



Patty Senecal

Director, Southern California Region

March 15, 2023

Mike Morris
Manager, Planning and Rules
South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Via e-mail at: mmorris@aqmd.gov

Re: SCAQMD Proposed Amended Rule 1178, Further Reductions of VOC Emissions from Storage Tanks at Petroleum Facilities, and Proposed Amended Rule 463, Organic Liquid Storage – WSPA Comments on Rulemaking Process and Preliminary Draft Rule Language

Dear Mr. Morris,

Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA) appreciates the opportunity to participate in the Working Group Meetings (WGMs) for South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD or District) Proposed Amended Rule 1178, Further Reductions of VOC Emissions from Storage Tanks at Petroleum Facilities (PAR 1178). WSPA is a non-profit trade association representing companies that explore for, produce, refine, transport, and market petroleum, petroleum products, natural gas, renewable fuels, and other energy supplies in five western states including California. WSPA has been an active participant in air quality planning issues for over 30 years. WSPA-member companies operate petroleum refineries and other facilities in the South Coast Air Basin that will be impacted by PAR 1178 and Proposed Amended Rule 463 (PAR 463), Organic Liquid Storage.

The California Health & Safety Code (HSC) requires the District, in adopting any Best Available Retrofit Control Technology (BARCT) standard, to ensure the standard is technologically feasible, and take into account “environmental, energy, and economic impacts” and to assess the cost-effectiveness of the proposed control options.¹ Cost-effectiveness is defined as the cost, in dollars, of the control alternative, divided by the emission reduction benefits, in tons, of the control alternative.² If the cost per ton of emissions reduced is less than the established cost-effectiveness threshold, then the control method is considered to be cost-effective. Cost-effectiveness evaluations need to consider both capital costs (e.g., equipment procurement, shipping, engineering, construction, and installation) and operating (including expenditures associated with utilities, labor, and replacement) costs. Currently, the District is applying a cost-effectiveness threshold of \$36,000 per ton of VOC emissions reduced, consistent with the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (2022 AQMP).³

As discussed in previous comment letters, the cost-effectiveness analysis presented is incomplete. In estimating costs for doming of external floating roof tanks, the District has not included potential operation and maintenance (O&M) costs. When O&M costs are included, the

¹ California Health & Safety Code §40406, 40440, 40920.6.

² California Health & Safety Code §40920.6.

³ SCAQMD Draft Final 2022 Air Quality Management Plan. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan>.

doming of crude oil tanks exceeds the cost effectiveness threshold.^{4,5} Additionally, SCAQMD has significantly overstated the potential emission reductions for doming of external floating roof crude oil tanks by assuming an RVP of 8.19 psi across all tanks modeled. WSPA believes Staff needs to consider RVP as a parameter in establishing appropriate classes and categories for the BARCT assessment and revise the emissions modeling to obtain more realistic emissions estimates.

WSPA understands from the March 17, 2023 Stationary Source Meeting presentation that Staff is now proposing a bifurcation of PAR 1178 to address EPA concerns separately from other updates related to the BARCT analysis.⁶ WSPA agrees that there are a number of outstanding issues with the BARCT analysis that need to be resolved which will require additional stakeholder engagement. For this reason, WSPA supports the District's proposal to bifurcate the proposed rule.

On February 17, 2023, SCAQMD released new preliminary draft rule language for PAR 1178 and PAR 463.^{7,8} WSPA offers the following comments.

- 1. SCAQMD has held no additional WGMs since its release of PAR 1178 rule language. The District has held no working group meetings for PAR 463 since opening the rule for amendment. SCAQMD has stated that they are adding rule language to PAR 463 and PAR 1178 to address the EPA disapproval of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Oil and Gas Regulation. WSPA agrees that SCAQMD needs to bifurcate the rule so CARB requirements can be addressed in a timely manner. This will also allow additional time to ensure proper analysis and provide an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the unsettled portions of the draft rule language.**

SCAQMD held seven working group meetings during the PAR 1178 rulemaking process, with the most recent meeting held on January 5, 2023. SCAQMD has held no working group meetings for PAR 463.

