Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
Bureau of Air
Permit Section

November 29, 2011

Responses to Comments on the Draft CAAPP Operating Permit for BP Pipelines (North America), Inc. – Manhattan Station for a pipe line breakout station in Manhattan, Illinois

Source Identification No.: 197811AAA
Application No.: 95090005

BACKGROUND

On May 7, 2004, the Illinois EPA, Bureau of Air received a CAAPP operating permit renewal application from BP Pipelines, Inc., for its Clean Air Act Permit Program (CAAPP) permit for an existing pipe line breakout station in Manhattan, Illinois.

The Illinois EPA has completed a public comment period on the draft of a renewed CAAPP permit. Comments were only received UESPA and BP Pipelines. The Illinois EPA is preparing this document, which addresses significant errors and typographical errors, to accompany the submittal of proposed CAAPP permit to USEPA.

COMMENTS WITH RESPONSES

Comments from USEPA

1. The draft permit contains anticipated operating scenarios as provided for in 39.5(7)(1). However, the permit does not meet the requirements to maintain a log of the scenario under which it operating (39.5(7)(l)(i)(A)) and require monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting (39.5(7)(l)(i)). IEPA must ensure that the permit contain these requirements for each anticipated operating scenario in permit conditions 5.11, 7.1.11, 7.2.11, 7.3.11, 7.4.11, and 7.5.11,.

   Response:

   The IEPA has reviewed the comment and concurs with the assessment. The following corrective action was taken.

   The draft permit limitations in Condition 5.11 was deleted since the Permittee would be required to comply with monitoring, inspection, recordkeeping and reporting requirements that are required by the conditions in each specific section, i.e., Sections 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, and 7.5. Further, Condition 5.9.2(a) was revised to delete the reference to Condition 5.11 and to correct the affected section listing.

   Conditions 5.12, 7.1.11, 7.2.11, 7.3.11, 7.4.11, and 7.5.11 were revised to clarify the scenarios covered and to include the log requirements pursuant to Condition 5.9.2(a) and to specify the monitoring, inspection, recordkeeping and reporting requirements referenced in USEPA's comment.

2. The permit provides for the use of emission factors as a method to determine emissions in 7.l.9(c)(ii)(C), 7.2.9(b)(i)(C), 7.3.9(c)(i)(C), 7.4.9(c)(i)(C), and 7.5.9(b)(i)(D). It is not clear whether the emission factors used by IEPA are indicative of the emissions at BPs facility. With a few exceptions, the EPA does not recommend the use of emission factors to develop source-specific permit limits or to determine compliance with permit requirements. In the Matter of Tesoro Refining and Marketing Co, Martinez, California Facility, Petition Number IX-2004-6 (March 15, 2005) at 32. IEPA either must justify in the record why these emission factors are representative of BP's

operations (i.e., representative to yield reliable data from the relevant time period representative of the sources compliance), and provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the emissions will not vary by a degree that would cause an exceedance of the standards, or IEPA must determine and adequately support another mechanism to assure compliance with the applicable emission limits.

Response:

The IEPA has reviewed the comment and concurs with the assessment. The reference to "emission factors" was deleted from the receptive conditions to correct the matter.

3. There are no Title I conditions in section 7.4. Given the dates of construction listed for the affected storage tanks in section 7.4, it is likely these units did obtain construction permits containing Title I applicable requirements. IEPA must include all applicable requirements in the CAAP. (39.5(7)(a))

Response:

The IEPA has reviewed the comment and concurs, the Title I limits from construction permit 86040028 were inadvertently overlooked. Subsequent to USEPA's comments, the construction permit was revised by BP Pipelines. Accordingly, subsections 7.4.6 and 7.4.9 were revised to incorporate the limitations and conditions from the revised construction permit into the proposed permit.

4. Condition 7.6.5 requires the Permittee to "periodically monitor." This term is practicably unenforceable. IEPA must define the minimum frequency the Permittee must monitor.

