicable to this permit, please see responses to comments in Subcategory Z.1.

With respect to the new PM_{2.5} increments, emissions from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet, which is a minor source for purposes of the PSD regulations, will be part of the baseline concentration and therefore, will not consume any of the available PM_{2.5} increment. See CAA § 169(4) (definition of "baseline concentrations"); 40 CFR § 52.21(b)(13). Until the PM_{2.5} minor source baseline date is triggered (*i.e.*, any date on or after October 20, 2011—the "trigger date" for PM_{2.5} increments) by submittal of a complete PSD permit application for a source that has significant PM_{2.5} emissions, emissions from minor sources are part of the PM_{2.5} baseline concentration and do not consume increment. Since a complete PSD permit application has not been submitted to Region 10 for a new major source on the Alaska OCS nor to ADEC for a new major source or a major modification to an existing major source in the Northern Alaska Intrastate Air Quality Control Region after the trigger date and prior to the issuance of the Kulluk minor source permit, emissions from the Kulluk will not consume any of the PM_{2.5} increment.

In any event, Region 10 does not interpret the cited language from the Clean Air Act to address when new regulatory standards take effect. Section 328 authorized EPA to issue regulations to establish requirements to control air pollution from OCS sources. It directed that "[n]ew sources shall comply with such requirements on the date of promulgation and existing sources shall comply on the date 24 months after. EPA promulgated the regulations authorized by Section 328 on September 4, 1992, and they became effective on that date. 57 Fed. Reg. 40,792 (September 4, 1992). This is confirmed by the language of 40 CFR § 55.3(d), which mandates that that new sources "shall comply with the requirements of this part by September 4, 1992." The permit fully complies with that provision by requiring the sources to comply with the requirements of Part 55.

Although this permit does not need to include an air quality analysis with respect to the new PM_{2.5} increment, Region 10 has nonetheless considered the new PM_{2.5} increment in connection with Region 10's responsibilities under Executive Order 12898 entitled "Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." Exec. Order 12898, 59 Fed. Reg. 7,629 (Feb. 16, 1994). As discussed in the Technical Support Document (at 20-22 and 33), the emissions of the

Kulluk and the Associated Fleet, when operating in compliance with permit requirements, will not cause or contribute to a violation of the PM_{2.5} NAAQS. For purposes of the Executive Order on Environmental Justice, the EAB has recently confirmed that “compliance with the NAAQS is emblematic of achieving a level of public health protection that, based on the level of protection afforded by the NAAQS, demonstrates that minority or low-income populations will not experience disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects due to exposure to relevant criteria pollutants.” Remand Order I at 73. This is because the NAAQS are health-based standards, designed to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics and is supported by the fact that “[t]he Agency sets the NAAQS using technical and scientific expertise, ensuring that the primary NAAQS protects the public health with an adequate margin of safety.” Id. Region 10 does not believe there will be a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects due to exposure to PM_{2.5} emissions because the permit ensures that emissions from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet will not cause or contribute to a violation of the PM_{2.5} NAAQS anywhere within ambient air to which the public has access and EPA has not made any findings that the current PM_{2.5} NAAQS are inadequate to protect public health. In contrast to the NAAQS, which are set at a level to protect public health, CAA § 109, PSD increments are established to prevent the significant deterioration of air quality, CAA § 166. EPA’s consideration of the health and welfare effects of PM_{2.5} in the context of carrying out the statutory requirement to balance the goals of CAA §§ 101 and 160 (to protect public health and welfare, parks, and air quality related values and to insure economic growth) in setting increment does not support a conclusion that PM_{2.5} emissions at levels below the level of the NAAQS have an adverse effect on public health.

Comment Z.2.b: Commenters also state that, for Title V permits, “applicable requirements” include “requirements that have been promulgated or approved by EPA through rulemaking at the time of issuance but have future compliance dates.” Because the new increments have already been established by EPA by regulation, the commenters assert, Shell must demonstrate compliance with them. The commenters contend that, with the proposed Kulluk operations, Shell has consumed almost two times the available increment and would not be able to demonstrate compliance with these increments as of the time that the minor source baseline date is established. Even if the permits are issued prior to the establishment of the minor source baseline date, the commenters continue, Shell should be required to demonstrate that it will comply with the PM_{2.5} increments prior to commencement of operations.

Response: As discussed above in the response to comment Z.2.a, the emissions from the Kulluk will not consume PM_{2.5} increment because the Kulluk will be an existing source if and when the minor source baseline date for the PM_{2.5} increment is triggered. Therefore, any PM_{2.5} concentrations attributable to the Kulluk, such as the modeled 17.0 ug/m³, 24-hour concentration, will simply increase the PM_{2.5} baseline concentration for the area.

AA. CATEGORY – VISIBILITY PROTECTION

Comment AA.1: Commenters state that Region 10 must ensure that the permitted temporary source will not adversely impact visibility in the region including in nearby refuge lands, such as ANWR, located adjacent to Kaktovik, which is as close as 14 kilometers (8 miles) from the nearest lease area. Commenters state that Congress has recognized the “unique wildlife, wilderness and recreational values” of ANWR. Commenters also contend that Part C of the Clean Air Act recognizes the importance of protecting air quality of areas with unique wildlife and recreational values, such as ANWR and that the CAA establishes the need to “preserve, protect and enhance the air quality ... areas of natural, recreational, scenic or historic value” and to “insure economic growth will occur in a manner consistent with the preservation of existing clean air resources.” The commenters generally support responsible onshore oil and gas development, including in ANWR, and also agrees with the CAA goal of protecting clean air. Given the proximity of ANWR to the proposed areas of operation, however, the commenters state that Region 10 must consider the air quality impacts, including visibility, to this area.

Response: See the responses to comments in Subcategory Z.1 for Region 10’s determination that the visibility requirements of Part C of the CAA are not applicable requirements for purposes of this permit. In addition, the visibility requirements of Part C apply only to federal Class I areas, and ANWR is not a federal Class I area. While the general language in the purpose statement of Part C (specifically CAA § 160) speaks in general of preserving, protecting, and enhancing air quality in areas of special national interest, the statute then goes on to establish the specific provisions for designating certain federal lands as “Class I” areas and establishing stringent requirements for protecting visibility and other air quality related values of the areas. See CAA §§ 162(a), 164(a), 165(a)(5), and 165(d)). Other federal lands, such as ANWR, are not Class I areas under the CAA and therefore receive the same level of air quality protection as any other lands that are not Class I areas.

Similarly, the specific requirements of Part C for the protection of visibility are even more limited – just to the mandatory federal Class I areas established by Congress in section 164(a) of the CAA. See §169A(a)(1). Again, ANWR is not a mandatory federal Class I area and, as such, the visibility requirements of Subpart 2 of Part C of the CAA are not applicable.

Comment AA.2: In addition to the basic provisions for preventing significant deterioration of air quality under the CAA, commenters state that other authorities also seek to protect air quality related values (AQRVs), such as visibility, in areas designated as Class II air sheds. The commenters state that the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), the Federal Land Manager (FLM) of ANWR, suggests that “planning, research and monitoring outlined ... for Class I areas can also be applied in Class II areas” and further notes that “information on air quality and AQRVs of a Class II area is important for comprehensive management of these refuge resources.” The commenters contend that one of the FWS’ broadly stated goals is to “[i]dentify and recommend solutions for external threats to refuge habitats, such as air and water quality.” The commenters further

state that emissions can be seen at distances greater than the eight miles that Shell will be from ANWR. For example, the commenters contend, the modeling prepared for the Shell oil shale research, development and demonstration (RD&D) Environmental Assessments (EAs) in northwest Colorado predicted that on 8-14 days per year, the visibility “limit of acceptable change” would be exceeded as a direct result of the Shell projects (not considering cumulative sources) at Flat Tops Wilderness Area, roughly 50 miles from the proposed source. The commenters continue that, while this particular project predicted greater emissions than projected emissions from Shell exploration activities with the Kulluk, the distances at which visibility impacts were predicted indicate that, even at lower emission rates, the Kulluk operations have the potential to impact visibility onshore and in ANWR. Given the potential for visibility impacts in the FWS managed area, the commenters conclude, Region 10 must, at a minimum, notify FWS of the potential visibility effects of proposed offshore exploration activities on ANWR.

Response: Region 10 did provide notice of issuance of the draft permit to the FWS office responsible for managing ANWR. Region 10 recognizes that Federal Land Managers of areas that are not Class I areas under the CAA still have an interest in protecting air quality related values (including visibility) of those areas. However, as discussed above in the response to comment AA.1, the Clean Air Act provides no additional protections to such Class II federal lands. EPA and permitting authorities do often work with permit applicants and the Federal Land Managers to assess the effect that new emissions might have on such areas, but there is no requirement to do so.

BB. CATEGORY – ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

BB.1 SUBCATEGORY – IN GENERAL

Comment BB.1.a: Commenters appreciate that Region 10 has conducted an analysis of compliance with the new 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS but are still concerned that the environmental justice analysis omits consideration of important factors that they believe may present a risk to human health and, therefore a disproportionate risk to environmental justice communities on the North Slope. The commenters state Region 10’s reliance on a demonstration of compliance with the NAAQS in order to assess environmental justice considerations is inconsistent with the EAB’s direction in remanding the permits for the Discoverer drillship to Region 10. The commenters contend that the existing modeling of compliance with the NAAQS appears to exclude any potential impacts from mobile source emissions that occur before the Kulluk is deemed to be an OCS Source and/or take place more than 25 miles from the OCS Source, including emissions while moving to the drill site, the emissions of the icebreaker/anchor handler while setting the anchors for the Kulluk, and the emissions from the fleet of support vessels, including icebreakers, before the Kulluk attaches to the first anchor. Although the commenters acknowledge that these emissions are not deemed to be emissions from the OCS source, they assert that Region 10 must provide a rational basis for whether and how the OCS Source and the Associated Fleet emissions have been analyzed in combination with the mobile source emissions in assessing potential adverse health impacts to local communities, both onshore and in offshore areas used for

subsistence purposes. The commenters are concerned that the NAAQS analysis, in and of itself, does not account for the potential combined impacts of the stationary and mobile source emissions, which could be relevant considerations in assessing potential health impacts from short-term and long term exposure to NO₂ as well as exposure to ozone, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀, among other pollutants. The commenters contend that Region 10 has some leeway in making sure these emissions are considered and that the ships are set up in such a way so as to bring down emissions to where they need to be.

Response: Executive Order 12898 provides that “[t]o the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, and consistent with the principles set forth in the report on the National Performance Review, each federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States and its territories and Commonwealth of the [Northern] Mariana Islands.” Section 1-101 of Exec. Order 12898, 59 Fed. Reg. 7,629 (February 16, 1994). “Federal agencies are required to implement this order consistent with, and to the extent permitted by, existing law.” *Id.* at 7632. As discussed in the Statement of Basis (at 54), the Title V operating permit program does not generally impose new substantive air quality control requirements and that, therefore, the primary means of addressing environmental justice issues in the Title V program is through increased public participation and review by permitting agencies and conditions to assure compliance with applicable requirements. Because the Title V permit in this case requires compliance with the NAAQS as an applicable requirement and established limits on PTE, Region 10 has considered environmental justice concerns in this action, where possible, in the context of assuring compliance with requirements applicable to the source. *Id.*

The language of the Executive Order directing federal agencies to identify and address impacts “as appropriate,” and “[t]o the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law” imparts considerable leeway to federal agencies in determining how to comply with the spirit and letter of the Executive Order. Avenal Order at 24. In implementing Executive Order 12898, it is appropriate for the Agency to consider the best available data that are germane in light of the scope and nature of the action before the agency in analyzing whether there may be disproportionate adverse impacts on minority communities and low-income communities. Shell Remand Order I at 80, fn. 87; Avenal Order at 24. The EAB has recently confirmed that the Executive Order does not require EPA to reach a determinative outcome prior to issuing a permit, particularly when the available data is inconclusive. Avenal Order at 24.

