

From	Subject	Received	Size	Category
RMAAQ REG - success filing and submitting to LC (1 item)	RMAAQ REG - success filing and submitting to LC	Wed 3/27/2013 10:15 AM	2 ...	✉
✉ @ VANDEHEY Maggie	RMAAQ REG - success filing and submitting to LC	Wed 3/27/2013 10:15 AM	2 ...	✉
SOS Filing (14 items)				
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 9:30 AM	8 KB	▽
✉ VANDEHEY Maggie	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 11:15 AM	95 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 11:24 AM	10 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 11:51 AM	10 ...	▽
✉ VANDERHEY Maggie	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 12:41 PM	10 ...	▽
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 12:48 PM	40 ...	▽
✉ VANDERHEY Maggie	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 12:53 PM	14 ...	✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 12:56 PM	14 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 12:57 PM	15 ...	▽
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 12:58 PM	45 ...	▽
✉ VANDERHEY Maggie	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 2/27/2013 12:59 PM	14 ...	✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: SOS Filing	Wed 3/20/2013 5:20 PM	10 ...	▽
✉ VANDERHEY Maggie	RE: SOS Filing	Mon 3/25/2013 9:48 AM	98 ...	✉
EQC Edits for your review and approval/feedback - deadline: Tuesday, February 26 (1 item)				✉
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	FW: EQC Edits for your review and approval/feedback - deadline: Tuesday, February ...	Fri 2/2/2013 8:50 AM	29 ...	▽
NESHAP/NSPS package (6 items)				✉
! ✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	FW: NESHAP/NSPS package	Thu 2/7/2013 10:06 AM	20 ...	▽
! ✉ VANDERHEY Maggie	RE: NESHAP/NSPS package	Thu 2/7/2013 11:54 AM	22 ...	▽
! ✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: NESHAP/NSPS package	Thu 2/7/2013 12:04 PM	28 ...	▽
! ✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: NESHAP/NSPS package	Thu 2/7/2013 12:53 PM	61 ...	▽
! ✉ VANDERHEY Maggie	RE: NESHAP/NSPS package	Thu 2/7/2013 12:57 PM	28 ...	▽
! ✉ VANDERHEY Maggie	RE: NESHAP/NSPS package	Thu 2/7/2013 12:55 PM	26 ...	▽
RM-Rule language and correct versions (2 items)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: RM-Rule language and correct versions	Thu 12/27/2012 9:49 AM	16 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: RM-Rule language and correct versions	Fri 1/25/2013 1:29 PM	15 ...	▽
RM-EQC Requests (5 items)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Automatic reply: RM-EQC Requests	Thu 1/17/2013 4:07 PM	8 KB	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: RM-EQC Requests	Tue 1/22/2013 10:18 AM	24 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: RM-EQC Requests	Tue 1/22/2013 11:41 AM	31 ...	▽
EQC Package Review (1 item)				✉
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	EQC Package Review	Mon 10/29/2012 4:52 PM	53 ...	✉
RM-ACDP Public Notice with Hearing Questions (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: RM-ACDP Public Notice with Hearing Questions	Mon 10/8/2012 11:51 AM	20 ...	▽
Andy Review of Rule Package (2 items)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Andy Review of Rule Package	Tue 9/18/2012 11:11 AM	12 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Andy Review of Rule Package	Tue 9/18/2012 12:34 PM	22 ...	▽
Blueprint and Public Notice (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Blueprint and Public Notice	Tue 9/18/2012 9:42 AM	9 KB	▽
Rulemaking Documents Ready for Posting (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Rulemaking Documents Ready for Posting	Mon 8/20/2012 10:49 AM	12 ...	▽
FIT regarding new rule making process (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: FIT regarding new rule making process	Wed 8/1/2012 2:00 PM	27 ...	▽
NESHAP/NSPS - Verbiage for EMT preview period (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: NESHAP/NSPS - Verbiage for EMT preview period	Mon 7/30/2012 4:33 PM	17 ...	▽
Signing the Fiscal Impact Statement (2 items)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Signing the Fiscal Impact Statement	Tue 5/22/2012 12:03 PM	9 KB	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Signing the Fiscal Impact Statement	Tue 7/17/2012 12:57 PM	15 ...	▽
Rule Package Review (2 items)				✉
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	Rule Package Review	Mon 7/16/2012 2:02 PM	50 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Rule Package Review	Tue 7/17/2012 11:28 AM	18 ...	▽
Public Hearing (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Public Hearing	Tue 7/17/2012 9:47 AM	10 ...	▽
Revised Rulemaking Package (2 items)				✉
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	Revised Rulemaking Package	Thu 7/5/2012 3:35 PM	50 ...	▽
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Revised Rulemaking Package	Mon 7/16/2012 11:00 AM	51 ...	▽
Exploring EQC meeting schedule changes for 2013 (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Exploring EQC meeting schedule changes for 2013	Mon 7/9/2012 10:39 AM	13 ...	▽
RM- NSPS/NESHAP (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	FW: RM- NSPS/NESHAP	Mon 7/9/2012 9:27 AM	12 ...	✉
Rulepackage Review (6 items)				✉
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	FW: Rulepackage Review	Mon 6/18/2012 3:56 PM	14 ...	▽
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Rulepackage Review	Tue 6/19/2012 3:26 PM	15 ...	▽
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Rulepackage Review	Wed 6/20/2012 11:54 AM	15 ...	▽
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	FW: Rulepackage Review	Wed 6/20/2012 1:36 PM	15 ...	▽
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Rulepackage Review	Fri 6/22/2012 3:24 PM	16 ...	▽
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Rulepackage Review	Mon 6/25/2012 2:35 PM	16 ...	▽
Rule Folder Permissions (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Rule Folder Permissions	Mon 6/18/2012 10:22 AM	11 ...	▽
2012/2013 NESHAP/NSPS Rulemaking (1 item)				✉
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: 2012/2013 NESHAP/NSPS Rulemaking	Fri 6/8/2012 1:34 PM	66 ...	▽
Schedule (5 items)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Schedule	Mon 4/16/2012 9:39 AM	8 KB	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Schedule	Tue 4/17/2012 4:53 PM	12 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Schedule	Mon 4/23/2012 12:20 PM	10 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Schedule	Tue 5/1/2012 11:00 AM	12 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Schedule	Tue 5/22/2012 12:02 PM	24 ...	▽
Blueprint V1.0 (5 items)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Blueprint V1.0	Tue 5/1/2012 3:44 PM	8 KB	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Blueprint V1.0	Wed 5/2/2012 1:20 PM	13 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	FW: Blueprint V1.0	Wed 5/16/2012 1:46 PM	12 ...	▽
NESHAP/NSPS-Proposal-V1.0 (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Automatic reply: NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V1.0	Thu 4/26/2012 4:34 PM	8 KB	▽
Scheduler in Blueprint (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Scheduler in Blueprint	Tue 4/24/2012 3:31 PM	8 KB	▽
Blueprint 2.0 (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Blueprint 2.0	Wed 4/18/2012 9:27 AM	8 KB	▽
Changes to The Blueprint (2 items)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Changes to The Blueprint	Wed 3/28/2012 4:41 PM	9 KB	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Changes to The Blueprint	Wed 3/28/2012 4:50 PM	11 ...	▽
EMT Rulemaking Blueprint Document for Your Review (1 item)				✉
✉ @ EBERSOLE Gerald	EMT Rulemaking Blueprint Document for Your Review	Tue 3/20/2012 1:17 PM	44 ...	▽
Review of PDF (3 items)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Review of PDF	Mon 3/19/2012 4:47 PM	8 KB	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Review of PDF	Mon 3/19/2012 4:50 PM	11 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: Review of PDF	Tue 3/20/2012 8:53 AM	12 ...	▽
SRP (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: SRP?	Mon 3/19/2012 10:35 AM	12 ...	▽
RME-NESHAP - NSPS Q-time inquiry (1 item, 1 unread)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: RM- NESHAP - NSPS Q-time inquiry	Mon 3/19/2012 9:42 AM	13 ...	▽
(none) (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald		Fri 3/16/2012 10:01 AM	8 KB	▽
RM-NESHAP-NSPS blueprint (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: RM-NESHAP_NSPS blueprint	Fri 3/16/2012 8:53 AM	17 ...	▽
Tom's Changes (2 items)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Tom's Changes	Tue 3/13/2012 10:54 AM	10 ...	▽
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	FW: Tom's Changes	Tue 3/13/2012 11:29 AM	11 ...	▽
RM-FedQReq: Getting started on Considerations and Resources (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	Accepted: RM_FedQReq: Getting started on Considerations and Resources	Thu 2/16/2012 1:16 PM	8 KB	▽
AQ schedule (1 item)				✉
✉ EBERSOLE Gerald	RE: AQ schedule	Fri 2/10/2012 11:56 AM	20 ...	▽

From: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Subject: RM:AQ REG - success filing and submitting to LC
Date: Wednesday, March 27, 2013 10:14:37 AM
Attachments: [SOS.LC.FILING.PROOF.pdf](#)

Congratulation! I'll stop by later.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29:43 AM

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Cc: [OLIPHANT Margaret](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15:16 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00	LC version
EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00	SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00	(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)
340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00	

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1
OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subsection (a) Each management practice in **Table 24** of this division that applies; (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operating a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this section, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section. (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent. (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those in (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent with subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule. (3) The owner or operator of a ~~C~~argo tanks unloading at a GDF must meet the requirements in section (1) of this rule and management practices in Table **35** of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — ~~A~~ Source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) ~~the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 27)~~ Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):

(i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;

(ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;

(iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;

(iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);

(v) Category 40. Gypsum products;

(vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;

(vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;

(viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;

(ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;

(x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or

(xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by the Department DEQ.

(b) High Fee — ~~Any~~ source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

~~If the Department DEQ determines that a source was issued for the Low Annual Fee but does not~~

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [OLIPHANT Margaret](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:24:26 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

My 2012/2013 rulemaking is not in sharepoint, the 2013/2014 rulemaking is. I will place the below documents into [7-Post EQC folder](#) the shared rulemaking folders. I was not aware I had to include tables even if they are not changing. That is not how things have been done in the past and I wish you would have told me sooner.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00	LC version
EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00	SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00	(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)
340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00	

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1
OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subsection (a) Each management practice in **Table 24** of this division that applies; (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operating a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this section, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section. (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent. (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those in (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent with subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule. (3) The owner or operator of a ~~C~~argo tanks unloading at a GDF must meet the requirements in section (1) of this rule and management practices in Table **35** of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — ~~A~~ Source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) ~~the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 27)~~ Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):

(i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;

(ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;

(iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;

(iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);

(v) Category 40. Gypsum products;

(vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;

(vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;

(viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;

(ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;

(x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or

(xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by the Department DEQ.

(b) High Fee — ~~Any~~ source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

~~If the Department DEQ determines that a source was issued for the Low Annual Fee but does not~~

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [OLIPHANT Margaret](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:52:53 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Table 1 in Division 244 is in Rule 340-244-0040 which is not included in this rulemaking.

I don't understand what you are saying in regard to complete citation. Please provide an example.

340-240-0242(1)(a) is not in error because the 4 is strikeout. The final will be Table 2, not Table 24.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the [NESHAP/NSPS 7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00	LC version
EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00	SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00	(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)
340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00	

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1
OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subsection (a) Each management practice in Table 24 of this division that applies; (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operates a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this section, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section. (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent. (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those in (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule. (3) The owner or operator of a cargo tanks unloading at a GDF must follow the requirements of OAR 340-244-0240(1) and management practices in Table 35 of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with OAR 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — A source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 275. Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):

(i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;

(ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;

(iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;

(iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);

(v) Category 40. Gypsum products;

(vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;

(vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;

(viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;

(ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;

(x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or

(xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by the Department DEQ.

(b) High Fee — Any source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

OR IF the Department DEQ determines that a source was invoiced for the Low Annual Fee but does not

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must

be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Cc: [OLIPHANT Margaret](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 12:41:23 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

I think we covered this in our conversation but I'll repeat...

When citing a table that originates in another rule, you would say something like in "Table # under OAR 340-##-####".

When citing a table within the rule of origination, you would say "Table #." If a rule references several tables with the same number, we would say "Table # under this rule" to be clear that we are talking about a division 340 table.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:53 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Table 1 in Division 244 is in Rule 340-244-0040 which is not included in this rulemaking.

I don't understand what you are saying in regard to complete citation. Please provide an example.

340-240-0242(1)(a) is not in error because the 4 is strikeout. The final will be Table 2, not Table 24.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00 LC version

EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00 SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00

340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00

340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00 (See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)

340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subsection:

- (a) Each management practice in Table 24 of this division that applies
- (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operating a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this section, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section.
 - (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent.
 - (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those required by paragraph (1)(b)(A).
- (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent, subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule.
- (3) The owner or operator of a Cargo tanks unloading at a GDF must follow the requirements of OAR 340-244-0240(1) and management practices in Table 35 of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — A Source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 27S. Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):

- (i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;
- (ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;
- (iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;
- (iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);
- (v) Category 40. Gypsum products;
- (vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;
- (vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;
- (viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;
- (ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;
- (x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or
- (xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by ~~the Department~~ DEQ.

(b) High Fee — Any source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

~~For the Department~~ DEQ determines that a source may be assessed for the Low Annual Fee but does not

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [OLIPHANT Margaret](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 1:48:14 PM
Attachments: [Attachment A - Proposed Rules.docx](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Maggie, I think I addressed your comments. Do you want to take a look before I send it to Stephanie? Jerry

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 12:41 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

I think we covered this in our conversation but I'll repeat...

When citing a table that originates in another rule, you would say something like in "Table # under OAR 340-##-####".

When citing a table within the rule of origination, you would say "Table #." If a rule references several tables with the same number, we would say "Table # under this rule" to be clear that we are talking about a division 340 table.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:53 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Table 1 in Division 244 is in Rule 340-244-0040 which is not included in this rulemaking.

I don't understand what you are saying in regard to complete citation. Please provide an example.

