BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY WASHINGTON, DC

In re:		JUN - 2 2014 U
Sierra Pacific Industries) PSD Appeal No. 14-01	Clerk, Environmental Appeals Board INITIALS
Permit No. 94-VP-18d)	
)	

ORDER DENYING SECOND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND MOTION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

The Environmental Appeals Board ("Board") has previously denied Celeste Draisner's petition for review and motion for reconsideration in the above-captioned matter. The Board now denies her second motion for reconsideration and motion to file supplemental information.

As explained in the Board's previous two orders, the Board does not have jurisdiction to review Clean Air Act Title V operating permits issued by approved states. *In re Sierra Pacific Indus.*, PSD Appeal No. 14-01 (EAB April 10, 2014) 16 E.A.D. __ (Order Dismissing Appeal For Lack of Jurisdiction); *In re Sierra Pacific Indus.*, PSD Appeal No. 14-01 (EAB May 2, 2014) (Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration and Motion for Extension of Time to Amend Motion for Reconsideration). A Title V permit issued by an approved state, however, is precisely what Ms. Draisner has asked the Board to review. Ms. Draisner's arguments to the contrary in her second request for reconsideration lack any merit. There are simply no circumstances under

which the Board can review the September 27, 2013 permit issued by the Shasta County Air Quality Management District.¹

The Board will summarily deny any further pleadings or requests for reconsideration in this matter. Motions denied.

So ordered.²

Dated: JUN 2 2014

ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD

Randolph L. Hill

Environmental Appeals Judge

¹ Along with her first motion for reconsideration, Ms. Draisner filed a motion for an extension of time to amend her first motion for reconsideration, alleging that she was in the process of gathering additional evidence that would support her motion. The Board denied that motion on the grounds that the evidence she already had submitted was conclusive and no additional time was warranted. Her second motion for reconsideration is a clear attempt to avoid the Board's prior ruling and could be denied solely on that basis. In any event, the additional evidence submitted continues to prove that the September 27, 2013 permit is a Title V permit, not a Prevention of Significant Deterioration permit. On May 27, 2014, Ms. Draisner filed another motion to file supplemental information. That motion is denied for the same reasons.

² The three-member panel deciding this matter is composed of Environmental Appeals Judges Leslye M. Fraser, Randolph L. Hill, and Kathie A. Stein.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing *Order Denying Second Motion for Reconsideration and Motion to File Supplemental Information* in the matter of Sierra Pacific Industries, PSD Appeal No. 14-01, were sent to the following persons in the manner indicated:

By U.S. First Class Mail:

Celeste Draisner Citizens for Clean Air P.O. Box 172 Whitmore, CA 96096

Marily Woodhouse The Battlecreekalliance.org P.O. Box 255 Montgomery Creek, CA 96065

By EPA Pouch Mail:

Kara Christenson Office of Regional Counsel, U.S. EPA Region 9 (ORC-2) 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105

Courtesy Copy By U.S. First Class Mail:

Heidi Strand P.O. Box 1544 Shasta Lake City, CA 96019

Rick Simon
Air Pollution Control Officer
Department of Resource Management
Shasta County Air Quality Management
District
1855 Placer Street, Suite 101
Redding, CA 96001

Tony Jaegel Sierra Pacific Industries 19794 Riverside Avenue Redding, CA 96049-6028 William M. Sloan Morrison & Foerster LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94105-2482

Courtesy Copy By EPA Interoffice Mail:

Brian Doster
Office of General Counsel
Air and Radiation Law Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
MC 2344A
Washington, D.C. 20460-0001

Annette Duncan

Secretary

Date:

e: June 2, 2019