Since the last PAR 1178 working group meeting held on January 5th, SCAQMD has released the following⁹:

- January 11, 2023 – PAR 1178 Initial Preliminary Draft Rule Language
- February 9, 2023 – PAR 463 Initial Preliminary Draft Rule Language
- February 9, 2023 – Updated PAR 1178 Initial Preliminary Draft Rule Language
- February 17, 2023 – PAR 1178 Preliminary Draft Rule Language
- February 17, 2023 – PAR 463 Preliminary Draft Rule Language
- February 17, 2023 – PAR 463/1178 Preliminary Draft Staff Report

A public workshop was held for both rulemakings on March 1, 2023. It is highly unusual for the District to release draft rule language with no opportunity for stakeholder discussion at a

⁴ WSPA Comment Letter dated January 19, 2023. Available in PAR 1178 Preliminary Draft Staff Report at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/Proposed-Rules/1178/par-1178-preliminary-draft-staff-report.pdf?sfvrsn=6>.

⁵ WSPA Comment Letter dated March 1, 2023.

⁶ SCAQMD Stationary Source Committee presentation, March 17, 2023. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/Agendas/ssc/ssc-agenda-3-17-2023.pdf?sfvrsn=10>.

⁷ PAR1178: Preliminary Draft Rule Language. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/Proposed-Rules/1178/par-1178-preliminary-draft-rule-language.pdf?sfvrsn=6/>

⁸ PAR 463: Preliminary Draft Rule Language. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/Proposed-Rules/1178/par-463-preliminary-draft-rule-language.pdf?sfvrsn=6>.

⁹ PAR 1178 and PAR 463 Rulemaking Documents. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/rules/scaqmd-rule-book/proposed-rules/rule-1178/>

working group meeting. In this case, there have been significant changes in each of the draft rule language documents since the last WGM, and it has been difficult to fully review and understand the impacts of these changes. Similarly, while the District presented their incremental cost effectiveness analysis in the Preliminary Draft Staff Report (PDSR), there has been no opportunity for stakeholders to review and comment on this analysis in a working group meeting.

While the District has stated that they are open to receiving information on such items as O&M costs and timeline for inspections, SCAQMD has not conducted an organized survey to request such information from facilities subject to these rules.

SCAQMD has stated that they are adding rule language to PAR 463 and PAR 1178 to address the EPA disapproval of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Oil and Gas Regulation. CARB has requested that the changes impacting the EPA disapproval be in place by May 2023 so that they can meet their timeline. The proposed updates to address EPA disapproval are not applicable to petroleum refinery operations and address VOC emissions in the upstream oil and natural gas industry. The current rulemaking provides a sense of urgency that is more focused on completing the rulemaking process based on CARB's timeline than providing an appropriately analyzed and factually supported rule with stakeholder input. SCAQMD needs to bifurcate the rule such that CARB's concerns can be addressed on the appropriate timeline. This would also allow stakeholders time to fully understand the impacts of the rule language and the ability to comment on appropriate changes, and for the District to make adjustments as necessary.

2. The District has not completed all of the cost-effectiveness analyses required under the California Health and Safety Code. Incremental cost-effectiveness of each progressively more stringent control option must be analyzed and compared to the cost-effectiveness threshold.

HSC Section 40920.6 prescribes two different cost-effectiveness analyses for BARCT rules¹⁰:

- 40920.6(a)(2): "Review the information developed to assess the cost-effectiveness of the potential control option. For purposes of this paragraph, "cost-effectiveness" means the cost, in dollars, of the potential control option divided by emission reduction potential, in tons, of the potential control option."; and
- 40920.6(a)(3): "Calculate the incremental cost-effectiveness for the potential control options identified in paragraph (1). To determine the incremental cost-effectiveness under this paragraph, the district shall calculate the difference in the dollar costs divided by the difference in the emission reduction potentials between each progressively more stringent potential control option as compared to the next less expensive control option."