340-240-0242(1)(a) is not in error because the 4 is strikeout. The final will be Table 2, not Table 24.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00

(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)

340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subsection:

- (a) Each management practice in Table 24 of this division that applies
- (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operating a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this rule, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section.
 - (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent.
 - (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those in section (1)(b)(A).
- (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent, with subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule.
- (3) The owner or operator of a Cargo tanks unloading at a GDF must follow the requirements of OAR 340-244-0240(1) and management practices in Table 35 of this rule.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — A Source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 27S. Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):

- (i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;
- (ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;
- (iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;
- (iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);
- (v) Category 40. Gypsum products;
- (vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;
- (vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;
- (viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;
- (ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;
- (x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or
- (xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by ~~the Department~~ DEQ.

(b) High Fee — Any source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

~~For the Department~~ DEQ determines that a source may be assessed for the Low Annual Fee but does not

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Cc: [OLIPHANT Margaret](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:12:37 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Jerry, I think you got all the "Table # of 40 CFR..." and Table # of this rule" distinction. Do you think there will be any ambiguity between our tables and the following tables?

[Chemical manufacturing facilities that do not transfer liquids containing organic HAP listed in Table 1 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV to tank trucks or railcars and are not subject to emission limits in Table 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 8 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV.](#)

I think the following should use the full citation.

(c) As used in OAR 340 division 224, regulated pollutant does not include any pollutant listed in divisions 244 and 246, unless the pollutant is listed in OAR 340 division 200 Table 2 (significant emission rates).
(107) "Renewal" means the process by which a permit is reissued at the end of its term.

If we use, "under this rule ", consider making it the first reference in the section then let the second reference be to the table without the "under this rule" as long as there is no ambiguity.

(131) "Section 504(e)" means subsection 504(e) of the FCAA which contains regulations for permit requirements for temporary sources.
(132) "Significant Air Quality Impact" means an additional ambient air quality concentration equal to or greater than in the concentrations listed in Table 1. The threshold concentrations listed in Table 1 under this rule are used for comparison against the ambient air quality standard and do not apply for protecting PSD Class I increments or air quality related values (including visibility). For sources of VOC or NOx, a major source or major modification has a significant impact if it is located within the Ozone Precursor

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 1:48 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Maggie, I think I addressed your comments. Do you want to take a look before I send it to Stephanie? Jerry

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 12:41 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

I think we covered this in our conversation but I'll repeat...

When citing a table that originates in another rule, you would say something like in "Table # under OAR 340-##-

#####".

When citing a table within the rule of origination, you would say "Table #." If a rule references several tables with the same number, we would say "Table # under this rule" to be clear that we are talking about a division 340 table.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:53 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Table 1 in Division 244 is in Rule 340-244-0040 which is not included in this rulemaking.

I don't understand what you are saying in regard to complete citation. Please provide an example.

340-240-0242(1)(a) is not in error because the 4 is strikeout. The final will be Table 2, not Table 24.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00	LC version
EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00	SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00	(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)
340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00	

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1
OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subsection (a) Each management practice in Table 24 of this division that applies (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operates a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B), the operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section. (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent. (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those in (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent, with subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule. (3) The owner or operator of a cargo tanks unloading at a GDF must follow OAR 340-244-0240(1) and management practices in Table 35 of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — A source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 27S. Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):

(i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;

(ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;

(iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;

(iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);

(v) Category 40. Gypsum products;

(vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;

(vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;

(viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;

(ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;

(x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or

(xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by the Department DEQ.

(b) High Fee — Any source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

(a) If the Department DEQ determines that a source was invoiced for the Total Annual Fee but does not

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is

there? Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [OLIPHANT Margaret](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:39:59 PM
Attachments: [image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)

See my responses below.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:13 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, I think you got all the "Table # of 40 CFR..." and Table # of this rule" distinction. Do you think there will be any ambiguity between our tables and the following tables?

[Chemical manufacturing facilities that do not transfer liquids containing organic HAP listed in Table 1 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV to tank trucks or railcars and are not subject to emission limits in Table 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 8 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV.](#)

No.

I think the following should use the full citation.

(c) As used in OAR 340 division 224, regulated pollutant does not include any pollutant listed in divisions 244 and 246, unless the pollutant is listed in OAR 340 division 200 Table 2 (significant emission rates).
(107) "Renewal" means the process by which a permit is reissued at the end of its term.

Wouldn't we just say Table 2 under this rule?

If we use, "under this rule", consider making it the first reference in the section then let the second reference be to the table without the "under this rule" as long as there is no ambiguity.

(131) "Section 504(e)" means subsection 504(e) of the FCAA which contains regulations for permit requirements for temporary sources.
(132) "Significant Air Quality Impact" means an additional ambient air quality concentration equal to or greater than in the concentrations listed in Table 1. The threshold concentrations listed in Table 1 under this rule are used for comparison against the ambient air quality standard and do not apply for protecting PSD Class I increments or air quality related values (including visibility). For sources of VOC or NOx, a major source or major modification has a significant impact if it is located within the Ozone Precursor

Ok.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 1:48 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret

Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Maggie, I think I addressed your comments. Do you want to take a look before I send it to Stephanie? Jerry

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 12:41 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

I think we covered this in our conversation but I'll repeat...

When citing a table that originates in another rule, you would say something like in "Table # under OAR 340-##-####".

When citing a table within the rule of origination, you would say "Table #." If a rule references several tables with the same number, we would say "Table # under this rule" to be clear that we are talking about a division 340 table.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:53 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Table 1 in Division 244 is in Rule 340-244-0040 which is not included in this rulemaking.

I don't understand what you are saying in regard to complete citation. Please provide an example.

340-240-0242(1)(a) is not in error because the 4 is strikeout. The final will be Table 2, not Table 24.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00	LC version
EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00	SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00	(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)
340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00	

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subpart:

- (a) Each management practice in Table 24 of this division that applies;
- (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operates a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this section, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section.
 - (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent.
 - (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those required by section (1)(b)(A).
- (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent, subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule.
- (3) The owner or operator of a cargo tanks unloading at a GDF must follow the requirements of OAR 340-244-0240(1) and management practices in Table 35 of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

- (a) Low Fee — A source may qualify for the Low Fee if:
 - (A) the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 27S. Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):
 - (i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;
 - (ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;
 - (iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;
 - (iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);
 - (v) Category 40. Gypsum products;
 - (vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;
 - (vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;
 - (viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;
 - (ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;
 - (x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or
 - (xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and
 - (B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and
 - (C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by the Department DEQ.
- (b) High Fee — Any source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

(a) If the Department DEQ determines that a source was assessed for the Low Annual Fee but does not qualify for the High Fee, the source will be assessed the High Fee.

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald

Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM

To: VANDEHEY Maggie

Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 3:05:47 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Below...

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:40 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

See my responses below.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:13 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, I think you got all the "Table # of 40 CFR..." and Table # of this rule" distinction. Do you think there will be any ambiguity between our tables and the following tables?

[Chemical manufacturing facilities that do not transfer liquids containing organic HAP listed in Table 1 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV to tank trucks or railcars and are not subject to emission limits in Table 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 8 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV.](#)

No.

I think the following should use the full citation.

(c) As used in OAR 340 division 224, regulated pollutant does not include any pollutant listed in divisions 244 and 246, unless the pollutant is listed in OAR 340 division 200 Table 2 (significant emission rates).
(107) "Renewal" means the process by which a permit is reissued at the end of its term.

Wouldn't we just say Table 2 under this rule? [Yes, if it is in this rule.](#)

If we use, "under this rule ", consider making it the first reference in the section then let the second reference be to the table without the "under this rule" as long as there is no ambiguity.

(131) "Section 504(e)" means subsection 504(e) of the FCAA which contains regulations for permit requirements for temporary sources.
(132) "Significant Air Quality Impact" means an additional ambient air quality concentration equal to or greater than in the concentrations listed in Table 1. The threshold concentrations listed in Table 1 [under this rule](#) are used for comparison against the ambient air quality standard and do not apply for protecting PSD Class I increments or air quality related values (including visibility). For sources of VOC or NOx, a major source or major modification has a significant impact if it is located within the Ozone Precursor

Ok.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 1:48 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Maggie, I think I addressed your comments. Do you want to take a look before I send it to Stephanie? Jerry

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 12:41 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

I think we covered this in our conversation but I'll repeat...

When citing a table that originates in another rule, you would say something like in "Table # under OAR 340-##-####".

When citing a table within the rule of origination, you would say "Table #." If a rule references several tables with the same number, we would say "Table # under this rule" to be clear that we are talking about a division 340 table.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:53 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Table 1 in Division 244 is in Rule 340-244-0040 which is not included in this rulemaking.

I don't understand what you are saying in regard to complete citation. Please provide an example.

340-240-0242(1)(a) is not in error because the 4 is strikeout. The final will be Table 2, not Table 24.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00	LC version
EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00	SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00	(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subpart:

- (a) Each management practice in Table 24 of this division that applies;
- (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operates a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this section, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section.
- (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent.
- (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those in:
- (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent, with subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule.
- (3) The owner or operator of a cargo tanks unloading at a GDF must follow the requirements of OAR 340-244-0240(1) and management practices in Table 35 of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — A source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 275. Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):

- (i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;
- (ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;
- (iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;
- (iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);
- (v) Category 40. Gypsum products;
- (vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;
- (vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;
- (viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;
- (ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;
- (x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or
- (xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by the Department DEQ.

(b) High Fee — Any source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

(c) If the Department DEQ determines that a source was invoiced for the Low Annual Fee but does not

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 3:10:08 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Actually, that is the first time it is used in the rule, so I will just remove OAR 340 division 200.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 3:06 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Below...

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:40 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

See my responses below.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:13 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, I think you got all the “Table # of 40 CFR...” and Table # of this rule” distinction. Do you think there will be any ambiguity between our tables and the following tables?

[Chemical manufacturing facilities that do not transfer liquids containing organic HAP listed in Table 1 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV to tank trucks or railcars and are not subject to emission limits in Table 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 8 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV.](#)

No.

I think the following should use the full citation.

(c) As used in OAR 340 division 224, regulated pollutant does not include any pollutant listed in divisions 244 and 246, unless the pollutant is listed in OAR 340 division 200 Table 2 (significant emission rates).
(107) "Renewal" means the process by which a permit is reissued at the end of its term.

Wouldn't we just say Table 2 under this rule? [Yes, if it is in this rule.](#)

If we use, “under this rule”, consider making it the first reference in the section then let the second reference be to the table without the “under this rule” as long as there is no ambiguity.

(131) "Section 504(e)" means subsection 504(e) of the FCAA which contains regulations for permit requirements for temporary sources.

(132) "Significant Air Quality Impact" means an additional ambient air quality concentration equal to or greater than in the concentrations listed in Table 1. The threshold concentrations listed in Table 1 under this rule are used for comparison against the ambient air quality standard and do not apply for protecting PSD Class I increments or air quality related values (including visibility). For sources of VOC or NOx, a major source or major modification has a significant impact if it is located within the Ozone Precursor Division 1 or 2 under OAR 340-0040.

Ok.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 1:48 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Maggie, I think I addressed your comments. Do you want to take a look before I send it to Stephanie? Jerry

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 12:41 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

I think we covered this in our conversation but I'll repeat...

When citing a table that originates in another rule, you would say something like in "Table # under OAR 340-##-####".

When citing a table within the rule of origination, you would say "Table #." If a rule references several tables with the same number, we would say "Table # under this rule" to be clear that we are talking about a division 340 table.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:53 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Table 1 in Division 244 is in Rule 340-244-0040 which is not included in this rulemaking.

I don't understand what you are saying in regard to complete citation. Please provide an example.

340-240-0242(1)(a) is not in error because the 4 is strikeout. The final will be Table 2, not Table 24.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS 7-Post EQC folder on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00
340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00

SOS version

(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1
OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subpart:
(a) Each management practice in Table 24 of this division that applies
(b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operating a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this section, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section.
(A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent.
(B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those required by paragraph (1)(b)(A) of this section.
(2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent, subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule.
(3) The owner or operator of a cargo tank unloading at a GDF must use the management practices in Table 35 of this section.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — A Source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 27S. Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):

(i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;

(ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;

(iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;

(iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);

(v) Category 40. Gypsum products;

(vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;

(vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;

(viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;

(ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;

(x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or

(xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by the Department DEQ.

(b) High Fee — Any source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

✓ To the Department DEQ determination that a source was identified for the Tons Annual Fee but does not

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [OLIPHANT Margaret](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:47:57 PM
Attachments: [Attachment A - Proposed Rules.docx](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)

You want to take one more look?

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:13 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, I think you got all the “Table # of 40 CFR...” and Table # of this rule” distinction. Do you think there will be any ambiguity between our tables and the following tables?

Chemical manufacturing facilities that do not transfer liquids containing organic HAP listed in Table 1 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV to tank trucks or railcars and are not subject to emission limits in Table 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 8 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV.

I think the following should use the full citation.

(c) As used in OAR 340 division 224, regulated pollutant does not include any pollutant listed in divisions 244 and 246, unless the pollutant is listed in OAR 340 division 200 Table 2 (significant emission rates).
(107) "Renewal" means the process by which a permit is reissued at the end of its term.

If we use, “under this rule”, consider making it the first reference in the section then let the second reference be to the table without the “under this rule” as long as there is no ambiguity.

(131) "Section 504(e)" means subsection 504(e) of the FCAA which contains regulations for permit requirements for temporary sources.
(132) "Significant Air Quality Impact" means an additional ambient air quality concentration equal to or greater than in the concentrations listed in Table 1. The threshold concentrations listed in Table 1 under this rule are used for comparison against the ambient air quality standard and do not apply for protecting PSD Class I increments or air quality related values (including visibility). For sources of VOC or NOx, a major source or major modification has a significant impact if it is located within the Ozone Precursor

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 1:48 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Maggie, I think I addressed your comments. Do you want to take a look before I send it to Stephanie? Jerry

From: VANDEHEY Maggie

Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 12:41 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

I think we covered this in our conversation but I'll repeat...

When citing a table that originates in another rule, you would say something like in "Table # under OAR 340-##-####".

When citing a table within the rule of origination, you would say "Table #." If a rule references several tables with the same number, we would say "Table # under this rule" to be clear that we are talking about a division 340 table.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:53 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Table 1 in Division 244 is in Rule 340-244-0040 which is not included in this rulemaking.