The commenters acknowledge that the emissions it is asking Region 10 to consider—from the icebreaker/anchor handler while presetting the anchors for the Kulluk and from the fleet of support vessels before the Kulluk attaches to the first anchor—are mobile source emissions that occur before the Kulluk is deemed to be an OCS source and/or take place more than 25 miles from the OCS source. These mobile source emissions are therefore not subject to regulation under this permit and were not required to be addressed in Shell’s application materials. Region 10 has nonetheless considered

information available to it. While the Kulluk is in transit to the drill site it will be moving, which will reduce the impact of the emissions at any one location. In addition, Shell has committed to using only ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel for its OCS exploration activities north of Bering Strait, although the permit can only require its use while the Kulluk is an OCS source and the Associated Fleet is within 25 miles of the source. This is expected to significantly reduce ambient concentrations of SO₂ well below the NAAQS for SO₂ and will also result in a reduction of particulate matter.

Shell's Exploration Plan discusses vessels relating to the Kulluk's operations that are not considered part of the Associated Fleet because they always will be located more than 25 miles from the Kulluk while the Kulluk is an OCS source. 2012 Revised Camden Bay Exploration Plan, Section 13.0. The Exploration Plan, however, does not include estimates of air emissions from these other vessels during the time they are more than 25 miles from the Kulluk or before the Kulluk becomes an OCS source. Region 10 does not have sufficient information regarding these emissions to conclude with certainty that consideration of these emissions, in conjunction with emissions authorized under the permits, would not cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS. However, Region 10 does not expect these additional emissions to do so because the vessels in question are expected to be in transit during this time period. Because compliance with the NAAQS is considered with respect to a specific location and because these vessels are expected to be moving during the activities in question, the impact of emissions from these vessels during these activities would be dispersed during transit and the impact at any one location would not be as great as would be the same level of emissions from a stationary source. To the extent any of these vessels would be stationary for any extended period of time, Region 10 expects that such vessels would be anchored and not using their propulsion engines, the emission units that would be expected to have the highest emissions on these vessels.

In summary, although Region 10 has insufficient information to conclude that consideration of emissions from these different vessels and activities would not, in conjunction with emissions authorized under the permits, cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS, Region 10 also has no information to suggest that they would do so. Region 10 therefore has no basis to conclude that, even considering these other vessels and activities in conjunction with emissions authorized under the permits, issuance of these permits would have a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations.

Comment BB.1.b: A commenter states that the fact that Shell's operations comply with the NAAQS alleviates any environmental justice concerns in the local communities as both EPA and the EAB have repeatedly stated that in the context of an environmental justice analysis compliance with the NAAQS is "emblematic" of achieving the requisite level of public health and environmental protection, with a built-in margin of safety. The commenter also notes Region 10's statements that the concentration of air pollutants in the local communities would be "well below" the NAAQS, including emissions from Shell's operations and background concentration of air pollutants.

Response: Region 10 agrees with the commenter that, in the context of an environmental justice analysis, compliance with the NAAQS is emblematic of achieving a level of public health protection that based on the level of protection afforded by the NAAQS demonstrates that minority and low-income populations will not experience disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects due to exposure to relevant criteria pollutants. Region 10 also agrees with the commenter that the concentration in the local communities of air pollutants authorized under this permit is expected to be well below the NAAQS.

Comment BB.1.c: Commenters state that the environmental justice concerns of communities of federally recognized tribes and peoples that inhabit the Arctic have not been sufficiently considered and that Region 10 should do a more thorough analysis, looking at air pollution impacts on communities.

Response: As discussed in Section 5.4 of the Statement of Basis and Category BB of the Response to Comments, Region 10 believes it has considered environmental justice concerns in a manner consistent with the Executive Order. Region 10's analysis did consider air pollution impacts on local communities. The commenters have not identified any specific deficiencies in Region 10's environmental justice analysis.

Comment BB.1.d: A commenter states that Region 10 must also work harder to make sure the Kulluk and Conoco air permits allow for air pollution levels that do not harm people and the environment, especially as Alaska Native communities will be disproportionately impacted by these activities. The commenter states that there are already high levels of asthma in these communities from the flaring from onshore operations and in Cook Inlet. The commenter contends that EPA's reviewing court previously found that more analysis was needed to assess the impact to Alaska Native communities for Shell's Discoverer drillship permit and the Kulluk and ConocoPhillips permits are the same. As an example, the commenter states that Conoco can emit 39,800 tons per year of carbon dioxide and the Kulluk can emit 80,000 tons of carbon dioxide per year and those equal the greenhouse gas emission levels of about 9,500 households, when there are only 2,800 North Slope Borough households today. The commenter states that this is a huge increase. The commenter also notes concerns about black carbon.

Response: For the reasons discussed in the Statement of Basis, throughout this Response to Comments, and the other documents in the administrative record for this permit, Region 10 is proceeding to issue this permit because it complies with the requirements of CAA § 328, 40 CFR Part 55, and 40 CFR Part 71. Region 10 has conducted an extensive review and analysis of the air quality impacts of the project and has determined that the permit will not cause or contribute to a violation of currently applicable NAAQS. Environmental justice considerations were thoroughly considered to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, as discussed in the Environmental Justice Analysis and in this Response to Comments document. Region 10 has concluded that the activities to be authorized under the permit will not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects with respect to air pollutants authorized under the permit on minority or low-income populations residing in the North Slope, including coastal

communities closest to the proposed operations and including consideration of the impact on communities while engaging in subsistence activities in areas where such activities are regularly conducted. Environmental Justice Analysis at 2. Impacts from Shell's proposed operations in the onshore communities are low, with the highest modeled concentrations occurring at Nuiqsut, constituting 50% of the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. With respect to carbon dioxide and black carbon, see the discussion in Category BB.4. The commenter has not identified a legal basis for denying issuance of these permits. Region 10 has complied with the Executive Order on Environmental Justice.

Comment BB.1.e: A commenter states that Region 10 has a new or renewed formal commitment to environmental justice and does not believe that EPA has not demonstrated that Shell Oil will not adversely and cumulatively impact the human health as well as the health of the other living communities in the Beaufort Sea.

Response: Region 10 agrees that EPA is committed to environmental justice and implementing the Executive Order on Environmental Justice. As discussed in Section 5.4 of the Statement of Basis, Region 10 believes that the activities proposed to be authorized under the permit will not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects with respect to NAAQS pollutants. See also the responses to other comments in Category BB for a discussion of other environmental justice concerns.

Comment BB.1.f: A commenter states that Region 10 should not permit the air pollution by either one of these companies but that Shell Oil has a larger operation and more emissions in the Beaufort. The commenter also states that the modeling conducted did not take into account from an environmental justice perspective the cumulative impacts to the communities that are already adversely impacted, including the accumulation of multiple sources of pollutants, both from the coast, onshore and offshore.

Response: Region 10 assumes that the reference to "either one of these companies" refers to Shell and to ConocoPhillips, because Region 10 proposed issuing permits to Shell for operation of the Kulluk in the Beaufort Sea and to ConocoPhillips for operation of a jackup rig in the Chukchi Sea on the same day. ConocoPhillips has since withdrawn its permit application and Region 10 will not be giving further consideration to issuance of that permit. In addition, as discussed in the responses to comments in Category Y, Region 10 did consider in issuing this permit the cumulative impacts for projects for which Region 10 has received permit applications. See also response to comment BB.1.a.

Comment BB.1.g: A commenter notes that EPA and Shell have established a solid track record of communication with the local communities regarding air permitting for Shell's exploration activities, including these draft air permits. The commenter further explains that this communication will continue and is in fact required under the draft permits once the permits are issued.

Response: The Kulluk Permit does require Shell to communicate with the local communities on a periodic basis regarding when exploration activities are expected to

begin and end at a drill site, the location of the drill site, and any restrictions on activities in the vicinity of Shell's operations. Permit Condition D.5.1.2.2. The permit also requires Shell to submit reports to Region 10. See, e.g., Permit Conditions A.17, A.18, and A.19.

BB.2 SUBCATEGORY – PUBLIC PROCESS FOR EJ ANALYSIS

Comment BB.2.a: Commenters state that the limited public comment period presents serious environmental justice issues for North Slope communities because local communities were not given adequate opportunity to enlist technical support and provide relevant comments on the critical issue of the appropriate model to be used in assessing impacts to air quality as well as the permits more generally. The commenters state that Region 10 specifically requested input on the new air quality model used for the first time in these permit proceedings and that the modeling that went into that work took years to prepare. The commenters continue that evaluation of that work requires an extremely high level of technical expertise, which is both time consuming and resource intensive, and that the agency's decision to provide limited, overlapping comment periods for recognized environmental-justice communities to review, analyze, and then provide comment on a brand new, technical modeling exercise impairs their communities' ability to adequately participate in the process. As a result, the commenters contend, they are unable to submit comments on key aspects of the environmental justice analysis, namely whether the predicted impacts to air quality are accurate and defensible. The commenters ask that Region 10 provide adequate time to obtain an independent technical review of the chosen modeling methodologies and state that Region 10 should have given advanced public notice of this important issue in order to allow for technical review and comment on the modeling.

Response: As discussed above in the response to comments in Category C, Region 10 took a number of steps to provide the opportunity for meaningful involvement and to engage the local communities in this permitting action, including the approval of the model. Region 10 held three separate informational meetings in Barrow and Kaktovik prior to the public comment period to describe the upcoming permitting actions and public comment opportunities. Region 10 also held an informational meeting and a public hearing on the permit and the underlying model and invited the North Slope Borough, the Native Village of Kaktovik, and the Native Village of Nuiqsut to participate in government-to-government consultation in letters dated June 7, 2011. The 46 day public comment period is longer than required under 40 CFR Part 71 and 40 CFR Part 124. Moreover, as discussed in response to comment C.3, these commenters submitted comments on the modeling that was performed to support the Discoverer permits and those permits used the same model. Therefore, the commenters in fact had a period of approximately 60 days in which to review and comment on the model.

Comment BB.2.b: A commenter states that the government has a duty, as stated in Executive Order 12,898 on Environmental Justice, to protect communities and to make sure that the government is providing a meaningful opportunity for people to fully engage in the public process and share their concerns before decisions are made. Commenters

contend that the comment period provided did not allow for meaningful public involvement.

Response: Region 10 agrees that the Executive Order on Environmental Justice calls on federal agencies to provide meaningful opportunities for involvement for communities of concern in decisions that potentially impact them. As described in Section 5.4 of the Statement of Basis and in response to comments BB.2.a and C.1, Region 10 believes it has provided North Slope communities potentially impacted by issuance of this permit with the opportunity for meaningful involvement in the decision-making process.

BB.3 SUBCATEGORY – 8-HOUR OZONE NAAQS

Comment BB.3.a: Commenters express concern that Region 10 did not consider a newly revised NAAQS– the 8-hour standard for ozone–in conducting its environmental justice analysis. The commenters note that EPA revised the 8-hour ozone standard because the prior standard did not adequately protect human health and that the agency is well aware of existing data suggesting that existing levels of ozone on the North Slope are as high as .050 ppm (8-hour average), and the Kulluk’s operations will add to significant existing and planned sources of VOCs. The commenters continue that the EAB Orders in remanding the Shell Discoverer permits to Region 10 require Region 10 to not only consider compliance with the existing NAAQS, but must also include and analyze other data that is germane to the issue of potential disproportionate adverse health impacts. The commenters assert that the Statement of Basis did not provide for any analysis of the impacts of ozone in analyzing environmental justice concerns and that the environmental justice analysis ignores ozone entirely as a pollutant of concern despite documentation that ozone levels on the North Slope are elevated in regions impacted by existing oil and gas development. Commenters continue that Region 10’s passing reference to ozone is arbitrary and inadequate for a number of reasons, including: 1) it does not provide any clarification as to whether Region 10 considered the new 8-hour ozone standard; 2) the statement in the environmental justice analysis mischaracterizes the findings of the air quality analysis, in which Region 10 concluded only that “it is unlikely this small increase in ozone precursors emissions would cause or contribute to violations of the ozone NAAQS; therefore, given the lack of quantified data and modeling, Region 10 appears to concede that violations of the NAAQS could be possible—even if they are unlikely—because Region 10 has not conducted quantified modeling; and 3) given the fact that ozone is a regional pollutant, Region 10 cannot justify its decision to ignore the combined cumulative impacts of proposed drilling operations in the Beaufort and the Chukchi Seas and that without looking at the combined emissions of ozone precursors from the Discoverer, the Kulluk, ConocoPhillip’s jackup rig, mobile sources, and onshore sources, Region 10 can only speculate as to whether the Kulluk will contribute to possible violations of the NAAQS in communities like Nuiqsut or subsistence use areas like Cross Island.