In the Public Workshop held on March 1, 2023, the District presented estimated emission reductions from each proposed BARCT requirement.¹¹ Proposed requirements include:

- Weekly OGI inspections

¹⁰ California Health and Safety Code 40920.6.

¹¹ PAR 1178 Public Workshop. Available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/Proposed-Rules/1178/pars-463-1178_public-workshop.pdf?sfvrsn=6.

- Doming for crude oil tanks
- 98% emission control for fixed roof tanks
- Secondary seals for internal floating roof tanks
- More stringent gap requirement

The District has not performed an incremental cost effectiveness analysis that evaluates each of the above control technologies against the other. Weekly OGI inspections for various types of tanks, including those that are <0.1 psi total vapor pressure, should be evaluated on an incremental basis to understand the incremental cost effectiveness of each control option. An incremental analysis on OGI inspections should be performed as follows:

1. Weekly OGI inspections for all tanks including those with less than 0.1 psia TVP;
2. Weekly OGI inspections for internal floating roof tanks greater than 0.1 psia TVP;
3. Weekly OGI inspections for domed external floating roof tanks greater than 0.1 psia TVP;
4. Weekly OGI inspections for external floating roof tanks greater than 0.1 psia TVP;
5. Weekly OGI inspections for fixed roof tanks greater than 0.1 psia TVP

Further incremental analysis should be performed to understand how the cost-effectiveness of the above OGI inspections and other proposed requirements compare, including:

6. More stringent gap requirements;
7. Secondary seals for internal floating roof tanks greater than 0.1 psia TVP; and
8. Doming for tanks storing material greater than 3 psia TVP.

Such incremental cost-effectiveness analyses are necessary to evaluate the cost per emission reduction for each progressively more stringent control option as compared to the next less expensive control option. Since the District is required to perform both cost-effectiveness evaluations to determine a BARCT standard, the District must include both analyses in its evaluation of proposed BARCT limits.

3. PAR 1178(b), Applicability:

The proposed rule language for the applicability section would remove the reference to true vapor pressure of organic liquids in storage tanks. Removal of this reference would result in tanks that were previously exempt from the rule (e.g., diesel or jet fuel storage tanks) becoming subject to the rule. SCAQMD has provided no technical basis for such a scope change. Absent this, the reference to true vapor pressure requirements should be re-added to the proposed rule.

The current rule language states that the rule applies to storage tanks used to store organic liquids with a true vapor pressure greater than 5 mm Hg (0.1 psi) absolute under actual storage conditions. The applicability section in the proposed rule language removes the reference to the true vapor pressure of the organic liquid stored. Removal of this reference would cause tanks that were previously exempt from the rule, such as diesel or jet fuel storage tanks, becoming subject to the rule. SCAQMD has provided no technical basis for such a change, nor have they presented stakeholders with impacts or costs. The Preliminary Draft Staff Report also does not describe this change in the section that discusses updates made to the applicability language. Since SCAQMD has provided no information demonstrating that organic liquids with a true vapor pressure less than 5 mm Hg have the potential to cause

considerable emissions, WSPA recommends that the PAR 1178 Applicability section be updated as follows:

(b) Applicability

The rule applies to all aboveground Storage Tanks that have capacity equal to or greater than 75,000 liters (19,815 gallons), are used to store Organic Liquids with a true vapor pressure greater than 5 mm Hg (0.1 psi) absolute under actual storage conditions and are located at any Petroleum Facility that emits more than 40,000 pounds (20 tons) per year of VOC as reported in the Annual Emissions Report pursuant to Rule 301 - Permit Fees in any emission inventory year starting with the Emission Inventory Year 2000. This rule also applies to all aboveground Storage Tanks with Potential for VOC Emissions of 6 tons per year or greater used in Crude Oil Production.