I don't understand what you are saying in regard to complete citation. Please provide an example.

340-240-0242(1)(a) is not in error because the 4 is strikeout. The final will be Table 2, not Table 24.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00	LC version
EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00	SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00	(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)
340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00	

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1
OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subsection (a) Each management practice in Table 24 of this division that applies (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operates a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B), the operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section. (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent. (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those in (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent, with subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule. (3) The owner or operator of a cargo tanks unloading at a GDF must follow OAR 340-244-0240(1) and management practices in Table 35 of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — A source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 27S. Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):

(i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;

(ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;

(iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;

(iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);

(v) Category 40. Gypsum products;

(vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;

(vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;

(viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;

(ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;

(x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or

(xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by the Department DEQ.

(b) High Fee — Any source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

(a) If the Department DEQ determines that a source was invoiced for the Total Annual Fee but does not

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is

there? Jerry

From: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Cc: [OLIPHANT Margaret](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 3:08:44 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Looks good.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:48 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

You want to take one more look?

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:13 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, I think you got all the "Table # of 40 CFR..." and Table # of this rule" distinction. Do you think there will be any ambiguity between our tables and the following tables?

Chemical manufacturing facilities that do not transfer liquids containing organic HAP listed in Table 1 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV to tank trucks or railcars and are not subject to emission limits in Table 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 8 of 40 CFR part 63 subpart VVVVV.

I think the following should use the full citation.

(c) As used in OAR 340 division 224, regulated pollutant does not include any pollutant listed in divisions 244 and 246, unless the pollutant is listed in OAR 340 division 200 Table 2 (significant emission rates).
(107) "Renewal" means the process by which a permit is reissued at the end of its term.

If we use, "under this rule", consider making it the first reference in the section then let the second reference be to the table without the "under this rule" as long as there is no ambiguity.

(131) "Section 504(e)" means subsection 504(e) of the FCAA which contains regulations for permit requirements for temporary sources.
(132) "Significant Air Quality Impact" means an additional ambient air quality concentration equal to or greater than in the concentrations listed in Table 1. The threshold concentrations listed in Table 1 under this rule are used for comparison against the ambient air quality standard and do not apply for protecting PSD Class I increments or air quality related values (including visibility). For sources of VOC or NOx, a major source or major modification has a significant impact if it is located within the Ozone Precursor

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 1:48 PM

To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Maggie, I think I addressed your comments. Do you want to take a look before I send it to Stephanie? Jerry

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 12:41 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

I think we covered this in our conversation but I'll repeat...

When citing a table that originates in another rule, you would say something like in "Table # under OAR 340-##-####".

When citing a table within the rule of origination, you would say "Table #." If a rule references several tables with the same number, we would say "Table # under this rule" to be clear that we are talking about a division 340 table.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:53 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Table 1 in Division 244 is in Rule 340-244-0040 which is not included in this rulemaking.

I don't understand what you are saying in regard to complete citation. Please provide an example.

340-240-0242(1)(a) is not in error because the 4 is strikeout. The final will be Table 2, not Table 24.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00	LC version
EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00	SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00	(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)
340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00	

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1
OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subpart:

- (a) Each management practice in Table 24 of this division that applies;
- (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operates a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this section, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section.
 - (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent.
 - (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those required by paragraph (1)(b)(A).
- (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent, with subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule.
- (3) The owner or operator of a cargo tanks unloading at a GDF must meet the requirements in section (1) of this rule and management practices in Table 35 of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

- (a) Low Fee — A source may qualify for the Low Fee if:
 - (A) the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 27S. Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):
 - (i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;
 - (ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;
 - (iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;
 - (iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);
 - (v) Category 40. Gypsum products;
 - (vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;
 - (vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;
 - (viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;
 - (ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;
 - (x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or
 - (xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and
 - (B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and
 - (C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by the Department DEQ.
- (b) High Fee — Any source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

(a) If the Department DEQ determines that a source was assessed for the Low Annual Fee but does not

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [OLIPHANT Margaret](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2013 5:19:48 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Maggie, rules approved without change. I have placed all the rules into 7-Post EQC folder as requested. Let me know if you need anymore. Jerry

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00	LC version
EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00	SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00	(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)
340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00	

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

OAR 340-244-0242 Table 1
OAR 340-244-0242 Table 2

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subsection (a) Each management practice in **Table 24** of this division that applies; (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operating a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this section, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section. (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent. (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those in (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent with subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule. (3) The owner or operator of a ~~C~~argo tanks unloading at a GDF must meet the requirements in section (1) of this rule and management practices in Table **35** of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — ~~A~~ Source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) ~~the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category 27)~~ **Electric Power Generation**, may be included with any category listed below):

(i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;

(ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;

(iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;

(iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);

(v) Category 40. Gypsum products;

(vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;

(vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;

(viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;

(ix) Category 62. ~~Perchloroethylene~~ Dry Cleaning;

(x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or

(xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by ~~the Department~~ DEQ.

(b) High Fee — ~~Any~~ source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

~~If the Department~~ DEQ determines that a source was issued for the Low Annual Fee but does not

If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Subject: RE: SOS Filing
Date: Monday, March 25, 2013 9:48:24 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Jerry, I'll file today. Thank you! Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2013 5:20 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Maggie, rules approved without change. I have placed all the rules into 7-Post EQC folder as requested. Let me know if you need anymore. Jerry

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: OLIPHANT Margaret
Subject: RE: SOS Filing

Jerry, thank you for asking. No, we don't use the draft certificate & order or the cover letter. All you need to do is file the following documents in the NESHAP/NSPS [7-Post EQC folder](#) on SharePoint and send me an email when you are done and let me know that the EQC adopted/amended the rules as recommended or describe the adjustments required to finalize the rules. I file electronically from that folder and place all proof of delivery in that location.

EQC.REDLINE. 3.20.2013-7.00	LC version
EQC.RULES.3.20.2013-7.00	SOS version
340-200-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE3-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE4-7.00	
340-200-0020.TABLE5-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE1-7.00	
340-216-0020.TABLE2-7.00	
340-244-0242.TABLE2-7.00	(See potential table 24 error below – Where is table 1?)
340-244-0242.TABLE3-7.00	

References from other division 244 rules to Table 2 & 3 need to include the complete citation or you will need to provide the table for each rule that simply state Table 2 or Table 3. You still have time to address these items before Stephanie sends the packet to the EQC.

340-244-0242

Vapor Balance Requirements

(1) Except as provided in section (2) of this rule, the owner or operator in OAR 340-244-0234(4), must meet the requirements in either subsection (a) Each management practice in **Table 24** of this division that applies; (b) If, prior to January 10, 2008, the owner or operator of a GDF operating a GDF that meets the requirements of either paragraph (1)(b)(A) or (1)(b)(B) of this section, the owner or operator of a GDF will be deemed in compliance with this section. (A) Achieves emissions reduction of at least 90 percent. (B) Operates using management practices at least as stringent as those required by paragraph (1)(b)(A) of this section. (2) Gasoline storage tanks equipped with floating roofs or the equivalent, with subject to the control requirements in section (1) of this rule. (3) The owner or operator of a ~~C~~argo tanks unloading at a GDF must meet the requirements in section (1) of this rule, the owner or operator of a GDF must meet the requirements in section (1) of this rule, and management practices in Table **35** of this division.

Table 1 below needs a full citation or you will need to include the table again with OAR 340-216-0062:

(3) Fees. Applicants for a new or modified Simple ACDP must pay the fees set forth in Table 2 of 340-216-0020. Annual fees for Simple ACDPs will be assessed based on the following:

(a) Low Fee — A Source may qualify for the Low Fee if:

(A) the source is, or will be, permitted under only one of the following categories from OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1, Part B (category **275**. Electric Power Generation, may be included with any category listed below):

(i) Category 7. Asphalt felt and coatings;

(ii) Category 13. Boilers and other fuel burning equipment;

(iii) Category 33. Galvanizing & Pipe coating;

(iv) Category 39. Gray iron and steel foundries, malleable iron foundries, steel investment foundries, steel foundries 100 or more tons/yr. metal charged (not elsewhere identified);

(v) Category 40. Gypsum products;

(vi) Category 45. Liquid Storage Tanks subject to OAR division 232;

(vii) Category 56. Non-Ferrous Metal Foundries 100 or more tons/yr. of metal charged;

(viii) Category 57. Organic or Inorganic Industrial Chemical Manufacturing;

(ix) Category 62. Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning;

(x) Category 73. Secondary Smelting and/or Refining of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metals; or

(xi) Category 85. All Other Sources not listed in Table 1 which would have actual emissions, if the source were to operate uncontrolled, of 5 or more tons a year of direct PM2.5 or PM10 if located in a PM2.5 or PM10 non-attainment or maintenance area, or 10 or more tons of any single criteria pollutant in any part of the state; and

(B) The actual emissions from the 12 months immediately preceding the invoice date, and future projected emissions are less than 5 tons/yr. PM10 in a PM10 nonattainment or maintenance area, and less than 10 tons/yr. for each criteria pollutant; and

(C) The source is not considered an air quality problem or nuisance source by the Department DEQ.

(b) High Fee — Any source required to have a Simple ACDP (OAR 340-216-0020 Table 1 Part B) that does not qualify for the Low Fee will be assessed the High Fee.

If the Department DEQ determines that a source was invoiced for the Low Annual Fee but does not qualify for the Low Fee, the source will be invoiced for the High Fee.

- If the EQC amends or adopt rules with tables, they ARE amending or adopting tables that originate with the rule. This means regardless of whether you are changing tables that originate in any rule the EQC is acting on, those tables must be part of the EQC packet.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:29 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: SOS Filing

Maggie, I am assuming I still have to draft a SOS filing certificate & order. There is no auto-generate off the blueprint is there? Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: FW: EQC: Edits for your review and approval/feedback - deadline: Tuesday, February 26
Date: Friday, February 22, 2013 8:50:13 AM
Attachments: [ProposalSCreorder_jss edits.docx](#)

fyi

From: CALDERA Stephanie
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2013 8:49 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: EQC: Edits for your review and approval/feedback - deadline: Tuesday, February 26

Hi Jerry,

The NESHASPs report is ready for your review of edits – to note, you'll see a lot of changes if you view in the “see changes” modes. This is because we relocated sections within the blueprint – and these moves are one I am going to suggest to Maggie as a permanent change to the blueprint form. I thought about what the critical information is for the commission and reordered the sections to reflect that. I think the changes will help them organize their review of our proposals, and should help them make very clear and informed decisions.

The other note is that Joanie has a few questions (noted as comments) throughout the document. If possible, please respond to the questions by making a related change in the text. If that's not possible, or you need more info about the question, feel free to add a comment to her comment or give me a ring to chat about the changes.

Thanks, and please let me know if you have any questions. I would like to include this with a packet of materials that I will give to Dick for his review next Tuesday or Wednesday.

- Stephanie

Stephanie Caldera
Policy analyst
Oregon DEQ
811 SW 6th Ave.
Portland, OR 97204
email: Caldera.Stephanie@deq.state.or.us
phone: 503-229-5301
fax: 503-229-6762

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Cc: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: FW: NESHAP/NSPS package
Date: Thursday, February 07, 2013 10:06:13 AM
Attachments: [NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.2.docx](#)
Importance: High

Nicole and/or Maggie, Andy approved the rule package to go to the Director's Office. The documents are in the draft EQC package folder, except I need you to replace the Blueprint with the attached. The reason is that I had a few last minute changes (I am at home and unable to replace the document). You will also notice in the folder the actual public and EPA comments (Andy likes to make this available to the EQC) and also lists of NSPS and NESHAP amendments since my last rulemakings. In my response to public comment, I said I would include these lists in the EQC package. This is all due to the Director's Office on Monday. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks. Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 7:50 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: PAPISH Uri; THORNBERG Carol
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Excellent work, Jerry. Thank you for clearly and succinctly addressing every one of my comments.

This is good to go to the director's office.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 9:03 AM
To: GINSBURG Andy
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Andy, you should already have NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1. If not, I have attached it. It is the same document you edited and commented in. I have left your comments and edits in the document. I have added to that document, in redline/strikeout, the changes I made in response to your edits and comments. I also created a Word document that shows only your edits and comments and my responses (also attached). I forgot to mention that Uri also had me make changes to the implementation section. Those are shown in redline/strikeout in NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1.

Uri was also concerned about the use of General ACDP Attachments for Simple and Standard ACDPs, so I had Mark Fisher explain the benefits of using Attachments for Simple and Standards ACDPs to Uri and the RMT. After Mark's explanation and discussion, it was decided to create an entirely new ACDP Attachment. We worked with Paul Garrahan to make sure the rule changes to make that happen did not trigger the need to re-notice.

Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2013 6:30 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: THORNBURG Carol
Subject: NESHAP/NSPS package

Jerry,

You mentioned that you have a document or email that shows how you responded to my comments. I have the rule package, but not that summary. Could you please send it to expedite my review?

Thanks.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Cc: [CALDERA Stephanie](#)
Subject: RE: NESHP/NSPS package
Date: Thursday, February 07, 2013 11:54:00 AM

Hi Jerry and Stephanie,

If NSPSFRNotices.pdf and NESHPFRNotices.pdf are part of the staff report then please send the Excel or Word versions and I'll put them in our table format.

I've renamed or will rename the documents that will become the Staff Report.pdf.

Proposal
Proposed Rules
NESHP Table ??? Map??? We need a short identifier
NSPS Table ??? Map??

Are you thinking the following documents will become part of a second .pdf with distribution limited to the EQC? If so, I'll gather them into NESHP-NPS Comments.pdf.

