From:	INAHARA Jill
To:	VANDEHEY Maggie
Subject:	RE: 340-216-8005 Tables
Date:	Thursday, May 22, 2014 11:28:22 AM

Statutory authority and statutes implemented?

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 11:24 AM
To: INAHARA Jill; GARTENBAUM Andrea
Subject: RE: 340-216-8005 Tables

Jill,

Thank you for looking at this and moving requirements to rule. If the tables are in one rule, we'll publish all three as one PDF. Without rule language, the SIP note is unnecessary for rule 8010. The rule still needs a lead in sentence about the tables.

Maggie Vandehey, EIM
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

The real voyage of discovery consists not in seeking out new landscapes, but in having new eyes.
ATTRIB. MARCEL PROUST, 1871-1922

From: INAHARA Jill
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 10:58 AM
To: VANDEHEY Maggie; GARTENBAUM Andrea
Subject: RE: 340-216-8005 Tables

Maggie,
Thanks for setting up the format for the division 216 tables. I talked with George Davis about this and we have decided to take all the text from the Division 216 tables and put it in the rules. OAR 340-216-8010 will only have 3 tables, Part A, B, and C. I have been working on them so you don't need to. Do I need the SIP note? I would like history for these tables so people can track when they get changed. Is that possible? This is very important because depending on the table in effect at the time, it will determine whether a source has been operating without a permit.
Thanks!
Jill

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 9:50 AM
To: INAHARA Jill; GARTENBAUM Andrea
Subject: FW: 340-216-8005 Tables

I forgot to mention that the rest of the rules would reference OAR 340-216-8004 when calling on ACDP tables.

From: VANDEHEY Maggie
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 9:43 AM
To: INAHARA Jill; GARTENBAUM Andrea
Subject: 340-216-8005 Tables

HI,

Please comment…

Here is a suggestions for the tables in division 216. It addresses the requirements included in the table, which is not a best practice. I've spent about 30 minutes on this and probably need another 30 if this is an agreeable direction. This would be the ideal rules and table if agreeable rather than the redline/strikethrough already in draft rule. Regardless, there are a few comments, would you address the comments?

Thank you,

Maggie