Response: As an initial matter, although there may be individual 8-hour concentrations as high as 0.50 ppm, the highest design value for the 8-hour standard for any of the monitoring sites is 0.40 ppm. The design value is in the form of the standard (which for

the 8-hour ozone standard is the three year average of the annual fourth highest daily maximum 8-hour concentration), which is the appropriate value for comparison to the NAAQS.

In addition, contrary to the statement by the commenters, the ozone NAAQS had not been revised at the time the comment was submitted, but instead had been proposed for revision. As discussed in response to comment X.2, EPA had proposed to reconsider the 0.075 ppm ozone NAAQS set in 2008 and requested comment on a range between 0.060 and 0.075 ppm. 75 Fed. Reg. 2,935 (January 19, 2010). EPA has recently announced, however, that at the President's direction, EPA will not be taking final action on its current proposal to revise the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. EPA instead intends to consider revisions to the ozone NAAQS in connection with the 5-year mandated revision of the ozone NAAQS in 2013. Statement by the President on the Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard, September 2, 2011. In any event, current ozone levels in the area are well below even the low end of the range that had been proposed by EPA (0.060 ppm). As discussed in the response to comments for Category X above, Region 10 does not believe modeling is required to conclude that emissions of ozone precursors from Shell's operations will cause or contribute to ozone levels that would exceed the low range of the proposed NAAQS. Region 10 believes this is true even when considering the combined emissions from the oil and gas activities permitted or proposed to be permitted on the Alaska OCS. See response to comment Y.4.

BB.4 SUBCATEGORY – GLOBAL WARMING AND BLACK CARBON

Comment BB.4.a: Many commenters stated that Region 10's environmental justice analysis was inadequate because it did not consider the impact of this permit on warming in the Arctic. Commenters contend that Region 10's environmental justice analysis is arbitrary and fails to meet Executive Order 12898 because it relies entirely on expected NAAQS compliance and does not consider the effect of Shell's GHG and black carbon emissions on indigenous peoples or lawfully consider the effect of Shell's emissions on subsistence users. The commenters allege that the EAB remanded Region 10's environmental justice analysis on the grounds that reliance on then existing NAAQS was insufficient because EPA had indicated that those standards were insufficient to protect public health. The commenters continue that the Arctic is already warming rapidly and that this warming has resulted in visible changes to Alaska's land, water, wildlife, and people, including the disappearance of sea ice. The commenters state that, as a result of receding and thinning sea ice, scientists have observed polar bears drowning and going hungry, walrus forced onto land, and sharp declines in numbers of ice-dependent sea birds, and that the warming is also threatening indigenous cultures because arctic animals and subsistence hunts are central to Alaska Native cultures. The commenters contend that subsistence hunters have to travel farther to access animals and that the melting permafrost is accelerating coastal erosion and forcing communities to relocate. The commenters note that EPA's Administrator has found that GHGs are "reasonably anticipated to endanger public health, for both current and future generations" and that America's Arctic—home to a large population of Alaska Natives—stands to suffer more than other locations due to the effects of high rates of projected regional warming on

natural systems. The commenters assert that Shell stands to contribute to this warming, and resulting harm to indigenous cultures, by emitting GHGs and black carbon and that Region 10 has failed to consider the amount of Shell's GHGs and black carbon emissions that will be emitted over the life of the permits.

Response: Region 10 recognizes that climate change is of particular concern to arctic communities because the Arctic is expected to experience the greatest rates of warming compared with other world regions and there is evidence that climate change is already having observable impacts in the Arctic. Region 10 also acknowledges that black carbon is now recognized as an important climate-forcing agent with particular impact on the arctic region. EPA's Endangerment Finding, Frequently Asked Questions. http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment/downloads/EndangermentFinding_FAQs.pdf

Although it is clear that GHGs contribute to global warming and other climate changes that result in impacts on the environment, due to the global scope of the problem, climate change modeling and evaluations of risks and impacts of GHGs are typically conducted for changes in emissions orders of magnitude larger than the emissions from individual projects that might be analyzed in PSD permit reviews. Quantifying the exact impacts attributable to a specific GHG source obtaining a permit in specific places and points would not be possible with current climate change modeling. PSD and Title V Permitting Guidance for Greenhouse Gases, EPA Office of Air and Radiation, March 2011.

In this case, the permit limits emissions of GHGs from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet to below PSD major source thresholds. Furthermore, emissions of GHGs from the Kulluk and the Associated Fleet only account for approximately 0.1 % of the Alaska 2005 total statewide estimated GHGs of 53 million tons and 0.40 % of the Alaska 2005 statewide oil and gas industry estimated GHGs of 15 million tons. 2012 Revised Camden Bay Exploration Plan at 3-3 to 3-4. In light of these facts, Region 10 does not expect that issuance of this permit will have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low income communities on the North Slope based on emissions of GHGs, even when considering emissions over the life of the permit.

With respect to black carbon, see response to comment BB.4.b below.

Comment BB.4.b: Commenters state that Shell's operations also could emit up to 28 tpy of PM_{2.5}, a large proportion of which will be black carbon. The commenters contend that black carbon is generally regarded as the second most important driver of arctic warming and cite an EPA report stating that this occurs because black carbon absorbs incoming and outgoing radiation and darkens snow and ice, which reduces the reflection of light back to space and accelerates melting. The commenters state that emissions of black carbon from sources in the Arctic are particularly troubling because arctic emissions can cause substantially more regional warming than similar amounts of black carbon emitted outside the Arctic and cite to numerous studies supporting this conclusion. The

commenters also cite to EPA reports that discuss studies showing that black carbon radiative forcing from both atmospheric concentration and deposition on the snow and ice has contributed to arctic surface warming and that black carbon may be the cause of as much as 50 % of arctic sea ice retreat.

Response: EPA recognizes the concerns regarding black carbon and is committed to fully evaluating its role on climate change. Based on available information at this time, Region 10 does not have information on which to reach a conclusion regarding whether emissions of black carbon from the Kulluk and Associated Fleet will have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low income communities on the North Slope. To the extent black carbon is comprised of particulate matter, it is regulated as PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ and emissions of these pollutants are estimated at 28 tpy.

CC. CATEGORY – BASELINE DATA

Comment CC.1: Commenters maintain that Region 10 must account for the substantial lack of data concerning the arctic environment. The commenters note that since the EAB remanded the Discoverer permits back to Region 10, the Secretary of Interior released a major report from the U.S. Geological Survey on the gaps in the scientific understanding of the United States' Arctic, citing to Holland-Bartels, Leslie, and Pierce, Brenda, eds., 2011, An evaluation of the science needs to inform decisions on Outer Continental Shelf energy development in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, Alaska: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1370. The commenters state that this document concludes that there are large information gaps about the Arctic Ocean, and these gaps are a “major constraint to a defensible science framework for critical Arctic decision making.” The commenters further note that the Alaska Federal District Court remanded Chukchi Lease Sale 193 because the agency had not fully considered the importance of missing information in its environmental impact analysis. One commenter states that he does not believe any data already collected is accurate enough to be the basis for any real environmental impact assessment and that long term consistent data should be collected before development of the magnitude at issue in these permits is considered so that people can understand what the affects would be. The commenters contend that Region 10 must acknowledge these shortcomings in the scientific understanding of the Arctic and move forward cautiously, ensuring that any permits it issues are designed to provide maximum protection for human health and the environment.

Response: The commenters do not say what type of data is missing or whether the missing data is even applicable to the proposed permit action. This permit is issued under the authority of the OCS regulations, 40 CFR Part 55, and the Title V program, 40 CFR Part 71. As discussed in Technical Support Document (at 6), Region 10 believes it is appropriate to use the regulations and guidance for conducting an air quality analysis with respect to the NAAQS under the PSD program where, as here, the Title V permit requires that the permit assure compliance with the NAAQS. As discussed in Section 4 of the Statement of Basis, the Technical Support Document, and in response to comments in Category T and U above, Region 10 has determined that Shell has met the

requirements to have representative background and meteorological data as necessary to assess ambient air quality in the areas that are expected to be affected by Shell's exploratory operations. While other baseline data may be useful or helpful in connection with other regulatory decisions related to Shell's exploration drilling operations in the Beaufort Sea, no other baseline data is required prior to issuance of this permit. Baseline data required for other regulatory determinations is outside the scope of this CAA permitting action.

Comment CC.2: A commenter stated that Region 10 used only data from Point Lay and did not go to Point Hope or the other villages to gather that information. The commenter states that there is not enough specific information in regards to the baseline and the data that is collected. The commenter contends that he had asked about the data that was acquired through the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme which is an international program that has participation by the United States under the National Science Foundation that has been going on since 1991. The commenter questions the accuracy of the data relied on to support this permit action.

Response: Region 10 did not rely on data from Point Lay or Point Hope to support this permitting action. Both of these villages border the Chukchi Sea, not the Beaufort Sea, where the activities to be authorized under this permit will be conducted. As discussed in response to comment CC.1, while other baseline data may be useful or helpful in connection with other regulatory decisions related to Shell's exploration drilling operations in the Beaufort Sea, no other baseline data is required prior to issuance of this permit. The commenter has not identified any specific concerns regarding the accuracy of the data relied on in this permitting action. Region 10 is therefore unable to provide a further response to this comment.

DD. CATEGORY – IMPACT ON LOCAL COMMUNITIES, SUBSISTENCE ACTIVITIES, AND TRADITIONAL USE

Comment DD.1: A number of commenters expressed concerns regarding the negative impact that Shells' specific exploratory operations and increased arctic oil and gas operations in general may have on the local communities, their environment and subsistence lifestyle. These comments include:

- Shell's operations would affect a large region of the Beaufort Sea that contains important habitat for endangered species and that serves as subsistence hunting grounds for Alaska Native communities.
- By relying exclusively on NAAQS, Region 10 has failed to account for effects on subsistence users. Shell's operations would take place close to local villages and within subsistence hunting grounds. In particular, Shell would operate very close to the villages of Kaktovik and Nuiqsut. As a result, Region 10's narrow focus on NAAQS compliance fails to account for the degree to which pollution below NAAQS levels might nonetheless disrupt subsistence activities by dissuading the native population from engaging in hunts due to fear of contamination. Also,

Region 10's analysis fails to address how Shell's air pollution might cause a disproportionate impact through non-air pathways. For instance, Shell will emit hazardous air pollutants, and some hazardous air pollutants bioaccumulate, raising the risk of human ingestion of toxic substances.

- Region 10 has not analyzed how Shell's application for air pollution permits in the outer continental shelf region may contribute to Arctic warming that might impact customary and traditional and modern cultural life ways of hunting, fishing, gathering, navigation and commerce of indigenous peoples and communities of the Arctic.
- A commenter stated concern about disproportionate adverse, cumulative toxic pollution impacts to communities of indigenous peoples and communities of birds, mammals, and fishes, and flora downwind from permitting what is definitely a major source of air pollution and sets a dangerous precedent for underestimating and minimizing actual physical impacts of permitted air pollution in the outer continental shelf region of the Beaufort Sea.
- A commenter stated that air pollution can affect the ocean and animals around Point Hope and expressed opposition to any air pollution.
- One commenter stated that the calculations show emissions of 200 tons of carbon monoxide, 240 tons of nitrogen oxides, and 30 tons per year of particulate matter, and stated that this constitutes 60,000 pounds of particulate matter that will enter the food chain.
- A commenter stated that EPA's air permits are not supposed to have adverse effects on minority populations, but that this is occurring in the subsistence zone through the process of biomagnifications, which is the concentration of toxins through the atrophic levels. The commenter explained that pollution will magnify through the food chain to seals, walrus, and polar bears.
- One commenter explained that the bowhead whale, the Beluga, the walrus and all different species of fish are an important part of the ecosystem on which communities rely.
- One commenter stated that Shell has a bad track history and referenced Nigeria, the Shetland Islands, and the North Sea and said Shell's track history is something to watch out for.
- One commenter stated that EPA has a mission statement to protect the health and safety of people in the United States.
- One commenter claimed the walrus, Beluga, bowhead whale, bearded seal and other species are being destroyed by pollution.