4. PAR 1178(c), Definitions.

The District should update the definition of Emission Inventory Year to align with the District's Annual Emissions Reporting (AER) program requirements. Additionally, WSPA recommends an exemption from OGI inspections for Out of Service tanks and is therefore proposing a new definition be added for Out of Service.

(c)(7): Emission Inventory Year

Facilities within the SCAQMD are required to report emissions under the Annual Emissions Reporting (AER) Program. This program requires reporting based on a calendar year (referred to as "Data Year").¹² The definition of Emission Inventory Year should be updated to be consistent with the AER requirements.

WSPA recommends that the definition of Emission Inventory Year be updated as follows:

EMISSION INVENTORY YEAR is the annual emission-reporting period from January 1 – December 31 beginning from July 1 of the previous year through June 30 December 31 of a given year. For example, Emission Inventory Year 2000 covers the period from July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000.

(c): Out of Service

WSPA is proposing a new exemption from OGI inspections for tanks that are out of service. WSPA is therefore proposing a new definition be added to Section (c). The suggested definition is presented below:

[New Section]

OUT OF SERVICE means the tank has lost suction, has met the requirements of Rule 1149, and is open to the atmosphere.

5. PAR 1178(d), Requirements:

¹² SCAQMD Annual Emission Reporting Overview. Available at: <https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/compliance/annual-emission-reporting>.

SCAQMD is proposing more stringent rim seal gap requirements and more stringent control efficiency for emission control systems. Staff have not performed the analyses required by the California Health and Safety Code to demonstrate that the proposed requirements are both technically feasible and cost effective. Further, the District is taking credit for emission reductions even though they state that there are no costs associated with certain proposed requirements. If the tanks already meet the proposed requirements, as asserted in the PDSR, then there would be no creditable reductions available.

(d)(1)(C): Rim Seal Requirements

SCAQMD has proposed modifying the gap specifications in section (d)(1)(C)(iii). Staff noted that they examined gap measurement inspection reports of a “statistically significant percentage” of tanks and found that all tanks reviewed would be in compliance with more stringent gap requirements.¹³ Because the 10% of tanks reviewed were found to be in compliance with the proposed requirement, SCAQMD reports it did not perform a cost-effectiveness analysis for the proposed change.

The California Health and Safety Code (HSC) states¹⁴:

(a) Prior to adopting rules or regulations to meet the requirement for best available retrofit control technology pursuant to Sections 40918, 40919, 40920, and 40920.5, or for a feasible measure pursuant to Section 40914, districts shall, in addition to other requirements of this division, do all of the following:

(1) Identify one or more potential control options which achieves the emission reduction objectives for the regulation.

(2) Review the information developed to assess the cost-effectiveness of the potential control option. For purposes of this paragraph, “cost-effectiveness” means the cost, in dollars, of the potential control option divided by emission reduction potential, in tons, of the potential control option.

The District has identified a potential control option. However, Staff have not performed the stringent analysis required by the HSC to ensure that the control is both technically feasible and cost-effective. Relying on results from tank inspections on only 10% of tanks, dismisses the possibility that a significant percentage of tanks may not be able to comply with the revised limits. Rim seals on existing tanks were designed and engineered to meet the gap specifications in the current rule. Because tanks are not round, if a facility adjusts the rim seal gap on one section of a tank, it could affect the rim seal gap at other parts of the tank. Thus, changing the gap specifications as proposed could potentially result in a refinery being required to completely reengineer both the floating roof and its seal.

Such a proposal would require a complete BARCT analysis, including evaluation of technical feasibility, potential compliance costs, and potential emission reductions benefits. To our knowledge, SCAQMD has not performed an evaluation on the technical feasibility or potential

¹³ PAR 1178 Working Group Meeting #5. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/Proposed-Rules/1178/par1178-wgm5-final.pdf?sfvrsn=12>.

