

**Air Permitting/
Stars2 Call
01/19/2012
9:30 - 11:30AM**

<https://ohioepa.webex.com>

- Meeting found under "Meeting Center"
- Password for meeting: **stars24u**
- Call in 1-877-668-4490 Access code: 680 904 139

Agenda

Agenda		
1	<p>PIDM Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stars2 v1.36 – Friday – 1/20 or 1/27 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Title V Mod containing only modified EUs – generates complete Title V permit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Associated data cleanup for mods issued since 7/2008. ○ Add GHG to FER/EIS ○ PER now pulls from current facility profile ○ Correspondence now in Air Services ○ "Issued Metrics" now capturing rush permits correctly. ○ "Report Review Metrics" changed to "FER Review Metrics" and clarified ○ New "Emissions/Stack Testing" workflow with task assigned to "DO/LAA Uploaded Report Reviewer". • 2011 FER/EIS reporting enabled by 1/30 • Voluntary GHG reporting in EIS for 2011 • All mailings nearly done for annual requirements, calls will start coming in. Make sure you have • HCDOES is now Southwest Ohio Air Quality Agency (SWOAQA) • PTI/PTIO App questions and Instructions up for comment until – February 3rd – send to Erica. • Update staff user roles in Stars2 before reports come in. 	Erica Engel-Ishida
2	<p>NWDO – Jan Tredway</p> <p>Is there an ongoing problem with the keyword search and should one go through the helpdesk to address these problems with the keyword search in STARS2?</p>	Erica Engel-Ishida
3	<p>SWOAQA – Brad Miller</p> <p>Procter & Gamble received a PBR (attached) where they wanted changes to the description. In checking the emissions unit description under facilities, it is listed correctly. It appears that the emissions unit description for the PBR is pulled from the permit. Should we do an administrative modification of the permit to change the permit description so the PBR is correct in the future?</p>	Erica Engel-Ishida
4	<p>SWOAQA – Brad Miller</p> <p>In STARS2 under Tools/Document Generation, what is the difference between a "logged" and "not logged" document (see attached)?</p>	Erica Engel-Ishida

5	<p>Canton – Carl Safreed</p> <p>I would like to revisit the topic of Emissions Unit Descriptions as both a Stars2 question and a permitting question. This topic, but not my specific question, was last discussed during the February 17, 2011 Air Permitting Live.</p> <p>For the moment, I would like to limit my question to the specific situation where a NTV facility submits a hardcopy PTIO application to modify an existing emissions unit (Chp. 31 modification). Let's assume that the current Facility Profile is fully up-to-date for this emissions unit with respect to the DAPC Description, based on the previous (i.e., still active) PTI or PTIO.</p> <p>Next, assume that the current DAPC Description includes technical details, and that the requested modification will make these details inaccurate. Because of this, is it correct for the permit writer to revise the EU Description only within the Permit Detail page, and to wait until the new Chp. 31 mod. permit is issued final to manually revise the Description at the Facility Profile level?</p> <p>In other words, shouldn't the DAPC Description in the current Facility Profile always match the currently active PTIO? Do you agree that this requires the permit writer (or someone at the DO/LAA) to monitor permit issuance notices and then, to keep things accurate, act quickly to manually revise the DAPC Description as soon as possible after issuance? (This is not a complaint; I'm just asking whether this is the correct procedure.)</p> <p>Note that above Chp. 31 mod. situation is the opposite of an initial installation permit. When a new emissions unit is created at the Facility Profile level, the ID and description information is entered there. The permit writer should then select the "Sync EUs with Facility" button at the bottom of the Permit Detail page. I mention this because in my Chp. 31 mod. example, the permit writer must make sure to NOT select the "Sync EUs with Facility" button, right? As shown in the pop-up box below, the "Sync EUs..." function will overwrite whatever may have been written at the Permit Detail level to match the current Facility Profile.</p> <p>How does the sync EU button play a part in this?</p>	Erica Engel-Ishida
6	<p>SEDO – Kim Reinbold, Sarah Harter</p> <p>When evaluating a facility to determine facility-wide emission rates of HAPs for Title V and MACT applicability, what is considered the PTE of a de minimis EU that is only de minimis via the recordkeeping requirement in OAC rule 3745-15-05(D) and not via uncontrolled potential? If a facility has records (or will keep records) to demonstrate that an EU has actual emissions of less than one TPY of HAPs (individual and total), is one TPY or less considered the federally enforceable HAP PTE for that EU? The current version of OAC rule 3745-15-05 was approved in Ohio's SIP on 7/9/10, so it is a federally enforceable rule.</p>	Mike Hopkins/ Andrew Hall
7	<p>SEDO – Sarah Harter</p> <p>Need clarification of DAPC position on evaluating potential to emit from controlled sources for purposes of major NSR projects. Question 5 of the December 10, 2009 BAT IOC, indicates that we cannot determine major NSR applicability based on emissions after controls. However, some recent permit actions have considered after-control emissions as PTE. Also, please discuss how the requirement to issue permits draft vs. direct final fits in with this issue.</p>	Mike Hopkins/ Andrew Hall
8	<p>SWDO – Craig Osborne</p> <p>Is there any discussion on the boiler MACT since the federal court moved on it the other day?</p>	Mike Hopkins/ Andrew Hall