Public Comment
EPA Comments

Regards,

Maggie Vandehey | Sr. Operations and Policy Analyst
Department of Environmental Quality | 34000
811 SW Sixth Ave., Portland, OR 97204-1390 | vandehey.maggie@deq.state.or.us
(503.229-6878 | In OR: 800.452-4011 | ☎ 503.229.6730

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 10:06 AM
To: VICK Nicole R.
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: FW: NESHP/NSPS package
Importance: High

Nicole and/or Maggie, Andy approved the rule package to go to the Director's Office. The documents are in the draft EQC package folder, except I need you to replace the Blueprint with the attached. The reason is that I had a few last minute changes (I am at home and unable to replace the document). You will also notice in the folder the actual public and EPA comments (Andy likes to make this available to the EQC) and also lists of NSPS and NESHP amendments since my last rulemakings. In my response to public comment, I said I would include these lists in the EQC package. This is all due to the Director's Office on Monday. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks. Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy

Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 7:50 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: PAPISH Uri; THORNBURG Carol
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Excellent work, Jerry. Thank you for clearly and succinctly addressing every one of my comments.

This is good to go to the director's office.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 9:03 AM
To: GINSBURG Andy
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Andy, you should already have NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1. If not, I have attached it. It is the same document you edited and commented in. I have left your comments and edits in the document. I have added to that document, in redline/strikeout, the changes I made in response to your edits and comments. I also created a Word document that shows only your edits and comments and my responses (also attached). I forgot to mention that Uri also had me make changes to the implementation section. Those are shown in redline/strikeout in NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1.

Uri was also concerned about the use of General ACDP Attachments for Simple and Standard ACDPs, so I had Mark Fisher explain the benefits of using Attachments for Simple and Standards ACDPs to Uri and the RMT. After Mark's explanation and discussion, it was decided to create an entirely new ACDP Attachment. We worked with Paul Garrahan to make sure the rule changes to make that happen did not trigger the need to re-notice.

Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2013 6:30 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: THORNBURG Carol
Subject: NESHAP/NSPS package

Jerry,

You mentioned that you have a document or email that shows how you responded to my comments. I have the rule package, but not that summary. Could you please send it to expedite my review?

Thanks.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg

Air Quality Administrator

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

(503) 229-5397 - Office

(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [CALDERA Stephanie](#)
Subject: RE: NESHP/NSPS package
Date: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:04:10 PM

I was going to take tomorrow off, in which case I wouldn't be able to send you the Excel/Word versions until Monday. Is that too late? Do I need to come in tomorrow to send you those documents?

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 11:53 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: CALDERA Stephanie
Subject: RE: NESHP/NSPS package

Hi Jerry and Stephanie,

If NSPSFRNotices.pdf and NESHPFRNotices.pdf are part of the staff report then please send the Excel or Word versions and I'll put them in our table format.

I've renamed or will rename the documents that will become the Staff Report.pdf.

Proposal
Proposed Rules
NESHP Table ??? Map??? We need a short identifier
NSPS Table ??? Map??

Are you thinking the following documents will become part of a second .pdf with distribution limited to the EQC? If so, I'll gather them into NESHP-NPS Comments.pdf.

Public Comment
EPA Comments

Regards,

Maggie Vandehey | Sr. Operations and Policy Analyst
Department of Environmental Quality | 34000
811 SW Sixth Ave., Portland, OR 97204-1390 | vandehey.maggie@deq.state.or.us
(503.229-6878 | In OR: 800.452-4011 | ☎ 503.229.6730

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 10:06 AM
To: VICK Nicole R.
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: FW: NESHP/NSPS package
Importance: High

Nicole and/or Maggie, Andy approved the rule package to go to the Director's Office. The documents are in the draft EQC package folder, except I need you to replace the Blueprint with the attached. The reason is that I had a few last minute changes (I am at home and unable to replace the document). You will also notice in the folder the actual public and EPA comments (Andy likes to make this available to the EQC) and also lists of NSPS and NESHAP amendments since my last rulemakings. In my response to public comment, I said I would include these lists in the EQC package. This is all due to the Director's Office on Monday. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks. Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 7:50 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: PAPISH Uri; THORNBURG Carol
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Excellent work, Jerry. Thank you for clearly and succinctly addressing every one of my comments.

This is good to go to the director's office.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 9:03 AM
To: GINSBURG Andy
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Andy, you should already have NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1. If not, I have attached it. It is the same document you edited and commented in. I have left your comments and edits in the document. I have added to that document, in redline/strikeout, the changes I made in response to your edits and comments. I also created a Word document that shows only your edits and comments and my responses (also attached). I forgot to mention that Uri also had me make changes to the implementation section. Those are shown in redline/strikeout in NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1.

Uri was also concerned about the use of General ACDP Attachments for Simple and Standard ACDPs, so I had Mark Fisher explain the benefits of using Attachments for Simple and Standards ACDPs to Uri and the RMT. After Mark's explanation and discussion, it was decided to create an entirely new ACDP Attachment. We worked with Paul Garrahan to make sure the rule changes to make that happen did not trigger the need to re-notice.

Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2013 6:30 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: THORNBURG Carol
Subject: NESHAP/NSPS package

Jerry,

You mentioned that you have a document or email that shows how you responded to my comments. I have the rule package, but not that summary. Could you please send it to expedite my review?

Thanks.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg

Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [CALDERA Stephanie](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Subject: RE: NESHP/NSPS package
Date: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:53:06 PM
Attachments: [Public Comments.docx](#)

Maggie, I think the Excel versions of the NESHP/NSPS notices are in my main rulemaking folder. EPA only sent my a .pdf, so I don't have a Word copy. That leaves the public comments, which are attached. Let me know if you find the Excel versions of the NESHP/NSPS notices. Thanks. Jerry

From: CALDERA Stephanie
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:05 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: NESHP/NSPS package

Maggie – I can wait a day or two for the commission packet if you need to get the Word/Excel docs integrated (and if you can wait until Monday).

- Stephanie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:04 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: CALDERA Stephanie
Subject: RE: NESHP/NSPS package

I was going to take tomorrow off, in which case I wouldn't be able to send you the Excel/Word versions until Monday. Is that too late? Do I need to come in tomorrow to send you those documents?

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 11:53 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: CALDERA Stephanie
Subject: RE: NESHP/NSPS package

Hi Jerry and Stephanie,

If NSPSFRNotices.pdf and NESHPFRNotices.pdf are part of the staff report then please send the Excel or Word versions and I'll put them in our table format.

I've renamed or will rename the documents that will become the Staff Report.pdf.

Proposal
Proposed Rules
NESHP Table ??? Map??? We need a short identifier
NSPS Table ??? Map??

Are you thinking the following documents will become part of a second .pdf with distribution limited to the EQC? If so, I'll gather them into NESHP-NPS Comments.pdf.

Public Comment
EPA Comments

Regards,

Maggie Vandehey | Sr. Operations and Policy Analyst
Department of Environmental Quality | 34000
811 SW Sixth Ave., Portland, OR 97204-1390 | vandehey.maggie@deq.state.or.us
(503.229-6878 | In OR: 800.452-4011 | ☎ 503.229.6730

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 10:06 AM
To: VICK Nicole R.
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: FW: NESHAP/NSPS package
Importance: High

Nicole and/or Maggie, Andy approved the rule package to go to the Director's Office. The documents are in the draft EQC package folder, except I need you to replace the Blueprint with the attached. The reason is that I had a few last minute changes (I am at home and unable to replace the document). You will also notice in the folder the actual public and EPA comments (Andy likes to make this available to the EQC) and also lists of NSPS and NESHAP amendments since my last rulemakings. In my response to public comment, I said I would include these lists in the EQC package. This is all due to the Director's Office on Monday. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks. Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 7:50 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: PAPISH Uri; THORNBURG Carol
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Excellent work, Jerry. Thank you for clearly and succinctly addressing every one of my comments.

This is good to go to the director's office.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 9:03 AM
To: GINSBURG Andy
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Andy, you should already have NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1. If not, I have attached it. It is the same document you edited and commented in. I have left your comments and edits in the document. I

have added to that document, in redline/strikeout, the changes I made in response to your edits and comments. I also created a Word document that shows only your edits and comments and my responses (also attached). I forgot to mention that Uri also had me make changes to the implementation section. Those are shown in redline/strikeout in NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1.

Uri was also concerned about the use of General ACDP Attachments for Simple and Standard ACDPs, so I had Mark Fisher explain the benefits of using Attachments for Simple and Standards ACDPs to Uri and the RMT. After Mark's explanation and discussion, it was decided to create an entirely new ACDP Attachment. We worked with Paul Garrahan to make sure the rule changes to make that happen did not trigger the need to re-notice.

Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2013 6:30 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: THORNBURG Carol
Subject: NESHAP/NSPS package

Jerry,

You mentioned that you have a document or email that shows how you responded to my comments. I have the rule package, but not that summary. Could you please send it to expedite my review?

Thanks.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package
Date: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:57:04 PM

The tables were in the main folders. Look in the final folder on Monday when you get in. Enjoy your three-day weekend!

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:53 PM
To: CALDERA Stephanie; VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: VICK Nicole R.
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Maggie, I think the Excel versions of the NESHAP/NSPS notices are in my main rulemaking folder. EPA only sent my a .pdf, so I don't have a Word copy. That leaves the public comments, which are attached. Let me know if you find the Excel versions of the NESHAP/NSPS notices. Thanks. Jerry

From: CALDERA Stephanie
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:05 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Maggie – I can wait a day or two for the commission packet if you need to get the Word/Excel docs integrated (and if you can wait until Monday).

- Stephanie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:04 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: CALDERA Stephanie
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

I was going to take tomorrow off, in which case I wouldn't be able to send you the Excel/Word versions until Monday. Is that too late? Do I need to come in tomorrow to send you those documents?

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 11:53 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: CALDERA Stephanie
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Hi Jerry and Stephanie,

If NSPSFRNotices.pdf and NESHAPFRNotices.pdf are part of the staff report then please send the Excel or Word versions and I'll put them in our table format.

I've renamed or will rename the documents that will become the Staff Report.pdf.

Proposal
Proposed Rules

NESHAP Table ??? Map??? We need a short identifier
NSPS Table ??? Map??

Are you thinking the following documents will become part of a second .pdf with distribution limited to the EQC? If so, I'll gather them into NESHAP-NPS Comments.pdf.

Public Comment
EPA Comments

Regards,

Maggie Vandehey | Sr. Operations and Policy Analyst
Department of Environmental Quality | 34000
811 SW Sixth Ave., Portland, OR 97204-1390 | yandehey.maggie@deq.state.or.us
(503.229-6878 | In OR: 800.452-4011 | ☎ 503.229.6730

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 10:06 AM
To: VICK Nicole R.
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: FW: NESHAP/NSPS package
Importance: High

Nicole and/or Maggie, Andy approved the rule package to go to the Director's Office. The documents are in the draft EQC package folder, except I need you to replace the Blueprint with the attached. The reason is that I had a few last minute changes (I am at home and unable to replace the document). You will also notice in the folder the actual public and EPA comments (Andy likes to make this available to the EQC) and also lists of NSPS and NESHAP amendments since my last rulemakings. In my response to public comment, I said I would include these lists in the EQC package. This is all due to the Director's Office on Monday. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks. Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 7:50 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: PAPISH Uri; THORNBURG Carol
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Excellent work, Jerry. Thank you for clearly and succinctly addressing every one of my comments.

This is good to go to the director's office.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 9:03 AM
To: GINSBURG Andy
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Andy, you should already have NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1. If not, I have attached it. It is the same document you edited and commented in. I have left your comments and edits in the document. I have added to that document, in redline/strikeout, the changes I made in response to your edits and comments. I also created a Word document that shows only your edits and comments and my responses (also attached). I forgot to mention that Uri also had me make changes to the implementation section. Those are shown in redline/strikeout in NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1.

Uri was also concerned about the use of General ACDP Attachments for Simple and Standard ACDPs, so I had Mark Fisher explain the benefits of using Attachments for Simple and Standards ACDPs to Uri and the RMT. After Mark's explanation and discussion, it was decided to create an entirely new ACDP Attachment. We worked with Paul Garrahan to make sure the rule changes to make that happen did not trigger the need to re-notice.

Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2013 6:30 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: THORNBURG Carol
Subject: NESHAP/NSPS package

Jerry,

You mentioned that you have a document or email that shows how you responded to my comments. I have the rule package, but not that summary. Could you please send it to expedite my review?

Thanks.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Cc: [CALDERA Stephanie](#)
Subject: RE: NESHP/NSPS package
Date: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:54:34 PM

No! No! No! Don't waste a perfectly good day off. I can take care of it on Monday morning.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:04 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: CALDERA Stephanie
Subject: RE: NESHP/NSPS package

I was going to take tomorrow off, in which case I wouldn't be able to send you the Excel/Word versions until Monday. Is that too late? Do I need to come in tomorrow to send you those documents?

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 11:53 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: CALDERA Stephanie
Subject: RE: NESHP/NSPS package

Hi Jerry and Stephanie,

If NSPSFRNotices.pdf and NESHPFRNotices.pdf are part of the staff report then please send the Excel or Word versions and I'll put them in our table format.

I've renamed or will rename the documents that will become the Staff Report.pdf.

Proposal
Proposed Rules
NESHP Table ??? Map??? We need a short identifier
NSPS Table ??? Map??

Are you thinking the following documents will become part of a second .pdf with distribution limited to the EQC? If so, I'll gather them into NESHP-NPS Comments.pdf.

Public Comment
EPA Comments

Regards,

Maggie Vandehey | Sr. Operations and Policy Analyst
Department of Environmental Quality | 34000
811 SW Sixth Ave., Portland, OR 97204-1390 | vandehey.maggie@deq.state.or.us
(503.229-6878 | In OR: 800.452-4011 | ☎ 503.229.6730

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 10:06 AM
To: VICK Nicole R.
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: FW: NESHAP/NSPS package
Importance: High

Nicole and/or Maggie, Andy approved the rule package to go to the Director's Office. The documents are in the draft EQC package folder, except I need you to replace the Blueprint with the attached. The reason is that I had a few last minute changes (I am at home and unable to replace the document). You will also notice in the folder the actual public and EPA comments (Andy likes to make this available to the EQC) and also lists of NSPS and NESHAP amendments since my last rulemakings. In my response to public comment, I said I would include these lists in the EQC package. This is all due to the Director's Office on Monday. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks. Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 7:50 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: PAPISH Uri; THORNBURG Carol
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Excellent work, Jerry. Thank you for clearly and succinctly addressing every one of my comments.