- One commenter referenced the good quality of clean air in Alaska.
- A commenter noted that the Arctic is very unique and asked that Region 10 not give a permit to Shell. The commenter noted that the timeframe in July is when animals go to the Arctic to nurse their young and that November is unpredictable and a bad season.
- One commenter referenced seeing a tourist ship in Point Hope and noted that there were additional sources of pollution besides Shell. The commenter was concerned with the pollution associated with the different ships.
- A commenter acknowledged that the country has a national interest in developing energy, but not to the detriment and the disproportionate adverse cumulative impact to the communities who would have to suffer from the air pollution. The commenter expressed concern that the permit would allow Shell to pollute air all over the Beaufort Sea, not in just one place, and it is unclear which communities would be impacted.
- One commenter referenced values taught by Tikigaq whaling captains and stated that bowhead whales and the marine mammals are out there are also very sensitive. The commenter was particularly concerned about noise from the ships and the traffic that will be authorized under the permit.
- A commenter expressed concern about harvesting an animal made sick by pollution.

Response: Region 10 appreciates the commenters' interest in and attention to the draft permit. We recognize the close, integral relationship the local communities have with the arctic environment and its resources and the importance to the local communities of subsistence hunting and fishing and the traditional way of life. However, the potential impact on the subsistence hunting or interference with traditional way of life is not a factor that the CAA requires EPA to evaluate in issuing OCS permits. Therefore, specific evaluation of impacts to subsistence hunting and fishing is beyond the scope of these OCS/PSD permits. *In re Shell Offshore Inc., Kulluk Drilling Unit and Frontier Discoverer Drilling Unit, Order Denying Review In Part and Remanding In Part*, 13 E.A.D. _ (September 14, 2007), slip op. at 68-69, fn. 66 (Kulluk EAB decision); see also *In re Knauf Fiber Glass GmbH*, 8 E.A.D. 121, 147 (EAB 1999) (stating that the Board's jurisdiction, and thus review power, is limited, extending only to those issues that are directly related to permit conditions that implement the federal PSD program).

As part of its environmental justice analysis, Region 10 generally considered Shell's impact on local communities while engaging in subsistence activities in areas where such activities are regularly conducted. For example, Region 10 noted that subsistence foods are an important component of the Iñupiat diet, that the residents reported traveling long distances off shore for hunting and other subsistence activities, and that subsistence plays an important cultural role in the communities. Region 10 also noted the location of the

Shell lease blocks relative to the subsistence areas. See Statement of Basis, Figure 5.1, at 56 (Subsistence Use Areas Mapped over Exploration Sites).

There are other regulatory programs in place to address the commenters' concerns. Kulluk EAB Decision, slip op. at 68-69, fn. 66. For example, BOEMRE did consider the effect and impacts of Shell's exploration activities on subsistence activities and the Iñupiat culture and way of life; risk of oil spills and their potential impacts to area fish and wildlife resources; disturbance to bowhead whale migration patterns; and harassment and potential harm of wildlife from noise, discharges, and vessel operations. See Finding of No Significant Impact, dated August 3, 2011, for Shell Offshore Inc., 2012 Revised Camden Bay Exploration Plan.

http://alaska.boemre.gov/ref/EIS%20EA/2012_Shell_CamdenEP_EA/2012FONSI.pdf;
Letter from Jeffrey Walker, BOEMRE, to Susan Childs, Shell, re: 2012 Revised Camden Bay Exploration Plan, dated August 4, 2011.

http://alaska.boemre.gov/ref/ProjectHistory/2012Shell_BF/2011_0804_soi.pdf

Finally, as explained in the Statement of Basis and this Response to Comments, Region 10's analysis indicates that this project, as regulated by the final permit, will not cause or contribute to a violation of any currently applicable NAAQS. Since NAAQS are established to protect public health and welfare, the project is not expected to have an adverse impact upon public health or welfare.

With respect to consideration of endangered species, see Section 5.1 of the Statement of Basis and Category KK of the Response to Comments. With respect to Region 10 oversight of Shell's compliance with permit requirements, see Category O of the Response to Comments.

The comments made regarding the draft ConocoPhillips permit are not relevant to this permit proceeding for the Shell Kulluk permit.

EE. CATEGORY – HEALTH IMPACTS AND GENERAL AIR QUALITY CONCERNS

Comment EE.1: Commenters state that some of the leases on which Shell would be allowed to drill are less than 25 miles from the Alaskan coast and that the environmental and human health impacts have not been sufficiently studied or communicated to potential communities that are downwind of exploration ships and the areas where a drilling rig would be stationed. The commenters contend that 500 meters as an outer perimeter for human health considerations for air quality standards is not sufficient and legally questionable under the Clean Air Act. The commenters also assert that a 25 mile radius for a major air pollution permit from exploration ships and drilling rig do not take into considerations of impacts to other communities that were not as consulted or informed of potential impacts to furred and feathered, or finned creatures that could be impacted by airborne particulates farther downwind "Kulluk's potential operations and will establish precedents that affect the Arctic's people and Environment. (Water Advocacy and Big Village)

Response: As explained, in response to comment BB.1.a, as part of Region 10's evaluation of Shell's permit applications, Region 10 considered the NAAQS. These national air quality standards are set at a level designed to protect public health protect public health, including the health of "sensitive" populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly, with an adequate margin of safety. For example, in setting the new 1-hour NAAQS for NO₂ and a new 1-hour SO₂ NAAQS, EPA understood that exposure to NO₂ and SO₂ concentrations above the standard has been linked to respiratory illnesses that lead to emergency room visits and hospital admissions, particularly in at-risk populations such as children, the elderly, and people with respiratory disease. In issuing the new 1-hour NO₂ and SO₂ NAAQS, EPA noted in particular that the prevalence and severity of asthma are higher among certain ethnic or racial groups such as Alaskan Natives. In these promulgations EPA specifically considered the exposure of sensitive subpopulations, including Alaskan Natives. 75 Fed. Reg. 6,482 (February 9, 2010); 75 Fed. Reg. 35,527 (June 22, 2010). See also Technical Support Document at Statement of Basis at 33-36 and Environmental Justice Analysis.

Region 10 determined through detailed modeling and careful analysis that Shell's operations as allowed under the permit will not exceed the national standards. In fact, the emissions are expected to be well below the standards in the North Slope communities on the Beaufort Sea and to be less than the NAAQS in the areas where the communities regularly conduct subsistence activities. Maximum modeled impacts from Shell's operations in the communities of Nuiqsut, Deadhorse and Kaktovik are well below the significant impact levels for the NAAQS pollutants. See Statement of Basis, Table 12, at 35. Considering existing air quality in these communities, the total impacts in these communities (from Kulluk operations and background concentrations) is less than 50% of the NAAQS for NO₂ and PM_{2.5}, and much less for all other NAAQS pollutants. Since this project will not cause or contribute to a NAAQS violation and since NAAQS are established to protect public health, the project is not expected to have an adverse impact upon public health. The commenters have provided no information to show that the impact in other onshore communities would be greater than the communities considered in this permitting action.

With respect to concerns regarding the 500 meter safety zone, please see responses to comments in Category P.

FF. CATEGORY – MODELING ICEBREAKER ACTIVITY

Comment FF.1: Commenters reference Shell's assumption that it will break ice for 38% of the time that it is authorized to operate under the Draft Permit and note that Shell used the same assumption in its application for the 2011 Discoverer Permits. Commenters question why Shell used the same assumption when the drilling vessels are different and conditions in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas are different, and ask that Region 10 explain why Shell used the same assumption of ice breaking time for both permits. (NSB, p. 33)

Response: The Draft Permit limits Shell's operations to a 120-day period between July and November. This period coincides with expected open water conditions but as Shell noted in its application, the frequency and intensity of ice conditions is unpredictable. In submitting its application, Shell relied on multi-year data from 2003-2005 collected at the Sivulliq drill site that showed a 15% frequency of ice at the drill site and 23% frequency of ice within 30 miles of the drill site. Shell summed these numbers to obtain a probability of ice management of 38% and used this assumption to estimate the maximum expected emissions for purposes of determining appropriate synthetic minor limits. See response to comments H.1.b, FF.2 and FF.3. Considering the year-to-year variability of ice conditions, Shell's use of multi-year data is appropriate and Region 10 does not consider the use of the same dataset for both the Draft Permit and the 2011 Discoverer Permits to be unreasonable.

In regards to their air quality modeling analysis, Shell assumed the open water period coincides with the availability of data from the buoys they deployed in the Beaufort Sea in 2009 and 2010 to model open water and ice conditions. Permit Application Supplement at 97. Shell also conservatively assumed that the ice management vessels are continuously operating at maximum load during the entire 120-day period (see Section 3.3.2 of the Technical Support Document). The question regarding ice duration is therefore moot in regards to modeled emissions.

Comment FF.2: Commenters reference Shell's permit application which states:

For emission estimation purposes the ice management fleet is assumed to be operating at maximum (nameplate rates) rate for 38 percent of the 120-day OCS period. For modeling purposes, the ice management vessels are assumed to be operating at maximum emission rate whenever the meteorology indicates that ice is present and assumed to be beyond the 25-mile radius when the data indicates open water.

Commenters state that there is no mention of icebreaker activity assumptions in the Statement of Basis or Air Quality Impact Analysis and that the amount of time the icebreaker fleet was assumed to be operating in the modeling analysis is unclear. Commenters question how the modeling analysis compares to the 38% figure used for estimating emissions and request that Region 10 make clear that the modeled activity represents the worst case operating scenario.

Response: The modeling assumptions regarding icebreaker activity are described Section D.3.2 (page 9) of the Technical Support Document. The assumptions regarding open water periods are described in Section E.2 (page 28) of the Technical Support Document. Shell did not use the 38 % assumption in its modeling analysis. They instead defined the open water period as the time a buoy could be (and was) deployed in the Beaufort Sea (August 5 – October 13, 2009; and August 14 – October 10, 2010). However, the distinction between open water and ice conditions only affected which dispersion model/meteorological data set

they used (AERMOD for ice conditions or AERMOD-COARE for open water conditions).

It is true that in its initial air quality analysis, Shell assumed that the ice management vessels would be beyond a 25-mile radius from the Kulluk during open water periods. Region 10 questioned this assumption and in response Shell revised its analysis by assuming that both ice management vessels would operate at maximum loads during the open water periods. Shell therefore modeled both ice breakers as if the vessels were managing ice continuously throughout the 120-day operational period. As described in the Technical Support Document (p.9), Region 10 believes that this approach is conservative because Shell does not intend to operate the primary ice management vessel within the 25-mile radius during open water periods, and should not need to operate the anchor handler under full load conditions during this period.

Comment FF.3: Commenters express concern that ice management activities may be underestimated in Shell's analyses. The commenters explain that heavier ice conditions result in heavier engine load factors and higher emissions, and reference that the 38% frequency of ice within 30 miles of the Kulluk is based on data from 2003-2005. The commenters cite to Shell's application to the US Coast Guard for safety zone designation in which the company stated that:

Ice conditions during 2006 were such that the areas of drilling interest were ice covered the majority of the period between July and October. If ice conditions are similar during 2007, then each drill rig will be constantly ice managed within its anchor array.

The commenters also reference the permit application in which Shell stated that “[t]he frequency and intensity of ice conditions is unpredictable and could range from no ice to ice sufficiently dense that the ice management vessels have insufficient capacity to push it out of the way”. Commenters contend that Region 10 must use an unbiased source of data which is something other than the applicant's estimate of ice conditions. Commenters also state that if estimates are based on a scientific analysis of ice flow data from 2003-2005 then that analysis should be made available for review and more recent data should be incorporated into the analysis, if possible. Commenters suggest that icebreaker emissions could be estimated and modeled to account for the maximum potential operation scenario, and any percentage less than the worst possible case would need to be specified as an enforceable permit conditions (*e.g.*, the permit could include an enforceable provision limiting the icebreaker operations to no more than 38% of the time).

Response: Region 10 agrees that the frequency and intensity of ice conditions in the Arctic is unpredictable. To provide operational flexibility to account for, among other things, unpredictability in ice frequency and intensity, the Region established source-wide emission limits and operational restrictions. Shell is required to comply with these limits and restrictions and has accepted the risk that, if ice conditions are worse than assumed, Shell may be required to curtail its drilling season or otherwise curtail

operations to ensure compliance with the permit terms and conditions. For this reason, the Region disagrees with commenters suggestion that an enforceable provision limiting icebreaker operations to 38% of the operational period should be included in the Permit. There is no need to specifically state that Shell can only operate the icebreakers for 38% of the time as the emissions from the ice breakers are counted against the source-wide limits and restrictions. Similarly, Region 10 does not believe it is necessary to obtain ice data from another source or to require that Shell use data that is more recent than the 2003-2005 dataset.