¹⁴ California Health and Safety Code §40920.6. Available at: <https://codes.findlaw.com/ca/health-and-safety-code/hsc-sect-40920-6/>.

compliance cost. Interestingly, even though the District states that all tanks already meet the revised gap requirement, they are still taking credit for reductions in the amount of 0.01 tons VOC per day.¹⁵ If all tanks are meeting the proposed requirement, which has not been shown, then there would be no reductions expected. WSPA recommends that SCAQMD remove the proposed changes to section (d)(1)(C).

(d)(4)(A)(i): Fixed Roof Tanks

SCAQMD has proposed that Fixed Roof Tank emissions be vented to a Fuel Gas System or an Emissions Control System with an overall control efficiency of 98%. The control efficiency in the current rule is 95%. In the Preliminary Draft Staff Report, SCAQMD notes that the most common type of vapor recovery system used on fixed roof tanks are combustion systems, with one supplier guaranteeing 98% control efficiency on such systems.¹⁶ Adsorption systems have higher capital costs and are less desirable for tanks, and the same supplier guaranteed 95% control efficiency for such systems.¹⁷ The District reviewed four initial performance tests, which all showed greater than 99% control efficiency.¹⁸ The District has not defined the number of vapor recovery systems in the regulated community, nor have they presented information that supports their claim that existing operating emission control systems already meet the proposed control efficiency.¹⁹ Current permits are issued based on a 95% control efficiency. If the District intends to update the control efficiency requirement, they should provide further information to support the assertion that this requirement can be met by all existing fixed roof tanks with vapor recovery systems. If the District is unable to provide technical evidence to support their assertion, such a rule change would require a complete BARCT analysis, including evaluation of technical feasibility and potential compliance costs.

Furthermore, it is unclear why the District is claiming 0.02 tons per day of VOC emission reductions from this proposed change. If the existing emission control systems already meet the proposed control efficiency, as asserted in the PDSR, then there would be no creditable reductions available.

WSPA recommends that the language revert back to the current rule language:

The tank emissions are vented to an emission control system with an overall control efficiency of at least 95% by weight or the tank emissions are vented to a fuel gas system.

6. PAR 1178(f), Inspection and Monitoring requirements:

Section (f)(4) proposes requirements for Optical Gas Imaging (OGI) inspections and requires that a demonstration of compliance be made within 24 hours of detection of visible vapors. The proposed rule further states that if compliance with applicable requirements cannot be demonstrated or is not determined, within 24 hours, the Storage Tank is deemed non-compliant. Some tanks may show evidence of vapors

¹⁵ SCAQMD PAR 1178 Working Group Meeting #5. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/Proposed-Rules/1178/par1178-wgm5-final.pdf?sfvrsn=12>.

¹⁶ SCAQMD Preliminary Draft Staff Report. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/Proposed-Rules/1178/par-1178-preliminary-draft-staff-report.pdf?sfvrsn=6>.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ SCAQMD PAR 1178 Working Group Meeting #7 Presentation. Available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/Proposed-Rules/1178/par-1178_wgm7_fin.pdf?sfvrsn=6.

during an OGI inspection, even when the tank is operating in compliance with rule requirements. The statement regarding non-compliance should therefore be stricken from the proposed rule language. Additionally, if a tank is found to have visible vapors, but is operating in compliance, no repairs or adjustments would be made. However, this same result would be expected during the next inspection. A facility would be forced to monitor, assess compliance, and monitor again in an endless cycle. A timeline should be added for tanks that are already demonstrated to be in compliance to break the cycle of re-inspecting every time visible vapors are detected.

Section (f)(4) sets forth the requirements for Optical Gas Imaging (OGI) Inspections. Section (f)(4)(C) requires that the Tank Farm Inspection be conducted at least every 7 calendar days since the previous inspection. This requirement will cause issues in planning, as the facilities will need to bring the inspection forward a day each time there is a holiday. WSPA recommends that the frequency be updated to once each calendar week.