This is good to go to the director's office.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 9:03 AM
To: GINSBURG Andy
Subject: RE: NESHAP/NSPS package

Andy, you should already have NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1. If not, I have attached it. It is the same document you edited and commented in. I have left your comments and edits in the document. I have added to that document, in redline/strikeout, the changes I made in response to your edits and comments. I also created a Word document that shows only your edits and comments and my responses (also attached). I forgot to mention that Uri also had me make changes to the implementation section. Those are shown in redline/strikeout in NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.1.

Uri was also concerned about the use of General ACDP Attachments for Simple and Standard ACDPs, so I had Mark Fisher explain the benefits of using Attachments for Simple and Standards ACDPs to Uri and the RMT. After Mark's explanation and discussion, it was decided to create an entirely new ACDP Attachment. We worked with Paul Garrahan to make sure the rule changes to make that happen did not trigger the need to re-notice.

Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2013 6:30 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: THORNBERG Carol
Subject: NESHAP/NSPS package

Jerry,

You mentioned that you have a document or email that shows how you responded to my comments. I have the rule package, but not that summary. Could you please send it to expedite my review?

Thanks.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Cc: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: RM- Rule language and correct versions
Date: Thursday, December 27, 2012 9:49:29 AM

I don't need to ask Paul G, this would not require re-noticing. All I would do is show the change to the newest version of the rule.

From: VICK Nicole R.
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2012 9:44 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RM- Rule language and correct versions

Hi, Jerry-

Welcome back! Don't mean to give you bad news right off, but there is an older version of one of your rules (from Carrie Ann's biomass boiler rule amendments):

340-210-0100 – latest compilation is 05/17/12 and yours is from 02/6/12. I've inserted a comparison to demonstrate the differences between the two versions and placed it here:

<Y:\2012 Plan\AQ-FedAQRegs - Jerry Ebersole\6-EQCPreparation\6d-DraftEQCPacket\CompareDIV210.docx>

Would you mind forwarding to Paul G. for review to see if this needs to be re-noticed? Maggie – what do you think?

On a side note, OAR 340-200-0040 should have December 6, 2012 redlined and have March 20 (or 21st) inserted.

Did Maggie confirm if the rules proposed to adopt are available? Such as 216-0068 and 244-0239?

Thanks!

Nicole Vick
Air Quality Program Analyst
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
503-229-5946

 Please consider if it is necessary to print this e-mail

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: RM- Rule language and correct versions
Date: Friday, January 25, 2013 1:29:19 PM

Maggie, are OAR 340-216-0068 and 340-244-0239 available? Jerry

From: VICK Nicole R.
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2012 9:45 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RM- Rule language and correct versions

Hi, Jerry-

Welcome back! Don't mean to give you bad news right off, but there is an older version of one of your rules (from Carrie Ann's biomass boiler rule amendments):

340-210-0100 – latest compilation is 05/17/12 and yours is from 02/6/12.
I've inserted a comparison to demonstrate the differences between the two versions and placed it here:

<Y:\2012 Plan\AQ-FedAQRegs - Jerry Ebersole\6-EQCPreparation\6d-DraftEQCPacket\CompareDIV210.docx>

Would you mind forwarding to Paul G. for review to see if this needs to be re-noticed? Maggie – what do you think?

On a side note, OAR 340-200-0040 should have December 6, 2012 redlined and have March 20 (or 21st) inserted.

Did Maggie confirm if the rules proposed to adopt are available? Such as 216-0068 and 244-0239?

Thanks!

Nicole Vick
Air Quality Program Analyst
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
503-229-5946

 Please consider if it is necessary to print this e-mail

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Automatic reply: RM: EQC Requests
Date: Thursday, January 17, 2013 4:07:03 PM

I am off Thursday morning and telecommuting Thursday afternoon, January 17, 2013.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Subject: RE: RM: EQC Requests
Date: Tuesday, January 22, 2013 10:18:10 AM

Could you email me this form? I am not in the office today.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2013 4:18 PM
To: CURTIS Andrea; WIND Cory Ann; EBERSOLE Gerald; MCCONNAHA Colin; FINNERAN Brian; VICK Nicole R.; NORDBERG Dave; LEBRUN Dave; URBANOWICZ Karla; BIORN-HANSEN Sonja; CLIPPER Chris; MCALLISTER Larry; STURDEVANT Debra; CALVERT Paula; BILLINGS Jim
Subject: FW: RM: EQC Requests

OK, I'm not coming in on Monday either. If you would do the test by Tuesday, Jan 22, that would be great!

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2013 4:07 PM
To: **Cc:** ROICK Tom; VICK Nicole R.; CLIPPER Chris; PAPISH Uri; STOCUM Jeffrey; COLLIER David; WIGAL Jennifer; JOHNDOHL Judy; ADES Dennis R; LIVENGOOD David
Subject: RM: EQC Requests

Hi,

You are on record as the Subject Expert for one or more proposed rules on the 2013 DEQ Rulemaking Plan. If you are not, please let me know.

ACTION 1

Please complete the [Monthly Reporting Form](#) on the Rulemaking SharePoint.

Why The EQC asked for a monthly rulemaking status report. Information gathered through the form will help develop that report. Reports will be finalized during the first week of the month. In addition to being sent to the EQC, the report will reside on the Rulemaking SharePoint where it is available to the team, your management and EMT. **BACKGROUND:** Completing this form also triggers other actions such as:

- Scheduling training for next steps in your rulemaking process
- Populating your SharePoint folders with blank documents for the next process step. For example, when the monthly report indicates start rulemaking activities will happen in the upcoming month, the SCHEDULE-1.00 will be placed in the 1-Planning folder.
- Developing measures that may become part of our Outcome Based Management system.

Mon, Jan 21 If you would test your first form by close of business on Monday,

excluding the narratives, it would help me test the final report and schedule your upcoming training events. It should take less than five minutes.

By the first of each month My Outlook will send an automatic reminder on the 25th of each month starting Jan. 25, 2013. It will include the link to the [Monthly Reporting Form](#) and a reminder of the due date. The due date will always be the first work day of the month. If you plan to be on leave during this time, please make sure to pass this responsibility to another team member.

ACTION 2

Please involve the EQC as shown on the [2013 EQC Designation](#) table. BACKGROUND: Each December, DEQ asks the EQC how they want to be involved in our upcoming rulemaking activities. This table identifies how the members want to be involved.

ACTION 3

If you have an Advisory Committee, add the EQC members to your Advisory Committee email/GovDelivery group. BACKGROUND: They want to know about all advisory committee activities – not just rulemaking advisory committees.

Bill	Bill@WRB-consulting.com
Jane	JoKRanch@hotmail.com
Ed	EdArmstrong2@gmail.com
Morgan	MorganRider@gmail.com
Colleen	cjohnson@eou.edu

Regards,

Maggie Vandehey | Sr. Operations and Policy Analyst
Department of Environmental Quality | 34000
811 SW Sixth Ave., Portland, OR 97204-1390 | vandehey.maggie@deq.state.or.us
(503.229-6878 | In OR: 800.452-4011 | ☎ 503.229.6730

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VICK Nicole R.](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: RM: EQC Requests
Date: Tuesday, January 22, 2013 11:41:20 AM

Is this what you are looking for? Not sure what goes into the program link row. Also do I need to fill out the 2013 EQC Designation Table now? If so, send that to me. Thanks Nicole!

From: VICK Nicole R.
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2013 11:18 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: RM: EQC Requests

Hi, Jerry-

This form is in SP. I can complete it for you with a bit of help from you. Please complete the table below and I'll submit the SP form. Thanks!

	Federal Regulations – March EQC	Federal Regulations later one
EQC meeting date	March 2013	Unknown
Rulemaking activity this month	EQC staff report: EMT preview; lead manager review; lead DA review	None
Rulemaking activity upcoming month	EQC staff report: Lead DA approval; OCO/OD review; send to EQC	None
Advisory committee and link	N/A	None
Program link		
Other link (if applicable)		

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2013 10:18 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: VICK Nicole R.
Subject: RE: RM: EQC Requests

Could you email me this form? I am not in the office today.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2013 4:18 PM
To: CURTIS Andrea; WIND Cory Ann; EBERSOLE Gerald; MCCONNAHA Colin; FINNERAN Brian; VICK Nicole R.; NORDBERG Dave; LEBRUN Dave; URBANOWICZ Karla; BIORN-HANSEN Sonja; CLIPPER Chris; MCALLISTER Larry; STURDEVANT Debra; CALVERT Paula; BILLINGS Jim
Subject: FW: RM: EQC Requests

OK, I'm not coming in on Monday either. If you would do the test by Tuesday, Jan 22, that would be great!

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2013 4:07 PM

To: Cc: ROICK Tom; VICK Nicole R.; CLIPPER Chris; PAPISH Uri; STOCUM Jeffrey; COLLIER David; WIGAL Jennifer; JOHNDOLH Judy; ADES Dennis R; LIVENGOOD David
Subject: RM: EQC Requests

Hi,

You are on record as the Subject Expert for one or more proposed rules on the 2013 DEQ Rulemaking Plan. If you are not, please let me know.

ACTION 1

Please complete the [Monthly Reporting Form](#) on the Rulemaking SharePoint.

Why The EQC asked for a monthly rulemaking status report. Information gathered through the form will help develop that report. Reports will be finalized during the first week of the month. In addition to being sent to the EQC, the report will reside on the Rulemaking SharePoint where it is available to the team, your management and EMT. BACKGROUND: Completing this form also triggers other actions such as:

- Scheduling training for next steps in your rulemaking process
- Populating your SharePoint folders with blank documents for the next process step. For example, when the monthly report indicates start rulemaking activities will happen in the upcoming month, the SCHEDULE-1.00 will be placed in the 1-Planning folder.
- Developing measures that may become part of our Outcome Based Management system.

Mon, Jan 21 If you would test your first form by close of business on Monday, excluding the narratives, it would help me test the final report and schedule your upcoming training events. It should take less than five minutes.

By the first of each month My Outlook will send an automatic reminder on the 25th of each month starting Jan. 25, 2013. It will include the link to the [Monthly Reporting Form](#) and a reminder of the due date. The due date will always be the first work day of the month. If you plan to be on leave during this time, please make sure to pass this responsibility to another team member.

ACTION 2

Please involve the EQC as shown on the [2013 EQC Designation](#) table. BACKGROUND: Each December, DEQ asks the EQC how they want to be involved in our upcoming rulemaking activities. This table identifies how the members want to be involved.

ACTION 3

If you have an Advisory Committee, add the EQC members to your Advisory Committee email/GovDelivery group. **BACKGROUND:** They want to know about all advisory committee activities – not just rulemaking advisory committees.

Bill	Bill@WRB-consulting.com
Jane	JoKRanch@hotmail.com
Ed	EdArmstrong2@gmail.com
Morgan	MorganRider@gmail.com
Colleen	cjohnson@eou.edu

Regards,

Maggie Vandehey | Sr. Operations and Policy Analyst
Department of Environmental Quality | 34000
811 SW Sixth Ave., Portland, OR 97204-1390 | yandehey.maggie@deq.state.or.us
(503.229.6878 | In OR: 800.452-4011 | ☎ 503.229.6730

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [FISHER Mark](#); [BAUMGARTNER Johnny](#); [CROUCHER Steve](#); [ROOT Jenny](#); [WILLIAMS Robin G](#); [VICK Nicole R.](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#); ["Garrahan Paul"](#); [KNIGHT William](#); [LAWRENCE Richard](#)
Subject: EQC Package Review
Date: Monday, October 29, 2012 4:51:49 PM
Attachments: [NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V3.0.docx](#)
[NESHAP-NSPS-Rulemaking-Language1.1.docx](#)
[NESHAPFRNotices.xlsx](#)
[NSPSFRNotices.xlsx](#)

Hi all, attached is the draft EQC package for your review.

In response to public comment, I have added two spreadsheets that list FR notices for the NSPSs and NESHAPs that are being adopted by reference. We included these spreadsheets in the public notice package in previous rulemakings, but because this rulemaking is a test case for the new rulemaking blueprint, I left them out. Leaving them out is probably the reason we received comments related to listing Federal Register Notices instead of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Keep in mind some sections of the package, such as the fiscal impact, can't change without going out on public notice again.

Please send me your comments no later than next Wednesday, November 7.

Thanks.

Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Subject: RE: RM-ACDP: Public Notice with Hearing Questions
Date: Monday, October 08, 2012 11:51:24 AM

This is not my rulemaking.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Monday, October 08, 2012 11:43 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: VICK Nicole R.
Subject: FW: RM-ACDP: Public Notice with Hearing Questions

Hi Jerry,

I'm analyzing the workload and schedule for the proposed the ACDP Fee Increase for the 2013 DEQ Rulemaking Plan and have a couple of questions. I've included an excerpt from Considerations workbook. **I'll make the change in the workbook if you would provide any corrections as a response to this email.**

Question 1: Considerations [3Stakeholder] Public Notice indicates the is "No public Notice." Should I change it to "Public Notice with hearing" since you are holding one Portland area information meeting/hearing? If so, what is the Notice START and END ?

EXCERPT FROM CONSIDERATIONS

	SSTART		EEND		not involved
	Year	Qtr	Year	Qtr	
Start	2013	1			
Advisory committee	2013	3	2013	4	not involved
Rulemaking notice	2013	4	2013	4	not involved
EQC Action	2013	4			
Effective	2013	4			

Thank you, Jerry.

Maggie
X6878

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [THORNBERG Carol](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Andy Review of Rule Package
Date: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 11:10:48 AM

Carol, Andy's involvement with the EQC Package is as follows:

Notify EMT of Preview Period	11/16/2012
Review	12/14/2012 – 12/21/2012
Approval	01/09/13

I thought Andy would review the package prior to the EMT preview period, but according to the Blueprint, that is not the case.

Let me know if these dates don't work.

Thanks.

Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#); [THORNBURG Carol](#); [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Cc: [ROICK Tom](#)
Subject: RE: Andy Review of Rule Package
Date: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 12:33:58 PM

So Carol, the EMT preview period is 11/16/2012 to 12/06/2012, Andy could also review the package at that time as part of the EMT.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 12:18 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald; THORNBURG Carol; VICK Nicole R.
Cc: ROICK Tom
Subject: RE: Andy Review of Rule Package

Hi,

Yes, it seems counter intuitive when compared to the old process. Here is the concept:

- The lead manager is responsible for:
 - Updating the lead administrator on the rulemaking throughout the process, and
 - Approving the preview period.
- For 2013, the lead administrator is responsibility for discussing potential rulemaking issues with the EMT and any member may follow a particular rulemaking on SharePoint.
- Generally, proposal elements that went through review and approval during notice, especially the Statement of Need, Federal Relationship and Land Use may not be changed for the EQC Staff Report.
- Previewers are the EMT; the lead administrator is a member of the EMT. All DEQ resources on Resources workbook are also reviewers and it is the process expert's responsibility to get their input before this point in the process. If a previewer has something to say, she or he may reach out to the team – this includes the lead administrator. The Kaizen team was clear, this is **not an approval** process but the opportunity for interested parties to "preview" the semi-final draft.
- The **preview** period MAY raise some issues that the team decides to resolve.
- The lead administrator approves the final report.

Any feedback?

Maggie
X6878

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 11:11 AM
To: THORNBURG Carol
Cc: VICK Nicole R.; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: Andy Review of Rule Package

Carol, Andy's involvement with the EQC Package is as follows:

Notify EMT of Preview Period	11/16/2012
Review	12/14/2012 – 12/21/2012
Approval	01/09/13

I thought Andy would review the package prior to the EMT preview period, but according to the Blueprint, that is not the case.

Let me know if these dates don't work.

Thanks.

Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Subject: Blueprint and Public Notice
Date: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 9:42:13 AM

Maggie, are you going to be able to take the Announcement and merge it back into the Blueprint?
Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [STELLMACH Nancy](#)
Cc: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#); [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Subject: Rulemaking Documents Ready for Posting
Date: Monday, August 20, 2012 10:48:35 AM

Nancy, the rulemaking documents are ready for posting.

They are:

NESHAP-NSPS-Announcement
NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V2.1
NESHAP-NSPS-Rulemaking-Language

Here is a link to their location: [Link](#).

I have placed Word and PDF versions of the documents in the linked folder.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks for your help on this.

Jerry Ebersole

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [MONRO David](#); [\[All DEQ\] AQ Managers](#)
Cc: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#); [VICK Nicole R.](#); [GINSBURG Andy](#)
Subject: RE: FYI regarding new rule making process
Date: Wednesday, August 01, 2012 2:00:06 PM

David, here is a link to PDF versions of the documents: [LINK](#). Jerry

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2012 1:48 PM
To: MONRO David; [All DEQ] AQ Managers
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie; VICK Nicole R.; EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: FYI regarding new rule making process

David,

Let's have Jerry create PDF versions of the document and give you a new link you can use when you forward this to staff. I just want to avoid getting any inadvertent edits into the master documents.

Thanks.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: MONRO David
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2012 3:54 PM
To: GINSBURG Andy; [All DEQ] AQ Managers
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie; VICK Nicole R.; 'gerald.ebersole@state.or.us'
Subject: RE: FYI regarding new rule making process

Thanks Andy – any problem with forwarding this to staff as an FYI?

David Monro
Air Quality Manager, Northwest Region
office: 503.229.5160
blackberry: 503.793.9635

PUBLIC RECORDS LAW DISCLOSURE: This is a public document. This e-mail may be subject to the state retention schedule and made available to the public.

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2012 9:09 AM
To: [All DEQ] AQ Managers
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie; VICK Nicole R.; 'gerald.ebersole@state.or.us'
Subject: FYI regarding new rule making process

Managers,

This email has a link to the near final NSPS/NESHAP update rule making proposal. I'm forwarding this to you because it is our first rule using the new blueprint templates and I thought you might like to see what it looks like in actual use. Jerry and Maggie have done a fabulous job of bringing this from concept to implementation.

You don't need to comment, although you are welcome to if you'd like. But please take a minute to skim it and see what you think. If you have any suggestions on the template itself for the next rule, please let Maggie know.

Thanks.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Dept. Of Environmental Quality

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2012 08:43 AM
To: (All DEQ) Executive Management Team
Cc: EBERSOLE Gerald; VICK Nicole R.; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: EMT review requested - deadline August 9th

Air Quality is currently piloting the new rulemaking blueprint with the update of federal air quality regulations (NESHAP/NSPS). As you know, the blueprint was designed to implement recommendations from the rulemaking kaizen team that reduces duplicative work, identifies and tracks resources required for the rulemaking and implementation thereof, allows for continuous improvement, and has built-in risk evaluation mechanisms. The idea is that this will allow us to view potential agency projects from a holistic approach and make decisions with "good" information.

This email begins the preview period on this pilot rulemaking proposal. The preview period is a step in the new rulemaking process that was not in the old process, so your feedback on how this step works is part of the pilot. During this preview period, members of the EMT are welcome and encouraged to provide comments on the rule content as well as the blueprint. You can use track changes to make your suggested edits and/or comments. Please save the document once you have completed your preview. If you open and realize someone has the document locked, please save the document and re-name with your initials at the end of the file name.

We will need your comments when the preview period closes on **August 9th**. The blueprint can be accessed by clicking [here](#)

Thanks.

Andy

Andy Ginsburg

Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(503) 229-5397 - Office
(503) 572-7195 - Mobile

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [GINSBURG Andy](#)
Cc: [ROIICK Tom](#); [VICK Nicole R.](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RM: NESHPAP/NSPS - Verbiage for EMT preview period
Date: Monday, July 30, 2012 4:33:00 PM

Andy, thanks for your prompt review. Tom has reviewed and approved the changes I made in response to your comments.

Let me know if you have any last minute changes. If not, the documents are ready for the EMT to preview.

Nicole and I have decided to use Word instead of pdf for EMT preview. Instructions and a link to the documents are included below.

Jerry

From: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 3:37 PM
To: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
Subject: RM: NESHPAP/NSPS - Verbiage for EMT preview period

Air Quality is currently participating in the blueprint pilot program to address federal air quality regulations in Oregon rules (NESHPAP/NSPS). The blueprint was designed to implement recommendations from the rulemaking kaizen team that reduces duplicative work, identifies and tracks resources required for the rulemaking and implementation thereof, allows for continuous improvement, and has built-in risk evaluation mechanisms. The idea is that this will allow management to view potential agency projects from a holistic approach and make decisions with “good” information.

This is the first email sent out that begins the preview period. During this preview period, members of the EMT are welcome and encouraged to provide comments on the rule content as well as the blueprint. You can use track changes as before to make your suggested edits and/or comments. Please save the document once you have completed your preview. If you open and realize someone has the document locked, please save the document and re-name with your initials at the end of the file name.

We will need your comments when the preview period closes on **August 9th**. The blueprint can be accessed by clicking [here](#).

Thanks, Jerry!

Nicole Vick
Air Quality Program Analyst
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
503-229-5946

 Please consider if it is necessary to print this e-mail

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Subject: Signing the Fiscal Impact Statement
Date: Tuesday, May 22, 2012 12:03:27 PM

Maggie, I don't see a signature line for the Fiscal Impact Statement. Does it still need to be signed?
Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#); [ROYS Jim](#); [HARRIS Jim](#)
Subject: RE: Signing the Fiscal Impact Statement
Date: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 12:57:08 PM

Has this been resolved yet?

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2012 12:28 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: VICK Nicole R.; ROYS Jim; HARRIS Jim
Subject: RE: Signing the Fiscal Impact Statement

Hi Jerry,

We have not reconciled the electronic signature yet for blueprint documents. You will need an email or signature in the rulemaking record to demonstrate budget agreement with the fiscal for now. Though there is no legal requirement for budget review of the fiscal or this signature, it is a DEQ best practice.

I'll let you know when we resolve this for the new process.

Maggie

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2012 12:03 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: VICK Nicole R.
Subject: Signing the Fiscal Impact Statement

Maggie, I don't see a signature line for the Fiscal Impact Statement. Does it still need to be signed?
Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [ROIICK Tom](#)
Cc: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#); [VICK Nicole R.](#); [THORNBURG Carol](#)
Subject: Rule Package Review
Date: Monday, July 16, 2012 5:01:50 PM
Attachments: [NESHAP-NSPS-Rulemaking-Language.docx](#)
[NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V2.1.docx](#)
[NESHAP-NSPS-Announcement.docx](#)

Tom, attached is the current rule package for your review. You have until Monday, July 23.

After that, the EMT is allowed to preview the rule package. It says the Lead Administrator notifies the EMT about the preview period. Not sure whether Andy would do that by email or at the EMT meeting. Maggie or Nicole?

Also, "DEQ Staff, specifically contributing resources" would be allowed to preview the package. Not sure who that is and how we would notify them. Maggie or Nicole?

Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#); [THORNBERG Carol](#); [ROICK Tom](#)
Subject: RE: Rule Package Review
Date: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 11:27:32 AM

Thanks!

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 11:26 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: VICK Nicole R.; THORNBERG Carol; ROICK Tom
Subject: RE: Rule Package Review

These are people you identified on the Resources worksheet who may need/want to know about the rulemaking. Since this is not on a SharePoint site, you can send one email . Please make sure the email lets them know this is a **preview** and why you have included them.

RULEMAKING CONTRIBUTORS

Thank you for your contributions to the NAME rulemaking. This is a courtesy preview of the notice documents that we plan to publish in the mm/dd [Bulletin](#). INCLUDE ANY NOTES YOU WOULD LIKE.

RULE IMPLEMENTATION

The proposed rules may involve:

BSD – NAME permit system may need changes – See ???
OCE – new enforcement actions – See OAR 340-000-000

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 5:02 PM
To: ROICK Tom
Cc: VANDEHEY Maggie; VICK Nicole R.; THORNBERG Carol
Subject: Rule Package Review

Tom, attached is the current rule package for your review. You have until Monday, July 23.

After that, the EMT is allowed to preview the rule package. It says the Lead Administrator notifies the EMT about the preview period. Not sure whether Andy would do that by email or at the EMT meeting. Maggie or Nicole?

Also, “DEQ Staff, specifically contributing resources” would be allowed to preview the package. Not sure who that is and how we would notify them. Maggie or Nicole?

Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [THORNBERG Carol](#); [VICK Nicole R.](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Public Hearing
Date: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 9:47:07 AM

I plan on having one public hearing hear at HQ and allow to attend the hearing by phone. Should I use a conference line or have the Bend, Medford, and Salem offices call into the line and invite people to those offices?

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [FISHER Mark](#); [BAUMGARTNER Johnny](#); [CROUCHER Steve](#); [LOGAN Paul S](#); [ROOT Jenny](#); [KNIGHT William](#); [POLLOCK Andree](#)
Cc: [ROICK Tom](#); [VICK Nicole R.](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#); [GINSBURG Andy](#)
Subject: Revised Rulemaking Package
Date: Thursday, July 05, 2012 3:35:19 PM
Attachments: [NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V2.1.docx](#)
[NESHAP-NSPS-Announcement.docx](#)
[NESHAP-NSPS-Rulemaking-Language.docx](#)

Hi team, Andy has reviewed the rulemaking package and as a result the Announcement and Proposal have changed. The rulemaking language has not changed, except that we removed the boiler and CIWSI rules because EPA failed to re-promulgate them by July 1. Please have any comments back to me by Monday, July 16. Thanks for your help on this! Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [FISHER Mark](#); [BAUMGARTNER Johnny](#); [CROUCHER Steve](#); [LOGAN Paul S](#); [ROOT Jenny](#); [KNIGHT William](#); [POLLOCK Andree](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: Revised Rulemaking Package
Date: Monday, July 16, 2012 11:00:08 AM
Attachments: [NESHAP-NSPS-Announcement.docx](#)
[NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V2.1.docx](#)
[NESHAP-NSPS-Rulemaking-Language.docx](#)

Any additional comments before I send the package to my manager (Tom Roick) for review? I plan on sending him the package by the end of the day.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2012 3:35 PM
To: FISHER Mark; BAUMGARTNER Johnny; CROUCHER Steve; LOGAN Paul S; ROOT Jenny; KNIGHT William; POLLOCK Andree
Cc: ROICK Tom; VICK Nicole R.; VANDEHEY Maggie; GINSBURG Andy
Subject: Revised Rulemaking Package

Hi team, Andy has reviewed the rulemaking package and as a result the Announcement and Proposal have changed. The rulemaking language has not changed, except that we removed the boiler and CIWSI rules because EPA failed to re-promulgate them by July 1. Please have any comments back to me by Monday, July 16. Thanks for your help on this! Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: Exploring EQC meeting schedule changes for 2013
Date: Monday, July 09, 2012 10:38:40 AM

December is probably pushing it. March would be okay with me.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 10:37 AM
To: CLIPPER Chris; VICK Nicole R.; BARROWS Bob; EBERSOLE Gerald; SIMPSON Manette; BELETE Etsegenet; MRAZIK Steve; TROX Randall; WIND Cory Ann
Subject: Exploring EQC meeting schedule changes for 2013

Hi,

The Office of the Director is thinking about reducing the number of meetings from six to five per year. Please let me know if it would cause problems for your rulemaking or planned information meetings if we were to cancel the Feb. 2013 and April, 2013 EQC meetings and have a March meeting instead.

Thank you.

Maggie Vandehey | Sr. Operations and Policy Analyst
Department of Environmental Quality
811 SW Sixth Ave., Portland, OR 97204-1390 | vandehey.maggie@deq.state.or.us
☎ 503.229-6878 | In OR: 800.452-4011 | ☎ 503.229.6730

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: FW: RM: NSPS/NESHAP
Date: Monday, July 09, 2012 9:27:26 AM

FYI

From: VICK Nicole R.
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 9:20 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RM: NSPS/NESHAP

Hi, Jerry-

Since Paul Logan has been promoted and Paul Garrahan is his replacement, I'd like to send Paul G. a quick overview of what rulemakings we have going on and approximate dates of when we will need his assistance to review our rulemaking packages.

I wanted to touch base with you and find out where your rulemaking is concerning DOJ review and if there is anything helpful I can pass along to Paul G. concerning the different look to this particular rulemaking with the blueprint. I know there were some concerns that Paul L. had with some of the forms and that Maggie was going to be working with DOJ on that.