GG. CATEGORY – ANNUAL MODELING ANALYSIS

Comment GG.1: Commenters state that one of the basic principles of the Clean Air Act is that EPA may not issue a permit unless it can “assure” that allowable emissions will not result in a violation of any applicable requirement, including NAAQS, citing to 42 U.S.C. §§ 7661c(e) and 7661c(a); 40 CFR §§ 71.2, 71.6(a)(1), 71.6(e)(1). Consistent with this basic principle, the commenters continue, Region 10 has interpreted Title V as requiring that an operating permit applicant demonstrate compliance with NAAQS in the same manner as the PSD program requires, citing to the Statement of Basis (at 26-27). Commenters therefore assert that, to receive a Title V permit, Shell must show that emission increases allowed by the permit will not result in a violation of NAAQS, but that the modeling of Shell’s proposed operations is both complex and wholly uncertain because Shell has not identified many of the emission units it will use. The commenters contend that Region 10 acknowledges that Shell’s failure to identify many emission units means that it has not actually demonstrated allowable increases will not violate NAAQS, citing to the Statement of Basis (at 36), where Region 10 stated “different configurations of emission units as well as their stack characteristics (height, diameter, location relative to structures) can change the modeled impact even if emissions are the same.” The commenters state that Region 10 attempts to overcome this uncertainty and comply with the law by “[r]equiring subsequent modeling analyses to be conducted. . . to establish that any future configuration” will not cause a violation of standards, making Shell’s present modeling a preliminary and purely hypothetical exercise that Region 10 intends to revisit once Shell identifies the equipment it intends to use. The commenters assert that this approach does not comply with the requirement that Shell demonstrate, before it is issued a permit, that its emissions will not cause a violation of applicable standards. The commenters further state that allowing Shell to provide its final modeling after Region 10 issues the permit violates the public’s right to comment on the complete draft permit, including the modeling demonstration, citing to 40 CFR § 71.11. The commenters conclude that Region 10 must withdraw the permit and require Shell to make this showing based upon the actual equipment that Shell intends to use in its exploratory drilling operations.

Response: Region 10 continues to believe that the limitations on emissions and operations, along with the associated monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements, together ensure that the Kulluk and Associated Fleet would not, at any authorized location or with any authorized changes in equipment, cause or contribute to a

violation of the NAAQS when operating in compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit.

As discussed in the Statement of Basis (at Section 2.6.2), Section 504(e) of the CAA, 40 CFR 71.6(e), and the comparable Title V COA regulations authorize Region 10 to issue Shell a single permit authorizing emissions from similar operations at multiple temporary locations, provided that the permit includes conditions that will assure compliance with all applicable requirements at all locations.¹⁹ As also discussed, the NAAQS are an “applicable requirement” for Title V temporary sources. CAA § 504(e); 40 CFR §§71.2 (definition of applicable requirement) and 71.6(e). Thus, this permit must include terms and conditions that assure compliance with the NAAQS at all authorized locations.

With respect to the locations at which operation is authorized under this permit, the modeling that has already been conducted demonstrates that the NAAQS will be protected with the modeled equipment configuration at all locations that constitute ambient air lease holdings.

With respect to potential changes in equipment referred to by the commenters, Region 10 acknowledges that the specific equipment to be installed on the Kulluk and the specific Associated Fleet vessels and emission units on those vessels are not specified in the permit or known at this time. EPA’s Part 71 regulations were revised in 2009 to clarify the availability of just this kind of flexibility in Title V operating permits. See Operating Permit Programs, Flexible Air Permitting Rules; Final Rule, 74 Fed. Reg. 51,418 (October 6, 2009). Use of the Flexible Air Permitting Rules is particularly appropriate in the case of Title V permits for Title V temporary sources under CAA § 504(e) and 40 CFR § 71.6(e). Congress specifically recognized that the operations of such Title V temporary sources would be “similar” and did not require that they be “identical.” See CAA § 504(e)

The applicable requirement at issue is the NAAQS as it applies to a Title V temporary source. In addition to the emission limits, operational restrictions, and monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements, the permit includes an “approved replicable methodology” or “ARM” to provide a reasonable assurance that the NAAQS will continue to be protected with any actual changes of vessels or equipment. Kulluk Final Permit, Condition C.4. An ARM is defined as Title V permit terms that

- (1) Specify a protocol which is consistent with and implements an applicable requirement, or requirement of [Part 71], such that the protocol is based on sound scientific and/or mathematical principles and provides reproducible results using the same inputs; and
- (2) Require the results of that protocol to be recorded and used for assuring compliance with such applicable requirement, any other requirement

¹⁹ As discussed in the Statement of Basis (at 4) and the Technical Support Document (at 5-6), this permit also serves as a minor source permit under the COA regulations that govern operation in the Inner OCS. ADEC’s minor source rules, which are approved as part of the COA regulations applicable to this permitting action, specifically authorize the issuance of a single permit that is valid for multiple locations. See 18 AAC 50.502(d)). The rules do not require the permittee to update its ambient assessment prior to moving to a location previously authorized under the permit.

implicated by implementation of the ARM, or requirement of [Part 71], including where an ARM is used for determining applicability of a specific requirement to a particular change.

CFR § 71.2 (definition of ARM). Under the flexible permitting provisions, Title V permits can include ARMs provided that no ARM shall contravene any terms needed to comply with any otherwise applicable requirement or requirement of Part 71 or circumvent any applicable requirement that would apply as a result of implementing the ARM. 40 CFR § 71.6(a)(1).

In promulgating the flexible permitting provisions, EPA discussed pilot projects under which permitting authorities determined that replicable procedures could be used to ensure that future changes at a source would meet ambient air quality requirements:

The plantwide VOC emissions caps used in the pilots were determined to be adequate for purposes of safeguarding the ozone NAAQS, but for other pollutants (e.g., air toxics) states sometimes required a replicable modeling procedure to screen the impacts of individual emissions increases relative to acceptable ambient levels. In the case of one pilot, an ambient dispersion model, complete with implementation assumptions, was included in the permit to evaluate any new air toxic pollutants of concern, or increases in existing toxic pollutants. Failure of a particular change to meet the screening levels triggered a case-by-case review of that change by the permitting authority.”

74 Fed. Reg. 51,424.

In this case, Region 10 believes that the permit condition establishing the modeling procedure in the event of equipment changes is a protocol based on sound scientific/mathematical principles. The condition requires reproducible results using the same inputs and requires the results of the protocol to be used for assuring compliance with the NAAQS. Only changes in equipment that are shown to comply with the NAAQS after complying with the modeling condition are allowed to be made under the permit condition. Requiring subsequent modeling analyses to be conducted in an identical manner, reflecting only specific equipment or configuration changes, to establish that any future configuration satisfying this requirement would protect the NAAQS, is using a protocol based on sound scientific principles to provide reproducible results with the same inputs. Thus, Region 10 disagrees with the commenter that the demonstration must be made with the actual equipment that Shell intends to use in future years, provided the permit terms and conditions assure compliance with all applicable requirements (here, the NAAQS as applied to a Title V temporary source) in light of such potential changes in equipment.

Although the commenter asserts that Shell must demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS before a permit can be issued, the commenter does not reference the actual requirements of the Part 71 rules related to compliance demonstrations (plans) in permit

applications (specifically 40 CFR § 71.5(c)(8)).²⁰ Under these requirements, applicants for Part 71 permits are not required to demonstrate that they will comply with applicable requirements but rather only provide a description of the compliance status of the source with respect to all applicable requirements.²¹ For requirements that would apply to future changes at the source (such as alternative operating scenarios (AOS) or preapproved changes), the applicant would only need to provide a statement that they will continue to comply with the applicable requirements.

Region 10 also disagrees with the commenter's contention that allowing Shell to submit additional modeling after Region 10 issues the permit if Shell changes any equipment violates the public's right to comment on the complete draft permit, including the modeling demonstration. As explained in the preamble to the proposed Flexible Air Permits rule (72 Fed. Reg. 52,206, 52,208, September 12, 2007), a key purpose of a flexible air permit is to provide flexibility for certain changes after the permit is issued without further review, including further public notice and comment, under permit terms that assure compliance with applicable requirements. The public is given the opportunity to comment on permit terms that provide for such operational flexibility at a source, including terms implementing "alternative operating scenarios" and "approved replicable methodologies," during the initial permit issuance rather than when the source avails itself of the flexibility provided by the terms. This opportunity to review and comment on the draft ARM (including the conditions under which the ARM can be used and whether the draft permit terms meet the Part 71 requirements for an ARM) satisfies the public participation requirements of 40 CFR § 71.11.

With respect to the operations of the Kulluk in the Inner OCS, the ADEC "minor source" rules, which are approved as part of the COA regulations applicable to this permitting action, would not require a permit for equipment changes unless the increased emissions

²⁰ As discussed in footnote 21 below, although Region 10 has relied on the PSD requirements for a NAAQS modeling demonstration as a guide for the showing here that the NAAQS will be protected when the sources is operating in compliance with the permit terms and conditions, the commenter's reference to 40 CFR § 52.21(k) is not directly applicable to issuance of this permit since this source is not subject to PSD.

²¹ The application requirements of Title V and Part 71 do not expressly require the submission of the modeling demonstration that Shell has submitted in support of this permit action. However, 40 CFR § 71.5(c) requires that the application include information sufficient to determine applicable requirements and to implement and enforce such requirements. In order for the permit issued by Region 10 to contain terms and conditions necessary to assure compliance with the unique applicable requirements at issue in this permit (*i.e.*, the NAAQS as directly applicable requirements for this Title V temporary source), Region 10 requested from Shell information on the air quality impacts of emissions from the Kulluk and Associated Fleet for Shell's anticipated operational scenarios. References in documents prepared by EPA in the administrative record to "required compliance demonstration," "NAAQS demonstration," "a Title V temporary source demonstrating compliance with the NAAQS," or similar terms should not be interpreted to alter the Title V and Part 71 permit application requirements, but refer instead to the modeling analysis and other information determined to be necessary by Region 10 in these specific circumstances under the Part 71 rules to support issuance of this permit. As discussed in the Technical Support Document (at 5), Shell was required to submit a demonstration that its proposed potential emissions will not violate the NAAQS for NO₂, SO₂, and PM₁₀.

(if any) exceed 10 tons per year of NO_x, SO₂ or PM-10. See 18 AAC 50.502(c)(3).²² The rules therefore allow some degree of operational flexibility, as long as the permittee stays within the terms and conditions of their permit. Region 10 reiterates, however, that, as provided in Kulluk Final Permit Condition B.16,²³ nothing in the permit relieves Shell of complying with the ADEC minor source rules for changes that would qualify as modifications under those rules.

HH. CATEGORY – OTHER PERMIT TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Comment HH.1: Commenters request that the Region include as a permit condition that the “approval to construct shall become invalid if construction is not commenced within 18 months after receipt of approval” or “if construction is discontinued for a period of 18 months or more.”

Response: This preconstruction requirement is already set forth in Permit Condition A.6.5.

Comment HH.2: Commenters request the Region 10 include in the permit a provision that discusses when the permit will be reopened for cause.

Response: The permit states that it will be reopened for cause and that cause exists under any of the circumstances described in 40 CFR § 71.7(f). Permit Condition A.7.1. That section of Part 71 provides that cause exists when:

(i) Additional applicable requirements under the Act become applicable to a major part 71 source with a remaining permit term of 3 or more years. Such a reopening shall be completed not later than 18 months after promulgation of the applicable requirement. No such reopening is required if the effective date of the requirement is later than the date on which the permit is due to expire, unless the original permit or any of its terms and conditions have been extended pursuant to paragraph (c)(3) of this section.

(ii) Additional requirements (including excess emissions requirements) become applicable to an affected source under the acid rain program. Upon approval by the Administrator, excess emissions offset plans shall be deemed to be incorporated into the permit.

(iii) The permitting authority (or EPA, in the case of a program delegated pursuant to §71.10) determines that the permit contains a material mistake or that inaccurate statements were made in establishing the emissions standards or other terms or conditions of the permit.

²² The terms of this permit, however, would not allow such an increase in emissions without a permit revision.

²³ This condition was Condition B.15.7 in the Kulluk Draft Permit.

(iv) The permitting authority (or EPA, in the case of a program delegated pursuant to §71.10) determines that the permit must be revised or revoked to assure compliance with the applicable requirements.