Section (f)(4)(E) states that demonstrations of compliance with Section (d) requirements must be made within 24 hours. 24 hours is an extremely short timeframe in which to access the tank and perform an inspection. Gap measurements must be performed inside a tank. A facility would need to quiet the tank prior to entering to verify compliance. This can be difficult on a tank under high use. Three (3) days is a more reasonable time schedule to demonstrate compliance. Additionally, the rule language should specify the methodology for determining compliance with Section (d) requirements.

More importantly, some tanks may show evidence of visible vapors during an OGI inspection, even when the tank is operating in compliance with rule requirements. If a tank is found to have visible vapors, but is operating in compliance, no repairs or adjustments would be made. However, this same result could be expected during the next OGI inspection. A facility could be forced to monitor, assess compliance, and monitor again in an endless cycle. A timeline should be added for tanks that are already demonstrated to be in compliance to break the cycle of re-inspecting every time evidence of vapors is found.

Finally, the presence of visible vapors does not necessarily indicate that a tank is not in compliance. The rule provides limits on gap length and cumulative length. It is understood that there are working and breathing losses from these tanks. Section (d)(1)(D) states:

(d)(1)(D) ...Rim Seal Systems are not required to be free of Visible Vapors during a Component Inspection.

The statement regarding non-compliance in (f)(4) should therefore be stricken from the proposed rule language.

WSPA recommends the proposed language be updated as follows:

*(f)(4) Optical Gas Imaging Instrument (OGI) Inspections
Effective January 1, 2024, the owner or operator shall demonstrate compliance with subparagraphs (d)(1)(D), (d)(2)(C), (d)(3)(C) and (d)(4)(C), by conducting OGI inspections in accordance with the following requirements:*

- (A) Inspections shall be conducted by a person who has completed a manufacturer's certification or training program for the OGI device used to conduct the inspection.
- (B) The person conducting the inspection shall operate and maintain the OGI device in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications and recommendations.
- (C) Tank Farm Inspections shall be conducted at least ~~every 7 calendar days since the last Tank Farm Inspection was conducted~~ once per week.
- (D) Component Inspections shall be conducted for floating roof tanks according to the following schedules:
 - (i) In the 3rd month after an inspection required by paragraph (f)(1) for external floating roof tanks.
 - (ii) Semi-annually for domed External Floating Roof Tanks and Internal Floating Roof Tanks.
- (E) Demonstration of compliance with subparagraphs (d)(1)(B), (d)(1)(C), clause (d)(4)(A)(ii)-(iii) or (d)(4)(A)(v), shall be made *using the methodology specified in (f)(1), (f)(2), or (f)(3), as applicable, within 24 hours 3 days* from when Visible Vapors were detected. ~~If compliance with applicable requirements cannot be demonstrated or is not determined, within 24 hours, the Storage Tank is non-compliant. If an inspected tank is demonstrated to be in compliance, another demonstration of compliance is not required unless evidence of Visible Vapors is found and 3 months have elapsed since the previous demonstration of compliance.~~

7. PAR 1178(g), Maintenance Requirements

WSPA recommends that the proposed rule language be updated to allow a facility 3 days to repair a tank instead of 72 hours. This update would make the language consistent with the requirements of Rules 1173 and 1176.