Do you have any upcoming DOJ review times scheduled for this rulemaking and if Paul L. will be doing that or Paul G.?

Please advise.

Thank you,

Nicole Vick
Air Quality Program Analyst
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
503-229-5946

 Please consider if it is necessary to print this e-mail

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: FW: Rulepackage Review
Date: Monday, June 18, 2012 3:55:57 PM
Attachments: [NESHP-NSPS-Proposal-V1.0.docx](#)

FYI. How do you want to address Paul's comments on the template?

From: Logan Paul S [mailto:Paul.S.Logan@doj.state.or.us]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 3:34 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

Attached are my additional comments on the RFR, fiscal and land use analysis. I hope this will provide helpful guidance about how to revise those sections to minimize legal risk. I'd suggest that DEQ take another crack at drafting them, consistent with these revisions, and then I could review them again. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 8:39 AM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

EPA released its proposed PM2.5 standards on Friday, and we filed our amicus brief in the California LCFS case Friday as well, so I didn't have chance to make more progress or send what I had. I'll send you documents later today.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2012 9:52 PM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

I'll have part of it done, but not all. I'll send you everything I can on Friday.

Paul

From: EBERSOLE Gerald [\[mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@doj.state.or.us\]](mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@doj.state.or.us)
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2012 2:49 PM
To: LOGAN Paul S
Subject: Rulepackage Review

Paul, will you have a chance to give me more detailed feedback by Friday? Jerry

*****CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE*****

This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this e-mail in error, please advise me immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: ["Logan Paul S"](#)
Cc: [ROIICK Tom](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review
Date: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 3:25:31 PM
Attachments: [NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V1.0.docx](#)

Paul, I have revised the rulemaking document to address some of your comments. Maggie will likely address your other comments on Thursday. Please review the revised fiscal and federal requirements sections as soon as possible to give Tom enough time to perform his review before he goes on vacation. Thanks. Jerry

From: Logan Paul S [mailto:Paul.S.Logan@doj.state.or.us]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 3:34 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

Attached are my additional comments on the RFR, fiscal and land use analysis. I hope this will provide helpful guidance about how to revise those sections to minimize legal risk. I'd suggest that DEQ take another crack at drafting them, consistent with these revisions, and then I could review them again. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Paul Logan
[Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943](#)

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 8:39 AM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

EPA released its proposed PM2.5 standards on Friday, and we filed our amicus brief in the California LCFS case Friday as well, so I didn't have chance to make more progress or send what I had. I'll send you documents later today.

Paul Logan
[Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943](#)

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2012 9:52 PM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

I'll have part of it done, but not all. I'll send you everything I can on Friday.

Paul

From: EBERSOLE Gerald [\[mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@doe.state.or.us\]](mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@doe.state.or.us)
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2012 2:49 PM

To: LOGAN Paul S
Subject: Rulepackage Review

Paul, will you have a chance to give me more detailed feedback by Friday? Jerry
*****CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE*****

This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this e-mail in error, please advise me immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [LOGAN Paul S](#)
Cc: [ROIICK Tom](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review
Date: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 11:54:20 AM
Attachments: [NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V2.0.docx](#)

Review this one instead. I made some changes and removed the boiler/CISWI rules because it doesn't look like they will be readopted by July 1.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 3:26 PM
To: 'Logan Paul S'
Cc: ROIICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Paul, I have revised the rulemaking document to address some of your comments. Maggie will likely address your other comments on Thursday. Please review the revised fiscal and federal requirements sections as soon as possible to give Tom enough time to perform his review before he goes on vacation. Thanks. Jerry

From: Logan Paul S [<mailto:Paul.S.Logan@doj.state.or.us>]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 3:34 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

Attached are my additional comments on the RFR, fiscal and land use analysis. I hope this will provide helpful guidance about how to revise those sections to minimize legal risk. I'd suggest that DEQ take another crack at drafting them, consistent with these revisions, and then I could review them again. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 8:39 AM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

EPA released its proposed PM2.5 standards on Friday, and we filed our amicus brief in the California LCFS case Friday as well, so I didn't have chance to make more progress or send what I had. I'll send you documents later today.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2012 9:52 PM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

I'll have part of it done, but not all. I'll send you everything I can on Friday.

Paul

From: EBERSOLE Gerald [\[mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@deq.state.or.us\]](mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@deq.state.or.us)
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2012 2:49 PM
To: LOGAN Paul S
Subject: Rulepackage Review

Paul, will you have a chance to give me more detailed feedback by Friday? Jerry
*****CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE*****

This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this e-mail in error, please advise me immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: FW: Rulepackage Review
Date: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 1:35:47 PM
Attachments: [NESHP-NSPS-Proposal-V2.0.docx](#)

Maggie, you will notice that I moved what alternative you considered from the Statement of Need section to the Federal Relationship section per Paul's suggestion. Jerry

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 11:54 AM
To: LOGAN Paul S
Cc: ROICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Review this one instead. I made some changes and removed the boiler/CISWI rules because it doesn't look like they will be readopted by July 1.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 3:26 PM
To: 'Logan Paul S'
Cc: ROICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Paul, I have revised the rulemaking document to address some of your comments. Maggie will likely address your other comments on Thursday. Please review the revised fiscal and federal requirements sections as soon as possible to give Tom enough time to perform his review before he goes on vacation. Thanks. Jerry

From: Logan Paul S [<mailto:Paul.S.Logan@doj.state.or.us>]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 3:34 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

Attached are my additional comments on the RFR, fiscal and land use analysis. I hope this will provide helpful guidance about how to revise those sections to minimize legal risk. I'd suggest that DEQ take another crack at drafting them, consistent with these revisions, and then I could review them again. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 8:39 AM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

EPA released its proposed PM2.5 standards on Friday, and we filed our amicus brief in the

California LCFS case Friday as well, so I didn't have chance to make more progress or send what I had. I'll send you documents later today.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2012 9:52 PM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

I'll have part of it done, but not all. I'll send you everything I can on Friday.

Paul

From: EBERSOLE Gerald [\[mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@deq.state.or.us\]](mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@deq.state.or.us)
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2012 2:49 PM
To: LOGAN Paul S
Subject: Rulepackage Review

Paul, will you have a chance to give me more detailed feedback by Friday? Jerry
*****CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE*****

This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this e-mail in error, please advise me immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: ["Logan Paul S"](#)
Cc: [ROIICK Tom](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review
Date: Friday, June 22, 2012 3:24:20 PM
Attachments: [NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V2.0.docx](#)

Is the attached better? I added an introductory paragraph to the fiscal section as requested. I also realized that I have how and why in the how section of the federal requirements section, so I moved the why from the how section to the why section.

From: Logan Paul S [mailto:Paul.S.Logan@doj.state.or.us]
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2012 2:41 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: ROIICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Thanks Jerry. You made good changes, which will greatly decrease legal risk. Attached are a few more comments. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Paul Logan
[Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943](#)

From: EBERSOLE Gerald [mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@doj.state.or.us]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 11:54 AM
To: LOGAN Paul S
Cc: ROIICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Review this one instead. I made some changes and removed the boiler/CISWI rules because it doesn't look like they will be readopted by July 1.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 3:26 PM
To: 'Logan Paul S'
Cc: ROIICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Paul, I have revised the rulemaking document to address some of your comments. Maggie will likely address your other comments on Thursday. Please review the revised fiscal and federal requirements sections as soon as possible to give Tom enough time to perform his review before he goes on vacation. Thanks. Jerry

From: Logan Paul S [mailto:Paul.S.Logan@doj.state.or.us]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 3:34 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

Attached are my additional comments on the RFR, fiscal and land use analysis. I hope this will provide helpful guidance about how to revise those sections to minimize legal risk. I'd

suggest that DEQ take another crack at drafting them, consistent with these revisions, and then I could review them again. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 8:39 AM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

EPA released its proposed PM2.5 standards on Friday, and we filed our amicus brief in the California LCFS case Friday as well, so I didn't have chance to make more progress or send what I had. I'll send you documents later today.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2012 9:52 PM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

I'll have part of it done, but not all. I'll send you everything I can on Friday.

Paul

From: EBERSOLE Gerald [\[mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@deq.state.or.us\]](mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@deq.state.or.us)
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2012 2:49 PM
To: LOGAN Paul S
Subject: Rulepackage Review

Paul, will you have a chance to give me more detailed feedback by Friday? Jerry
*****CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE*****

This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this e-mail in error, please advise me immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: ["Logan Paul S"](#)
Cc: [ROIICK Tom](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review
Date: Monday, June 25, 2012 2:34:38 PM
Attachments: [NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V2.0.docx](#)

Paul, Maggie had additional changes to the fiscal section to address your concerns. Attached is the most current version. Jerry

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2012 3:24 PM
To: 'Logan Paul S'
Cc: ROIICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Is the attached better? I added an introductory paragraph to the fiscal section as requested. I also realized that I have how and why in the how section of the federal requirements section, so I moved the why from the how section to the why section.

From: Logan Paul S [<mailto:Paul.S.Logan@doj.state.or.us>]
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2012 2:41 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: ROIICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Thanks Jerry. You made good changes, which will greatly decrease legal risk. Attached are a few more comments. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: EBERSOLE Gerald [<mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@doj.state.or.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 11:54 AM
To: LOGAN Paul S
Cc: ROIICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Review this one instead. I made some changes and removed the boiler/CISWI rules because it doesn't look like they will be readopted by July 1.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 3:26 PM
To: 'Logan Paul S'
Cc: ROIICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Paul, I have revised the rulemaking document to address some of your comments. Maggie will likely address your other comments on Thursday. Please review the revised fiscal and federal requirements sections as soon as possible to give Tom enough time to perform his review before he goes on vacation. Thanks. Jerry

From: Logan Paul S [<mailto:Paul.S.Logan@doj.state.or.us>]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 3:34 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

Attached are my additional comments on the RFR, fiscal and land use analysis. I hope this will provide helpful guidance about how to revise those sections to minimize legal risk. I'd suggest that DEQ take another crack at drafting them, consistent with these revisions, and then I could review them again. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 8:39 AM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

EPA released its proposed PM2.5 standards on Friday, and we filed our amicus brief in the California LCFS case Friday as well, so I didn't have chance to make more progress or send what I had. I'll send you documents later today.

Paul Logan
Oregon Department of Justice, 971.673.1943

From: Logan Paul S
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2012 9:52 PM
To: 'EBERSOLE Gerald'
Subject: RE: Rulepackage Review

Jerry,

I'll have part of it done, but not all. I'll send you everything I can on Friday.

Paul

From: EBERSOLE Gerald [<mailto:EBERSOLE.Gerald@doj.state.or.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2012 2:49 PM
To: LOGAN Paul S
Subject: Rulepackage Review

Paul, will you have a chance to give me more detailed feedback by Friday? Jerry
*****CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE*****

This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this e-mail in error, please advise me immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: Rule Folder Permissions
Date: Monday, June 18, 2012 10:22:17 AM

I can open them and save them to my E drive, I just can't save them to the rule folder. I will save them in my E: drive until I can save them in the rule folder again.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 10:20 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: Rule Folder Permissions

In the interim, can I send you a document?

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 10:06 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: Rule Folder Permissions

I don't have permission to work on the documents in my rule folder.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [FISHER Mark](#); [BAUMGARTNER Johnny](#); [CROUCHER Steve](#); [POLLOCK Andree](#); [LOGAN Paul S](#); [WILLIAMS Robin G](#); [LAWRENCE Richard](#); [KNIGHT William](#); [ROOT Jenny](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: 2012/2013 NESHAP/NSPS Rulemaking
Date: Friday, June 08, 2012 1:33:51 PM
Attachments: [NESHAP_NSPS-Proposal-V1.0.docx](#)
[Announcement.docx](#)
[2012 Rulemaking Language 2.docx](#)

Thanks for all your comments on the rulemaking package!

I have made several changes based on those comments.

Attached is the current package.

Please send any additional comments by next Friday, June 15, 2012.

Jerry

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2012 10:59 AM
To: FISHER Mark; BAUMGARTNER Johnny; CROUCHER Steve; POLLOCK Andree; LOGAN Paul S; WILLIAMS Robin G; LAWRENCE Richard; KNIGHT William; ROOT Jenny
Subject: 2012/2013 NESHAP/NSPS Rulemaking

You have been selected to be part of my rulemaking team. This rulemaking uses the new rulemaking process, so the rulemaking package looks different. Please review the attached documents and provide me comments by Monday, June 4. If you don't have time to review the whole package, focus your review as follows:

Mark: Review the permitting rules and rules that implement the federal emissions guidelines for commercial and industrial solid waste incinerators.

Johnny/Andree/Steve: Reviews the gasoline dispensing rule amendments.

Paul: Makes sure all legal issues are adequately resolved, and the proposed rules are legally sufficient (within authority, consistent with statute, enforceable).

Robin: Review and approve statement of need and fiscal impact statement.

Richard: Though this does not involve fees and invoicing, would still like him to be aware of the rule changes.

William: Review notice and announcement.

Jenny: Reviews proposed rules to ensure enforcement issues are addressed.

Thanks.

Jerry Ebersole

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Schedule
Date: Monday, April 16, 2012 9:38:31 AM

When do I get access to the schedule and any other tabs I need for the public notice phase?

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: Schedule
Date: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 4:53:20 PM

Seems like a lot of wording disappeared when we went from 1.15 to 2.0.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 12:15 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: Schedule

Hi Jerry,

Your post-EMT approval workbook NESHAP-NSPSblueprint V2.0 on your shared drive. Nicole and I were going to go over the schedule but she is out sick.

Maggie.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2012 9:38 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: Schedule

When do I get access to the schedule and any other tabs I need for the public notice phase?

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Schedule
Date: Monday, April 23, 2012 2:19:44 PM

Looking at the schedule tab, is this the process for the public notice?