40 CFR § 71.7(f). Through the cross-reference to 40 CFR § 71.7(f), the Kulluk Permit does include provisions that discuss when cause exists to reopen the permit.

Comment HH.3: Commenters request that Shell demonstrate compliance with the new 8-hour Ozone NAAQS within six months of the new standard being announced.

Response: As discussed in response to comment X.2, the proposal to revise the 8-hour ozone NAAQS has not been finalized and indeed EPA has stated that it does not intend to take final action on that proposal at this time. Part 71 has provisions that address when a permit must be reopened to add newly promulgated requirements. See 40 CFR § 71.7

Comment HH.4: Shell commented that its permit application requested aggregate limits for the three deck crane engines. Shell states that aggregate limits are essential for the cranes because the proposed activity requires the flexibility to operate up to two cranes simultaneously and it's impossible to know in advance which cranes will operate at any given time. Given the intermittent nature of crane operation and operational limits that will keep the crane engines from operating at maximum rated power, Shell believed that this approach supported aggregate limits that would ensure NAAQS protection.

Shell recognizes, however, that Region 10 set draft permit limits based specifically on the emission rates used in the modeling analysis (Statement of Basis, p. 40). Shell notes that because the crane modeling in the application divided total 24-hour emissions by three, Region 10 assigned a portion of the aggregate to each crane, resulting in per-crane-engine limits for NO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀. Furthermore, the dispersion analysis in the permit application evaluated daily average NO_x emission rates when evaluating compliance with the short-term NO_x ambient air quality standard; maximum one-hour emissions would be higher than daily average hourly emissions.

Specifically, Shell requests that Condition D.6.4 in the Draft Permit be revised to include the following language:

6.4 Deck Crane Engines (Units K-4A – 4C)

6.4.1 During Drilling Activity, aggregate emissions from all deck crane engines combined shall not exceed the emission limits specified for each of the pollutants below.

D.6.4.1.1 NO_x: 12.0 lb/hr

D.6.4.1.2 PM_{2.5}: 3.4 lb/day

D.6.4.1.3 PM₁₀: 3.4 lb/day

6.4.2 During all times other than Drilling Activity, aggregate emissions from all deck crane engines combined shall not exceed the

emission limits specified for each of the pollutants below.

- D.6.4.2.1 NO_x: 12.0 lb/hr
- D.6.4.2.2 PM_{2.5}: 5.7 lb/day
- D.6.4.2.3 PM₁₀: 5.7 lb/day

Shell providing additional modeling runs to support this requested permit change. Shell characterized the dispersion modeling runs as using the same model and modeling procedures that Shell used in its permit application, and involving no altered assumptions or any other changes to source characterizations other than as explained below.

Shell re-evaluated the ambient air quality implications of crane emissions by increasing the hourly emissions and assuming that all crane emissions came from a single crane. Specifically, there are three modeling scenarios:

Scenario 1 considers all three crane engine emissions come from crane engine stack A, with emissions from crane engines B and C set to zero.

Scenario 2 considers all three crane engine emissions come from crane engine stack B, with emissions from crane engines A and C set to zero.

Scenario 3 considers all three crane engine emissions come from crane engine stack C, with emissions from crane engines A and B set to zero.

Shell notes that changing these variables involves no changes to the underlying model, modeling procedures, or assumptions that were subject to public review. The model already contains inputs for the crane engine stacks; the three separate crane locations are already imbedded in the emission sequences used to determine the probabilistic design day. Shell states that the modeling runs supporting this comment simply changed the numerical values associated with those inputs. Anyone running the model would get the same results.

Shell explains that this demonstration focuses on compliance with the 1-hour NO₂ and 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS, which are the most constraining ambient standards for the Kulluk project. As shown in the application, PM₁₀ concentrations are well below the NAAQS and any changes to these concentrations would be proportional to the changes in PM_{2.5} concentrations. Therefore, an explicit analysis is not performed for PM₁₀.

Shell states that the modeling approach taken to support this comment provides hourly data, spatial specificity, and a conservative approach that ensures NAAQS compliance while allowing for aggregate limits for the cranes. In its application, Shell demonstrated that the proposed crane emissions contributions to maximum concentrations on the “design days” are very small, showing that the highest-impacting crane engine would contribute approximately 1.2% of the Kulluk concentrations for 1-hour NO₂, and 0.5% for 24-hour PM_{2.5}.

By modeling total emissions from all three cranes as coming from a single crane location, Shell contends that the modeling runs provided in support of this comment present an even more conservative approach. This approach shows the maximum possible concentrations from the requested aggregate crane emission rates, because spreading emissions among multiple sources results in lower concentrations than simulating those same emissions from a single location. This is reflected in the modeling results, which are summarized in the table below. Shell explains that with these conservative assumptions, the total 1-hour NO₂ and 24-hour PM_{2.5} concentrations are only slightly increased from the permit application values, and in all cases project concentrations remain below the NAAQS.

1-hour NO₂ & 24-hour PM_{2.5} Concentrations – Comparing Application Results and Revised Crane Engine Scenario Results

NAAQS	Total Concentrations (µg/m ³) (includes background)			NAAQS (µg/m ³)
	Application	Revised Crane Engine Scenarios	Increase from Application	
1-hour NO ₂	151.49	162.17	10.68	188
24-hour PM _{2.5}	34.01	34.05	0.04	35

In summary, Shell states that the modeling runs provided with this comment support replacing the per-crane limits with aggregate emission limits for the three crane engines. They demonstrate that even if all of the aggregated emissions came from a single crane – which represents the maximum possible impact of the requested limits – the NAAQS would be protected. Shell contends that spreading the aggregate allowable emissions among the three cranes, regardless of the distribution, will result in concentrations that are at-worst equal to, but likely lower than, the concentrations calculated based on all of the emissions coming from a single crane. Shell states that imposing aggregate emission limits will, therefore, ensure that the NAAQS are protected while giving the project necessary operational flexibility.

Response: The air quality impact analysis for 1-hour NO₂ and 24-hour PM_{2.5} provided by Shell during the public comment period supports the permittee’s request to adjust the numerical emission limits in Condition D.6.4.1 and D.6.4.2 to reflect aggregate limits for all emission units in that category instead of emission limits on a per unit basis. Accordingly, the numerical limits have been amended as requested.

For PM_{2.5}, the analysis provides the basis for revising the permit to move forward with emission limits that apply to all three deck crane engines combined, not separately as the draft permit proposed. For PM_{2.5}, the new analysis assumes no emissions increases. The analysis assumes that the same total emissions are generated. But this time, all emissions are assumed to be exhausted through a single stack rather than three stacks that are spread across three locations on the Kulluk deck. The new PM_{2.5} analysis shows an increase of 0.12 percent to the maximum concentration previously predicted. The new resultant ambient concentration of 34.05 µg/m³ (which includes background) remains less than the

24-hr PM_{2.5} NAAQS of 35µg/m³. Because NAAQS remain protected, Region 10 has revised the emission limits to reflect the emission rates modeled.

For the revised NO₂ analysis, Shell again modeled emissions as if exhausted from a single stack. This time, however, Shell increased the combined emission rate from 3.6 lb/hr to 12 lb/hr for Well Drilling Activity and from 6 lb/hr to 12 lb/hr for all other activities. Whereas the 12 lb/hr emission rate is based upon an hourly fuel combustion capacity value of 26 gallons per hour, the “3.6 lb/hr” and “6 lb/hr” emission rate values reflect average daily fuel consumption for different activity levels expressed as an hourly value for modeling purposes.²⁴ The new NO₂ analysis shows an increase of 7 percent to the maximum concentration previously predicted. The new resultant ambient concentration of 162.17 µg/m³ (which includes background) remains less than the 1-hr NO₂ NAAQS of 188µg/m³. Because NAAQS remain protected, Region 10 has revised the emission limits to reflect the emission rates modeled.

Region 10 also revised the text of the permit, but not as requested. Region 10 used the same sentence structure as used in Permit Condition D.6.2.1 for the MLC HPU Engines. Region 10 took this approach because Shell modeled the deck crane engines in an analogous manner to the MLC HPU engines. In both cases, emissions from identical emission units were conservatively assumed to be generated at a single location on the Kulluk deck. Demonstrating compliance with the NAAQS using this conservative assumption provides for additional flexibility in the corresponding permit condition.

While the change to Permit Conditions D.6.4.1 and D.6.4.2 does increase the amount of NO_x the deck crane engines can emit during any given hour, this revision does not increase the overall PTE of the OCS source which remains at 240 tpy.

Comment HH.5: The Alaska Department of Natural Resources provided the following specific comments on the Draft Permit and Statement of Basis:

Kulluk Draft Permit

1. Page 20, Item 26.3.4 refers to a form in Appendix B for recording visibility, but there was no Appendix B provided with the document.
2. Page 23, Item 3.1.1.4 refers to a form in Appendix B for recording visibility, but there was no Appendix B provided with the document.

Kulluk Statement of Basis

1. Page 20, final paragraph, sentence four references the Discoverer drill rig. This reference should be changed to the Kulluk drill rig.
2. Page 34, Condition B.15 – the text refers to 18 AC 50.110. The correct citation should read 18 AAC 50.110.

²⁴ Max 1-hr: (26 gal/hr) x (0.462 lb NO_x/gal) = 12lb/hr
Average Well Drilling Activity: (184 gal / 24 hr) x (0.462 lb NO_x/gal) = 3.6 lb/hr
Average Cementing/Logging Activity: (307 gal / 24 hr) x (0.462 lb NO_x/gal) = 6 lb/hr
See Permit Application, Appendix G pages 4 and 6.

3. Page 39, Condition D.4.9 – prohibits Shell from operating the Kulluk in the Beaufort Sea within the same drilling season as the Noble Discoverer drilling vessel. This condition appears as Condition D.4.8 on page 38 of the permit. Consideration should be given to adding a caveat on this condition that in the unlikely event of a well blowout emergency this condition should not preclude the use of a second drilling vessel to drill a relief well.
4. Page 53, Section 5.3 Coastal Zone Management – it should be noted that the Alaska Coastal Management Program described in this section ceased to exist as of July 1, 2011.
5. Page 55, Footnote 20, line 2 – The reference refers to Alaska’s North Slope. It should refer to Alaska’s North Slope.

Response: Region 10 erroneously omitted the Visible Emissions Field Data Sheet as Appendix B of the proposed permit. In the final permit, the Visible Emissions Field Data Sheet is presented as Appendix B.

With respect to the comments regarding errors in the Statement of Basis, Region 10 acknowledges the errors the commenter points out. Region 10 inadvertently referenced the Discoverer drill rig rather than the Kulluk drill rig on page 20; incorrectly cited 18 AAC 50.110 on page 34; and misspelled the word “North” on page 55.

With respect to the comment regarding the termination of Alaska’s Coastal Zone Management Program, see response to Category JJ earlier in this document.

Lastly, the commenter asks Region 10 to consider including a caveat to Condition D.4.8 to ensure that this condition does not prohibit the use of a second vessel to drill a relief well in the event of an emergency blowout. Condition D.4.8 prohibits Shell from operating the Kulluk in the Beaufort Sea in the same drilling season as the Discoverer because Shell’s application did not consider the air quality impacts or the aggregation aspects (*i.e.*, what constitutes the “stationary source”) of operating both vessels in the same sea during the same drilling season. See response to comment E.1. As a general matter, Clean Air Act stationary source permitting programs are not intended to address emergency activities, such as those that may be necessary to respond to a blowout. See generally *Shell Gulf of Mexico, Inc. and Shell Offshore, Inc.*, Frontier Discoverer Drilling Units, OCS Appeal Nos. 10-01 through 10-04, Order on Four Additional Issues, dated March 14 2011, at 26-38. To the extent Shell determines that safety considerations associated with an emergency blowout require operation of both the Discoverer and the Kulluk in the Beaufort Sea in violation of Permit Condition D.4.8, Region 10 will evaluate any such situation in accordance with EPA’s excess emissions policy.²⁵

²⁵ See e.g., Memorandum from Kathleen M. Bennett to Assistant Administrator for Air, Noise and Radiation Regional Administrators, Regions I-X, Re: Policy on Excess Emissions During Startup, Shutdown, Maintenance, and Malfunctions, dated September 28, 1982; Memorandum from John B. Rasnic, Director, Stationary Source Compliance Division Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards to Linda M. Murphy, Director, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division Region 1, Re: Automatic or Blanket Exemptions for Excess Emissions During Startup, and Shutdowns Under PSD, dated January 28, 1993; Memorandum from Eric Schaeffer, Director, Office of Regulatory Enforcement, to Addressees, Re:

Comment HH.6: Shell recommended the following changes to the Draft Permit to correct what it characterized as unintended errors:

- Page 6, Table 2 in “Source Description.” The bottom right cell of the table (the “600 hp” Approximate Aggregate Rating for OSRV WB-1A-1Z) should also refer to footnote “h.”
- Page 33, Table D.2.1, footnote p. This footnote is for the PM_{2.5} column in the table, so should refer to “PM_{2.5} emission factors,” not “PM₁₀ emission factors.”
- Page 34, Table D.2.2. The column headings for N₂O and CH₄ are swapped. The 0.0009 lb/gal emission factor for engines is for methane (CH₄), not N₂O (see 7/20/11 EPA memo, “Derivation of Emission Factors in Tables D.2.1 and D.2.2 of Draft Permit to Shell for Operation of Kulluk in Beaufort Sea”).
- Page 40, Condition D.6.3.1. To be consistent with the language in Condition 6.4.1, delete the word “Combined,” the “s” from the word “engines,” and the phrase “operating at a single location”, and add the word “each” before “MLC” so it reads: “Emissions from each MLC air compressor engine shall not exceed ...”