Response:

The IEPA has reviewed the comment and does not concur with the assessment since the minimum frequency is shown in the first sentence of the condition, i.e., "each calendar month"...etc. However, in order to avoid confusion, the term "periodically" was deleted from Condition 7.6.5.

5. Conditions 7.7.8 and 7.8.8 refer to "formal observations" but does not define the term. EPA encourages IEPA to define the term such as requiring Method 22. Furthermore, the permit does not detail the follow up actions the Permittee must take if the "formal observations" indicate that opacity is observed. For example, the observance of opacity could trigger a Method 9 test within 15 days or at the next time the generator is operated. Requesting a Method 9 test "upon written request by the Illinois EPA" as required in 7.7.7(a) and 7.8.7(a) is not sufficient. The permit must contain a methodology to assure compliance with the opacity requirements.

Response:

The IEPA has reviewed the comment and concurs with the assessment. The conditions have been revised to indicate that Method 9 must be used to

determine visual opacity and Method 22 may be used to determine visible emissions. Further, a Method 9 test must be used if visible emissions are still present after the engine is serviced.

6. Condition 7.8.4(b) is not a non-applicability determination. In fact BP is still subject to the maximum achievable control technology standard (MACT) although "excluded from certain requirements." EPA should take this term out of section 7.8.4 and include it in section 7.8.3 and either define which MACT requirements this Unit is excluded from or remove this practicably unenforceable phrase from the permit.

Response:

The IEPA has reviewed the comment and concurs with the assessment. Condition 7.8.4(b) have been removed and a new Condition 7.8.3(c) has been added to indicate that the affected engine is subject to 40 CFR Part 63 Subpart ZZZZ and compliance with 40 CFR Part 63 Subpart ZZZZ is based upon compliance with 40 CFR 60 Subpart IIII, see Condition 7.8.3(b)).

7. The statement of basis must include the rationale for the periodic monitoring required in section 5.0 of the permit and a basis for the periodic monitoring for section 7.8 in Table 8.

Response:

The IEPA has reviewed the comment and concurs with the assessment. The following is the rationale for the periodic monitoring required in section 5.0 of the permit and a basis for the periodic monitoring for section 7.8 in Table 8.

Section 5.0

Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category. Monitoring is detailed in the specific regulations cited in the condition.

Section 7.8 in Table 8

Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.

8. The following permit terms are missing an origin and authority:

Response:

The IEPA has reviewed the comment and concurs with the assessment. The following origin and authority were added to each referenced conditions:

Condition	Origin of Authority Added
a. 5.7.3	5.7.3(a): 35 IAC 218.128(b)(1) 5.7.3(b): 35 IAC 218.128(b)(2) and 5.7.3(c): 35 IAC 218.112(c) and 218.128(b)(2)(B) and (C)
b. 5.9.3	39.5(7)(b) and (e) of the Act

c. 5.9.7	**39.5(7)(b) and (e) of the Act**
d. 5.9.8	**39.5(7)(b) and (e) of the Act**
e. 7.1.10(b)	**39.5(7)(b), (d) and (f) of the Act**
f. 7.1.11	**39.5(7)(l)(i) of the Act**
g. 7.7.8	**39.5(7)(d) of the Act**
h. 7.8.5(c)	**[39.5(7)(a) of the Act]**
i. 7.8.5(d)	**39.5(7)(p)(ii)(D) of the Act**

Comments from BP Pipelines

1. Condition 1.2 - The Owner/Parent Company address has changed from Torch Parkway in Warrenville to a new address in Naperville.

Response:

The Permittee submitted a CAAPP 273 form and address was revised.

2. Typographical error at Section 7.7.12(d) - condition refers to Condition 7.6.5(a) which should actually be Condition 7.7.5(a).

Response:

The IEPA has reviewed the comment and concurs and the condition has been revised.