- Meet with team
- Team develops notice package
- Lead manager reviews package
- Lead Administrator reviews package
- Lead Administrator approves package
- Open review period
- Lead manager approves package

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Schedule
Date: Tuesday, May 01, 2012 11:00:13 AM

Staff Report		
EQC meeting	Due	Mailed to EQC
Dec 15-16	11/10/11	11/28/11
Feb 16-17	1/12/2012	1/23/12
Apr 26-27*	3/15/2012	3/26/12
June 21-22	5/11/2012	5/28/12
Aug 23-24	7/13/2012	7/30/12
Oct 25-26	9/14/2012	10/1/12
Dec 13-14	11/2/2012	11/19/12

Maggie, is the OCO final/plain English review between the “staff report due” and “mailed to EQC” or does it happened before the “Staff Report Due”? In my experience, it is between the “staff report due” and “mailed to EQC”. Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Subject: RE: Schedule
Date: Tuesday, May 22, 2012 12:02:00 PM

Maggie, I never got an answer to this question.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2012 11:00 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: Schedule

Staff Report		
EQC meeting	Due	Mailed to EQC
Dec 15-16	11/10/11	11/28/11
Feb 16-17	1/12/2012	1/23/12
Apr 26-27*	3/15/2012	3/26/12
June 21-22	5/11/2012	5/28/12
Aug 23-24	7/13/2012	7/30/12
Oct 25-26	9/14/2012	10/1/12
Dec 13-14	11/2/2012	11/19/12

Maggie, is the OCO final/plain English review between the “staff report due” and “mailed to EQC” or does it happen before the “Staff Report Due”? In my experience, it is between the “staff report due” and “mailed to EQC”. The answer to this affects the schedule.

If it is the former, this is what the schedule would look like.

Approve Proposal	LA	1/9/13	
Archive Proposal, draft rules and supporting documents			
Send to OCO for final review	PE	1/10/13	1/10/13
OCO plain English review	LA	1/10/13	1/22/13
Address OCO comments	PE, RDT	1/22/13	1/25/13
Loop as needed	-		
SUBMIT EQC STAFF REPORT TO EQC			1/28/13
Archive Proposal, draft rules and supporting documents			
Develop EQC presentation	PE, RDT	1/28/13	2/5/13
OPTION Dry run presentation Make presentation adjustments Loop as needed END OPTION	RDT	2/6/13	
	PE	2/6/13	2/13/13

ATTEND EQC MEETING

2/21/13

Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Blueprint V1.0
Date: Tuesday, May 01, 2012 3:44:04 PM

NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V1.0 is for the EQC, am I supposed to be working on the public notice instead?

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Subject: RE: Blueprint V1.0
Date: Wednesday, May 02, 2012 1:20:18 PM

I did look at E-Cycles, and it confirms that what you created is the EQC staff report, not the proposal background.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2012 8:06 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: VICK Nicole R.
Subject: RE: Blueprint V1.0

You will need to complete the statement of need and fiscal impact statements sections and the attached announcement. See a sample of how it looks in the [E-Cycles rulemaking](#).

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2012 3:44 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: Blueprint V1.0

NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V1.0 is for the EQC, am I supposed to be working on the public notice instead?

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: FW: Blueprint V1.0
Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2012 1:46:22 PM

This was the issue, the word document you created was the EQC report, not the public notice report. I changed it based on what was included in the E-cycles public notice.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2012 1:20 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: VICK Nicole R.
Subject: RE: Blueprint V1.0

I did look at E-Cycles, and it confirms that what you created is the EQC staff report, not the proposal background.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2012 8:06 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: VICK Nicole R.
Subject: RE: Blueprint V1.0

You will need to complete the statement of need and fiscal impact statements sections and the attached announcement. See a sample of how it looks in the [E-Cycles rulemaking](#).

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2012 3:44 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: Blueprint V1.0

NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V1.0 is for the EQC, am I supposed to be working on the public notice instead?

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Automatic reply: NESHAP-NSPS-Proposal-V1.0
Date: Thursday, April 26, 2012 4:33:38 PM

I will be telecommuting on Thursday, April 26, 2012.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Scheduler in Blueprint
Date: Tuesday, April 24, 2012 3:31:15 PM

Maggie, why can't I schedule the EQC package. I would like to be able to determine the impact of delaying the public notice by a month. Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Blueprint 2.0
Date: Wednesday, April 18, 2012 9:26:44 AM

Content still missing. For instance, in C86 and P44, half my text is missing.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Changes to The Blueprint
Date: Wednesday, March 28, 2012 3:40:43 PM

Maggie, I made a few changes based on Andy's and Margaret's input. These changes are awaiting Tom's review. Tom also wants to know what time we are on at the EMT. Thanks. Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: Changes to The Blueprint
Date: Wednesday, March 28, 2012 4:49:57 PM

Maggie, the current version of the Blueprint (now V1.15) is ready to go to the EMT. Tom wants to meet early next week on how to present this to the EMT. I will send out a meeting request. Jerry

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2012 3:41 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: Changes to The Blueprint

Maggie, I made a few changes based on Andy's and Margaret's input. These changes are awaiting Tom's review. Tom also wants to know what time we are on at the EMT. Thanks. Jerry

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [GINSBURG Andy](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#); [THORNBERG Carol](#)
Subject: EMT Rulemaking Blueprint Document for Your Review
Date: Tuesday, March 20, 2012 1:17:11 PM
Attachments: [NESHP-NSPSblueprint V1.13j.pdf](#)

Hi Andy, hope all is well.

Attached, for your review, is the draft document that will go to the EMT in lieu of a Start Rulemaking Proposal. Tom has reviewed, and we worked with Maggie to put this together. We expect to present this to the EMT as a pilot, similar to the E-Cycles pilot. The draft document is generated by tabs in the blueprint workbook, one for “Considerations” and one for “Resources.” There are two other tabs “Schedule” and “Proposal” that will be developed once we get EMT approval to go forward.

After your review we will make edits and prepare for a dry run. The dry run will be an opportunity to discuss how best to present this to the EMT.

Since the document is a PDF, you can't do a red-line strikeout review in the document. Here are some options for your review:

- In the PDF highlight text and add comments using sticky notes. To do that, click on Comment in the upper right corner of the document, then click on either Sticky Note or Highlight Text.
- Copy text from the PDF, create a new Word document, paste the text into Word, use red-line strikeout in Word and send the Word document as a email attachment.
- Send written comments by email.

Part of the pilot has included working with Maggie on the blueprint format for review/editing and we are still working on the best way to do that.

Call me if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Jerry
(503) 229-6974

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#); [ROICK Tom](#)
Subject: Review of PDF
Date: Monday, March 19, 2012 4:46:38 PM

I have reviewed the pdf and had a few comments.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#); [ROICK Tom](#)
Subject: RE: Review of PDF
Date: Monday, March 19, 2012 4:49:48 PM

Why was the invoicing section in V1.13 different than in V1.12?

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 4:47 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie; ROICK Tom
Subject: Review of PDF

I have reviewed the pdf and had a few comments.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [ROIICK Tom](#)
Subject: RE: Review of PDF
Date: Tuesday, March 20, 2012 8:52:54 AM

I figured out how to comment, but not edit.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2012 8:00 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: ROIICK Tom
Subject: RE: Review of PDF

I took care of the invoicing and the paragraph spacing. What is your impression about editing in the pdf – thinking of it from Andy's perspective?

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 4:47 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie; ROIICK Tom
Subject: Review of PDF

I have reviewed the pdf and had a few comments.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [ROICK Tom](#)
Subject: RE: SRP?
Date: Monday, March 19, 2012 10:35:23 AM

Okay, I have finished making Tom's changes. Jerry

-----Original Message-----

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 9:16 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Cc: ROICK Tom
Subject: RE: SRP?

Maggie, I have finished making changes. Jerry

-----Original Message-----

From: ROICK Tom
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 8:40 AM
To: GINSBURG Andy; EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: THORNBURG Carol
Subject: RE: SRP?

Andy,

My apologies, I've held this up. Jerry was planning to have something for you by Friday. I didn't realize it was on your calendar this morning.

Jerry and I are working on the blueprint to get it formatted for your review. We were hoping to sit down with you on Tues to talk through it as an introduction (11-5pm blocked out for the review). Instead, we'll email it to you with introductory remarks in the email.

We'll get the blueprint to you by 1:00 pm Tues. Also, we can delay a few days if needed, based on your availability.

Thanks,
Tom

-----Original Message-----

From: GINSBURG Andy
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 6:06 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: ROICK Tom; THORNBURG Carol
Subject: SRP?

Jerry,

Am I supposed to have your SRP to review now?

Andy

Andy Ginsburg
Air Quality Administrator
Oregon Dept. Of Environmental Quality

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Cc: [ROICK Tom](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: RM: NESHAP - NSPS Q-time inquiry
Date: Monday, March 19, 2012 9:41:48 AM

I have charged #26489 for rulemaking and guidance.

From: VICK Nicole R.
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 8:11 AM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: ROICK Tom; VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: RM: NESHAP - NSPS Q-time inquiry

Good morning,

Regarding Q-time and tracking the time it takes for rulemakings, when you charge to Q-time #26489, has this only been for rulemaking only?

Do you plan on spending any time on other things not associated with the rulemaking, such as implementation, etc.?

Please advise – thanks!

Nicole

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Date: Friday, March 16, 2012 10:01:10 AM

Could you send what went to the EMT for E-cycles again?

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [ROICK Tom](#); [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Cc: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Subject: RE: RM-NESHAP_NPS: blueprint
Date: Friday, March 16, 2012 8:52:36 AM

He is scheduled to start reviewing it on Tues. at 1 pm. Maybe we can brief him then?

From: ROICK Tom
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2012 12:49 PM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie; EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: VICK Nicole R.
Subject: RE: RM-NESHAP_NPS: blueprint

Jerry,

I'm headed out for a meeting all afternoon, but will get you comments tomorrow am. A couple thoughts:

I think it would be a mistake to pitch it to Andy without some explanation, this being the first/pilot for AQ. We should schedule a meeting with Andy to talk through it. I've got a ½ hour on Andy's calendar Tues 4-4:30 pm, that may be our only opportunity without some delay.

If we could meet with Maggie/Nicole tomorrow afternoon (Friday) or Monday that would help. I expect to have more questions/comments that are in their area of blueprint expertise.

Thanks,
Tom

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 5:15 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: VICK Nicole R.; ROICK Tom
Subject: RM-NESHAP_NPS: blueprint

Hi Jerry,

We are now on version 1.1 of the [NESHP-NPSblueprint](#). The older version is under [Planning/1.a.Blueprint/Older version](#). I've responded to some of your comments about formatting and spell check on version 1.1 and have split some of the longer descriptions. I would be glad to give you a 10-minute refresher on working with text in Excel cells. Please address my comment on the Regulated Party on the Proposal worksheet. Let me know when Tom has finished his review and I'll load the latest version of the schedule.

Maggie Vandehey
ext. 6878

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Tom"s Changes
Date: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 10:53:54 AM

Tom wants the following changes:

- Rule caption: Updating Oregon Rules to Address Changes in Federal Air Quality Regulations
- Regulated parties: Move below "Summary of proposed rules"

Also, it is difficult for me to make the blueprint look good on the screen. I am assuming that is not my problem, it is either yours or Nicole's, or it is not really a problem.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: FW: Tom's Changes
Date: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 11:28:51 AM

Also, what am I going to be required to present at the EMT? Do I plan on presenting like I would for an SRP?

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 10:54 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject: Tom's Changes

Tom wants the following changes:

- Rule caption: Updating Oregon Rules to Address Changes in Federal Air Quality Regulations
- Regulated parties: Move below "Summary of proposed rules"

Also, it is difficult for me to make the blueprint look good on the screen. I am assuming that is not my problem, it is either yours or Nicole's, or it is not really a problem.

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: Accepted: RM_FedAQReq: Getting started on Considerations and Resources
Start: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 2:00:00 PM
End: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 3:00:00 PM
Location: Maggie"s Office

From: [EBERSOLE Gerald](#)
To: [VICK Nicole R.](#)
Cc: [VANDEHEY Maggie](#)
Subject: RE: AQ schedule
Date: Friday, February 10, 2012 11:55:53 AM

When will I have access to the Blueprint?

From: VICK Nicole R.
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 3:21 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Cc: THORNBURG Carol
Subject: FW: AQ schedule

Thank you, Jerry! I appreciate it.

Regarding option 1, you have 02/23 down for an EMT meeting. I don't see there is one scheduled for that day. The next EMT would be on 03/08 - unless there's something I'm missing? Also on option 1 is an EQC meeting scheduled for 10/18 – this is actually on 10/25 and 10/26. For reference, here is a link to the EQC and EMT meetings with dates:

<http://deq05/intranet/working/rulemaking/index.htm> (let me know if you have any questions.)

When you get time perhaps later today or next week, you and Carol may need to sit down together in case some of these dates coincide with other things on Andy's schedule. I will let you both schedule and handle that though.

Thanks to both!

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 3:10 PM
To: VICK Nicole R.
Subject: RE: AQ schedule

From: VICK Nicole R.
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 2:20 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: RE: AQ schedule

Yes, but since Carol and Andy are not familiar with that, I'm playing it safe and think it's best to cover our bases here. That schedule still needs to be reviewed to ensure all of the SIP items are included. Plus, the summertime = vacation time.

From: EBERSOLE Gerald
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 2:18 PM
To: VICK Nicole R.
Subject: RE: AQ schedule

I thought I was supposed to use the Blueprint Scheduler?

From: VICK Nicole R.
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 2:16 PM
To: EBERSOLE Gerald
Subject: AQ schedule

Hi, Jerry-

I wanted to check in with you on your rulemaking. Andy's schedule is booking up quick and I wanted to be sure to get you scheduled in for your dry runs and review rounds.

Would you mind creating your schedule and saving it [here](#) please?

Here is the latest version of the schedule template:

[G:\AQ_Administrator\AQ_Rule_Activity\Templates \(Reports & Forms\)\worksheetAQRulemakingSchedule_template.xls](G:\AQ_Administrator\AQ_Rule_Activity\Templates (Reports & Forms)\worksheetAQRulemakingSchedule_template.xls)

Once you have saved this file, would you please send it to Carol and I? Even though we are going to use your rulemaking as a pilot, we will stray a little by creating this schedule. I'm playing it safe here and asking you to do this to guarantee your spots with Andy and keep the timeline smooth.

Thank you,
Nicole