Response: With respect to the last cell in Table 2 of the proposed permit, Region 10 acknowledges that we inadvertently referenced footnote “g” rather than footnote “h.” In the final permit, the last cell of Table 2 references footnote “h.” With respect to the text within footnote “p,” Region 10 inadvertently references “PM₁₀” rather than “PM_{2.5}.” In the final permit, footnote “p” makes reference to “PM_{2.5}.” Finally, Region 10 acknowledges inadvertently misidentifying N₂O and CH₄ emission factors in Table D.2.2. The final permit’s Table D.2.2 correctly identifies N₂O and CH₄ emission factors.

With respect to the comment regarding Permit Condition D.6.3.1, commenter requests Region 10 to consider amending the text. Region 10 is revising Permit Condition D.6.3.1 and is creating Permit Condition D.6.3.2 to provide clarity with respect to the emission limits applicable to MLC Air Compressors engines necessary for NAAQS protection.

The Draft Permit’s Condition D.6.3.1 stated,

6.3.1 Combined emissions from MLC air compressor engines operating at a single location shall not exceed the emission limits specified for each of the pollutants below.

6.3.1.1	NO _x :	14.8 lb/hr
6.3.1.2	PM _{2.5} :	7.4 lb/day
6.3.1.3	PM ₁₀ :	7.4 lb/day

Guidance on the Appropriate 6/12/08 Meyer Memo; Memorandum from Steven A. Herman, Assistant Administrator for Enforcement and Compliance Assurance; Robert Perciasepe, Assistant administrator for Air and Radiation to Regional Administrators, Regions I-X, Re: State Implementation Plans: Policy Regarding Excess Emissions During Malfunctions, Startup, and Shutdown, dated September 20, 1999.

Although not made clear in the Draft Permit, Region 10 intended to limit emissions from two groups of engines operating at two separate locations through this one permit term. As the application clearly illustrates, one group was modeled as if located on the Port side of the Kulluk while the other was modeled as if located on the Starboard side. The two groups were modeled simultaneously, and each group's emissions were modeled as exhausting through a single stack distinct from the other group's stack.

The Port engines were modeled with the following emission rates: NO_x - 14.8 lb/hr, PM_{2.5} - 7.4 lb/day and PM₁₀ - 7.4 lb/day. The Starboard engines were modeled with the following emission rates: NO_x - 14.8 lb/hr, PM_{2.5} - 7.4 lb/day and PM₁₀ - 7.4 lb/day. See Technical Support Document Tables 3 and 4.

Region 10 recognizes that the Draft Permit language can be improved to better reflect emission rates that were modeled for the MLC Air Compressor Engines. The following two Permit Conditions, which do not represent an increase in allowable emissions, are being inserted into the permit to clarify Draft Permit Condition D.6.3.1.

6.3.1 Combined emissions from Port MLC air compressor engines shall not exceed the emission limits specified for each of the pollutants below.

6.3.1.1	NO _x :	14.8 lb/hr
6.3.1.2	PM _{2.5} :	7.4 lb/day
6.3.1.3	PM ₁₀ :	7.4 lb/day

6.3.2 Combined emissions from Starboard MLC air compressor engines shall not exceed the emission limits specified for each of the pollutants below.

6.3.2.1	NO _x :	14.8 lb/hr
6.3.2.2	PM _{2.5} :	7.4 lb/day
6.3.2.3	PM ₁₀ :	7.4 lb/day

II. CATEGORY – GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION

Comment II.1: Commenters questioned whether Region 10 had properly engaged in government-to-government consultation. One commenter referenced the trust relationship between federal and tribal governments and stated that the federal government has a fiduciary responsibility to Indian tribes to protect their lands and resources. The commenter stated that the federal government must recognize tribal governments as separate sovereign nations. The commenter read from a document that was described as Department of Interior order number 3225 concerning the Endangered Species Act and subsistence uses in Alaska. In reading from this document the commenter stated that the Department of Interior will ensure government-to-government consultation with Alaska natives, and the Department of Commerce will comply with relevant orders and policies in consulting with Alaska natives. The commenter also read

from what was described as a court case concerning the question of whether the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act can lawfully extinguish aboriginal title or rights in Alaska. The commenter also cited to a Supreme Court case, *City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York*, 544 U.S. 197 and stated that the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act was unconstitutional and an act of genocide and fraud upon the indigenous people of Alaska.

Response: Region 10 recognizes that the federal government has a unique legal relationship with tribal governments which involves, among other things, providing for meaningful and timely consultation. Executive Order 13175, issued on November 9, 2000 and entitled “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments,” requires federal agencies to have an accountable process to ensure meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of policies that have tribal implications. 65 Fed. Reg. 67,249; EPA Policy on Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribes, May 4, 2011. To ensure meaningful and timely consultation, Region 10 has established a tribal consultation framework and developed a communications protocol to provide for meaningful involvement of North Slope communities in decision making.

Given the geographic proximity between the Kulluk’s proposed operations and off-shore areas where subsistence activities occur, Region 10 determined that tribal consultation was warranted. In letters dated June 6, 2011, Region 10 invited the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope, Native Village of Kaktovik, and Native Village of Nuiqsut to engage in government-to-government consultation. The Region also held informational meetings in Barrow and Kaktovik on June 15-17, 2011 to discuss OCS permitting actions, including the Draft Permit. These meetings were open to the public and all North Slope entities (city governments, tribal governments, the North Slope Borough, and the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission) received invitations to attend these early informational meetings. The Region believes its actions have ensured meaningful and timely consultation with tribal governments.

Comments regarding the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act are outside the scope of this proceeding.

JJ. CATEGORY – COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT

Comment JJ.1: Commenters reference the fact that Alaska’s Coastal Management Program (ACMP) expired by operation of statute on June 30, 2011. One commenter stated that it is premature for Region 10 to issue the Draft Permit without a coastal management program.

Response: Region 10 is aware that the ACMP expired on June 30, 2011 by operation of Alaska Statutes 44.66.020 and 44.66.030. Because a federally approved coastal zone management program must be administered by a state agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) withdrew the ACMP from the National Coastal Management Program established under the Coastal Zone Management Act. 76 Fed. Reg. 39,857 (July 7, 2011). As a result, the Coastal Zone Management Act consistency

provisions at 16 U.S.C. § 1456(c)(3) and 15 CFR Part 930 no longer apply in Alaska and consistency certifications are no longer required. However, prior to the expiration of the ACMP, Region 10 conducted a review of the projects required to undergo ACMP consistency review and determined that a consistency review for the Draft Permit was not required under the ACMP. Accordingly, Region 10 does not believe that a decision on the Draft Permit would be premature in the absence of a coastal management program.

KK. CATEGORY – ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Comment KK.1: At the public hearing in Barrow, one commenter questioned whether he should be concerned about the Draft Permit with respect to the Coastal Zone Management Act and Endangered Species Act (ESA).

Response: Although the Alaska Coastal Management Program is no longer in effect, the Region determined that a consistency review would not have been required under the former program. See response to comment JJ.1. Section 7 of the ESA requires federal agencies, in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (collectively “the Services”), to ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by the agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a species listed as threatened or endangered, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat of such species. The BOEMRE is the lead agency for ESA Section 7 compliance with respect to Shell’s oil exploration activities and has consulted with the Services regarding Shell’s activities in the Beaufort Sea. In fulfilling its ESA obligations for this permitting action, Region 10 reviewed the ESA consultation documents prepared by BOEMRE and the biological opinions issued by the Services. A discussion of Region 10’s ESA process is provided in the Statement of Basis (pp.50-51).

II. SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE PERMIT

The following table lists the changes made to the Draft Permit and provides a brief summary of the rationale for the changes (as compared to July 22, 2011 Revised Draft Permit).

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
Page 1	Added actual issuance date.	
Page 1	Added actual date permit is to become effective.	
Page 1	Added actual date Title V permit is to expire.	
Page 5	Added acronym for continuous monitoring	

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
	system	
Table 2	Corrected two typos. In row “OSRV Work Boats (OSRV WB)”, correct reference is to footnote “g” rather than footnote “f”. In last cell of table, correct reference is to footnote “h” rather than footnote “g”.	Corrected typo. See also RTC Comment HH.6.
A.18	Revised to make minor changes to reflect most recent COA requirements for excess emissions and permit deviation reports.	OCS permits on the Inner OCS must include COA requirements. See 40 CFR 55.14. The draft permit did not include the most current COA language. See 18 AAC 50.346(b)(2), Standard Permit Condition III Excess Emissions and Permit Deviation Reports.
B.2.2.1	Replaced language that required visible emissions observations to be conducted within 6 months of permit issuance. Revised permit condition states, “Within 30 days of the Kulluk becoming an OCS source or within 30 days of startup of an emission unit, whichever is later, observe exhaust for 18 minutes.”	In response to concerns raised by Shell in a telephone conversation on October 13, 2011, between Doug Hardesty, EPA, and Pauline Ruddy, Shell, Region 10 is deviating from standard operating permit language to account for the fact that this is both a Title V permit and a construction permit. Equipment may not be installed, much less operating, within 6 months of permit issuance. The Kulluk is prohibited from becoming an OCS source until July 1, 2012. New language provides flexibility to permittee to conduct observations within a reasonable time after startup.

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
B.14.1	Added “Perform regular maintenance considering the manufacturer’s or the operator’s maintenance procedures.”	Revised to include a subparagraph in a COA requirement that was erroneously omitted. See 18 AAC 50.346(b)(5), Standard Permit Condition VI Good Air Pollution Practices.
B.16	Re-numbered Condition B.15.7 as Condition B.16. Entitled B.16, “COA Obligations for Modifications Subject to 18 AAC Article 5 Minor Permits.”	Clarifying change.
B.17	Created condition to require permittee to provide emissions information consistent with COA requirement born out of the State’s emissions reporting obligations in 40 CFR Part 51.	OCS permits on the Inner OCS must include COA requirements. See 40 CFR 55.14. Region 10 erroneously omitted this standard condition from the draft permit. See 18 AAC 50.346(b)(8), Standard Permit Condition XV Emission Inventory Reporting.
C.3.3	Added language clarifying that permittee is to report capacity of boilers and heaters in units of “MMBtu per hour” and “gallons per hour.”	Clarifying change.
Table D.2.1 – Row for Units K-5A – 5Z. Table D.2.2 – Rows for Units IB1-2A – 2Z and IB2-2A – 2Z.	Revised CO emission factor to 0.007 lb/gal.	See RTC Comment I.3.a-c. See also October 21, 2011 EPA memo. New value reflects worst-case emissions test results for boiler on the Discoverer.
Table D.2.1 – Row for Unit K-6. Table D.2.2 – Row for OSRV WB-1A – 1Z	Revised NO _x and PM _{10/2.5} emission factors to 0.399 lb/gal and 0.038 lb/gal, respectively.	See RTC Comment I.3.a. See also October 21, 2011 EPA memo. New values reflect 90 th percentile

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
		emissions test result values for engines with output greater than 600 hp on Discoverer and Associated Fleet.
Table D.2.1 – Last Cell	Revised CH ₄ emission factor to 1596 lb/month.	See RTC Comment I.3.d. New value assumes that what was projected to be emitted during an entire drilling season is emitted in just one month.
Table D.2.1 – Footnote p	Changed “PM ₁₀ ” to “PM _{2.5} ”	Corrected typo.
Table D.2.2	Under column “Emission Unit ID,” replace “OSRV WB 1 – 4” with “OSRV WB-1A – 1Z.”	Corrected typo.
Table D.2.2	Exchange emission factor values in columns “N ₂ O” and “CH ₄ .”	Corrected typo. See also RTC Comment HH.6.
D.3.4	Added phrase “within a drilling season” to the end of condition.	Clarifying change. Revised language is consistent with language in Condition D.3.3.
D.3.10	Added requirement to calculate and record information on the number of days the Kulluk operates as an OCS source, the number of hours of drilling activity, and the number of hours of MLC activity.	Requires recordkeeping to provide a reasonable assurance of compliance with Conditions D.3.2, D.3.3, and D.3.4 and are generally responsive to concerns expressed in comments within Category I.1, J.1, K and M.1 that the permit include sufficient monitoring to assure compliance with limits.
D.4.1.2, D.4.1.3, D.4.2.2, D.4.2.3, D.4.4.3, D.4.4.4, D.6.14.2, D.6.15.2, D.6.15.3	Corrected a series of typos in which cross references failed to identify correctly the permit condition being referenced.	Corrected typos. Each cross reference failed to identify the letter (D.4.4.1, for example) in the designation of the referenced permit conditions.

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
D.4.1.4, D.4.2.4, D.4.4.5, D.6.14.3, D.6.15.4	Deleted conditions requiring Shell to calculate heater and boiler emissions assuming operation at maximum capacity.	In response to concerns raised by Shell in a telephone conversation on October 13, 2011, between Doug Hardesty, EPA, and Pauline Ruddy, Shell, Region 10 is revising these conditions to make the emission calculation requirement for heaters and boilers consistent with emission calculation requirement for regularly operated engines.
D.4.5	Corrected a typo that erroneously referenced Condition F.2.3 rather than Condition F.2.4.	Corrected typo.
D.4.6	Revised total fuel combustion allowance to 7,004,428 gallons.	See RTC Comment I.3.d. New fuel allowance reflects increased projection of mud degassing PTE.
D.4.9	Created condition prohibiting permittee from purchasing any liquid fuel other than ULSD. Condition requires permittee to keep records to show compliance.	See RTC Comment G.1. Permittee originally requested operating limit that restricts diesel fuel purchases to ULSD. Proposed permit inadvertently omitted this owner-requested limit. Final permit includes operating limit.

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
D.5.5	Make reference to “drilling season” rather than “rolling 12-month period.” Clarify that an activity occurring during parts of two days is considered two events regardless of whether the activity lasts longer than 24 hours.	Clarifying change. The changes recognize that compliance with the NAAQS is based upon air quality observations that occur within blocks of time that align with the calendar. The specific 24-hour period is the day, and the specific 12-month period is the calendar year. That portion of the calendar year in which permittee is authorized to operate is the drilling season.
D.6.3.1, D.6.3.2	Revised Condition 6.3.1 and created Condition 6.3.2 to clarify that one set of emission limits apply to “Port” emission units and the other apply to “Starboard” emission units.	See RTC Comment HH.6. The change limits Shell to installing MLC Air Compressor Engines to two distinct locations and makes it more clear what emission limits apply at those locations. Change in no way represents an increase in allowable emissions from draft permit.
D.6.4.1, D.6.4.2	Revised deck crane engines’ emission limitations.	See RTC Comment HH.4. Emissions from all engines now aggregated to determine compliance with new limits. Change represents an increase to hourly NO _x allowable emissions, but no increase to allowable PM _{2.5} emissions. Change results from new modeling provided by Shell.
D.6.10.1.2	Revised the PM _{2.5} emission limit from 73.9 lb/day to 74.4 lb/day.	Corrected typo.

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
D.6.14	Revised permit condition to require that units K-5A – 5Z and K-8 demonstrate compliance with 1-hour NO _x limit by multiplying appropriate emission factor by hourly operation rate.	To demonstrate compliance with 1-hour NO _x limit, hourly emissions must be calculated for these emission units. In the proposed permit, Region 10 inadvertently exempted permittee from making this hourly demonstration for the Kulluk incinerator (K-8). The change to the permit corrects this error. In response to concerns raised by Shell in a telephone conversation on October 13, 2011, between Doug Hardesty, EPA, and Pauline Ruddy, Shell, Region 10 is also revising this condition with respect to Kulluk heaters and boilers (K-5A – 5Z). In the proposed permit, Region 10 had erroneously thought the permittee was accepting of calculating boiler emissions assuming operation at maximum hourly capacity in exchange for not monitoring operating rate. In the final permit, permittee is required to collect hourly operating data for heaters and boilers and to use the data to calculate emissions.
D.6.15.3	Revised permit condition to delete the following language, “multiplied by the appropriate emission factor (lb/ton) specified in Tables D.2.1 – D.2.2 times 24.”	Clarifying change. The deleted language is not necessary given the language in D.6.15. Revised permit condition is now consistent with D.6.15.2.

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
E.3.2	Revised permit to require all incinerators undergo source testing to determine test-derived emission factors for CO and NO _x .	See RTC Comment I.3.a.

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
F.1.1	<p>Added additional GPS requirement for Shell to monitor the date, time and location of the Associated Fleet when the Kulluk becomes and ceases to be an OCS source and when the Associated Fleet enters or leaves the 25 mile radius area around the Kulluk.</p>	<p>The revised permit condition makes it more clear that all fuel combusted while the Associated Fleet is within 25 miles of the Kulluk must be accounted for if the permit requires Shell to record the time at which each vessel enters or leaves the 25 mile radius area around the Kulluk when the Kulluk is an OCS source, as well as the location of the Associated Fleet at the time the Kulluk becomes and ceases to be an OCS source. These requirements have been added to Condition F.1.1 of the permit and will require the collection of information needed to ensure, in conjunction with other permit requirements, that all of the fuel combusted by the Associated Fleet while regulated by this permit is accounted for and considered when determining compliance. These changes are generally responsive to concerns expressed in comments within Category I.1, J.1, K and M.1 that the permit include sufficient monitoring to assure compliance with limits.</p>

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
F.2.2	Amended condition to require permittee monitor heater and boiler fuel consumption.	In response to concerns raised by Shell in a telephone conversation on October 13, 2011, between Doug Hardesty, EPA, and Pauline Ruddy, Shell, Region 10 is revising this condition to make the fuel monitoring requirement for heaters and boilers consistent with fuel monitoring requirement for engines that operate regularly.
F.2.2.1.1	Amended condition to replace “engine” with “emission unit or emission unit group” to recognize that fuel flow meters may be employed to determine fuel consumption rate of an individual combustion unit or a group of combustion units.	Clarified that a fuel flow meter should have no inflows or outflows between it and the associated individual emission unit or emission unit group. Clarifying Condition F.2.2.1.1 is generally responsive to comments within Category I.1, J.1, K and M.1 that the permit include sufficient monitoring to assure compliance with limits.
F.2.2.5	Added requirement to record fuel usage for all emission units.	Added to ensure the annual fuel usage limit has appropriate recordkeeping requirements. Enhancing Condition F.2.2.5 is generally responsive to comments within Category I.1, J.1, K and M.1 that the permit include sufficient monitoring to assure compliance with limits.

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
F.2.4.2	<p>The revised language in the permit specifies that the permittee is to “determine the sulfur content of each delivery of fuel to the Kulluk and Associated fleet.” In lieu of sampling and analyzing each delivery, the permittee may “Obtain from the fuel supplier certification of the sulfur content of the fuel as purchased, and obtain documentation that each storage tank transporting the fuel between purchase and delivery has not caused the fuel delivered to become higher than 100 ppm sulfur content.”</p>	<p>See RTC Comment G. Changes to language more clearly specify options for determining sulfur content of fuel shipments.</p>
F.2.5	<p>Added language to clarify when monitoring of the incinerator temperature is required.</p>	<p>In response to concerns raised by Shell in a telephone conversation on October 13, 2011, between Doug Hardesty, EPA, and Pauline Ruddy, Shell, Region 10 is revising this condition to more clearly describe the time period during which the permittee is required to monitor incinerator temperature. Temperature monitoring is to begin as soon as waste is introduced to the incinerator.</p>

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
F.2.7	Created condition to require permittee to monitor Kulluk emergency generator operation.	Added to ensure the Kulluk emergency generator operating restrictions have appropriate recordkeeping requirements. Creating Condition F.2.7 is generally responsive to comments within Category I.1, J.1, K and M.1 that the permit include sufficient monitoring to assure compliance with limits.
F.3	Spell out abbreviation for CMS as continuous monitoring system.	Clarifying change.
F.3.2	Added language to clarify when operation of the SCR inlet temperature and urea pump CMS is required.	In response to concerns raised by Shell in a telephone conversation on October 13, 2011, between Doug Hardesty, EPA, and Pauline Ruddy, Shell, Region 10 is revising this condition to clarify the time period during which the permittee is required to operate these two aspects of the SCR CMS.
F.3.7	Correct typos that cross reference incorrect permit conditions.	Clarifying change.
F.4.2	Added language to clarify when monitoring of the exhaust gas inlet temperature to the oxidation catalyst is required.	In response to concerns raised by Shell in a telephone conversation on October 13, 2011, between Doug Hardesty, EPA, and Pauline Ruddy, Shell, Region 10 is revising this condition to clarify the time period during which the permittee is required to monitor temperature.

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
G.1, G.2, G.3, G.4, G.5	Added descriptive titles.	Clarifying change.
G.1.5, G.1.6.1, G.1.7.1, G.1.7.4, G.1.8.1, G.2.12.2, G.3.3	Correct typos that cross reference incorrect permit conditions.	Clarifying change.
G.1.8, G.1.8.1 and G.1.8.2.	The revised language in the permit specifies that the permittee is to “determine and record the sulfur content, cetane index and aromatic content of each delivery” in accordance with the appropriate sampling and analysis methods. In lieu of sampling and analyzing each delivery, the permittee may “Obtain from the fuel supplier certification of the sulfur content of the fuel as purchased, and obtain documentation that each storage tank transporting the fuel between purchase and delivery has not caused the fuel delivered to become higher than 15 ppm sulfur content.”	See RTC Comment G. Original permit language simply requiring “the purchase” of ULSD lacked specificity. The fuel being delivered to storage tanks serving affected sources must meet specification as it is delivered from supply vessel. Requirement applies to all fuel intended to be combusted while Kulluk is an OCS source. Revisions also specify how compliance is to be determined.
G.3.5	Correct a typo that identified the incorrect underlying regulation.	Corrected typo.

Permit Condition or Location	Description	Explanation or Response to Comments Discussion
G.3.5.1, G.3.5.2, G.3.5.3	Replace “or” with “and” with respect to requirement to determine cetane index and aromatic content. Replace “ASTM D 4737 10” with “ASTM D 976-80.” Replace “ASTM 5186-03” with “ASTM D 1319-03”	Changes consistent with changes to G.1.8.1.1 that correctly reference requirement to test for cetane index “and” aromatic content, not cetane index “or” aromatic content. Changes also correct the references to analytical methods for determination of cetane index and aromatic content for diesel fuel as referenced in ASTM D975-11 “Standard Specification for Diesel Fuel Oils.”
G.5.2.2.3	Correct a typo where a cross reference failed to identify the letter in the designation of the referenced permit condition.	Corrected typos.
Attachment A – EPA Notification Form – Excess Emission and Permit Deviation Reporting	Added form to permit.	Region 10 erroneously omitted this form from the draft permit.
Attachment B – Visible Emission Field Data Sheet	Added form to permit.	Region 10 erroneously omitted this form from the draft permit. See RTC at Comment HH.5.
Attachment C – Emission Inventory Reporting Form.	Added form to permit.	Region 10 erroneous omitted this form from the draft permit. OCS permits on the Inner OCS must include COA requirements. See 40 CFR 55.14. See 18 AAC 50.346(b)(9), Standard Permit Condition XVI Emission Inventory Reporting Form. Form is referenced by newly created Condition B.17.