PAR 1178(g) proposes new maintenance requirements in response to deficiencies found during inspections. WSPA recommends that SCAQMD update the allowable timeframe for repairs to 3 calendar days to be consistent with Rules 1173 and 1176. WSPA proposes language be updated as follows:

- (g) *The owner or operator shall repair, or replace any materials or components, including but not limited to, piping, valves, vents, seals, gaskets, or covers of Roof Openings or seals that do not meet all the requirements of this rule before filling or refilling an emptied and degassed storage tank, or within ~~72 hours~~ 3 calendar days after an inspection, including one conducted by the owner or operator or the contracted third-party as specified in subdivision (f).*

8. PAR 1178(h), Record Keeping and Reporting Requirements

The presence of visible vapors is not necessarily indicative of a tank being out of compliance. Therefore, a facility should not be required to notify the Executive Officer

each time visible vapors are detected. A record of such detections will be maintained on site in accordance with the rule. Additionally, SCAQMD is proposing video recordings of the OGI inspections. It is unclear how the video capture will contribute to rule compliance. WSPA recommends that this requirement be removed from the rule language.

For inspections required by subparagraph (f)(4), the proposed rule language requires that all visible vapors be reported to the Executive Officer within 8 hours of detection. As discussed in Comment 5, the presence of visible vapors is not necessarily indicative of a tank being out of compliance. A facility should not be required to notify the Executive Officer of the presence of visible vapors unless a tank is found to be non-compliant. Additionally, a facility is required to maintain records of visible vapors under Section (h)(2)(B), so there will be a record to refer back to as needed.

SCAQMD is requiring that records of leaks identified with an OGI device include a digital recording of the leak for a minimum of 5 seconds. It is unclear how this video capture will contribute to compliance. WSPA recommends this requirement be removed from the rule language.

WSPA recommends the proposed language be updated as follows:

(h) Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements

(1) ...

(2) For OGI inspections required by subparagraph (f)(4), the owner or operator shall:

~~*(A) Report all Visible Vapors to the Executive Officer by phone (1-800-CUTSMOG or 1-800-288-7664) within 8 hours of detection.*~~

(B) Keep records of Component Inspections, including tank identification, date of inspection and findings. Findings shall include identification of Storage Tanks from which Visible Vapors were identified, any determinations made pursuant to subparagraph (f)(4)(E), and corrective measures taken, if applicable.

(C) Keep records Visible Vapors detected during a Tank Farm Inspection, including tank identification, date of inspection, and findings. Findings shall include identification of tanks from which Visible Vapors were identified, any determinations made pursuant to subparagraph (f)(4)(E), and corrective measures taken, if applicable.

~~*(D) Record all Visible Vapors from tanks for a minimum of 5 seconds. Digital recordings shall be accurately time-stamped and kept on-site for a minimum of 2 years to be made available to the Executive Officer upon request.*~~

9. PAR 1178(j), Exemptions

The District has not provided a technical basis for expanding the scope of Rule 1178 to tanks with a true vapor pressure less than or equal to 5 mm Hg, nor has the District assessed the impacts for such inclusion. These tanks should continue to be exempt

from all rule requirements. Separately, tanks that are out of service should be exempt from the requirements of OGI inspections.

As discussed in Comment 2, the District has provided no technical basis for inclusion of tanks with a true vapor pressure less than or equal to 5 mm Hg in the rule, nor have they provided any analysis of the impact to the regulated community from this inclusion. Therefore, WSPA recommends that the rule language continue to exempt storage tanks with a true vapor pressure less than or equal to 5 mm Hg.

WSPA recommends the proposed language be updated as follows:

(j)(2) Storage Tanks that do not have a Potential For VOC Emissions of 6 tons per year or greater used in Oil Production and are storing Organic Liquid ~~with a True Vapor Pressure equal to or less than 5 mm Hg (0.1 psi) absolute under actual storage conditions~~ are exempt from the requirements of this rule, with the exception of the requirements specified in paragraphs (f)(4), (h)(1) and (h)(6), provided the owner or operator demonstrates that the Organic Liquid stored has a True Vapor Pressure of 5 mm Hg (0.1 psi) absolute or less under actual storage conditions semi-annually.

PAR 1178(j) should also include an exemption from OGI inspections for tanks that are out of service.

WSPA recommends the PAR1178 language be updated to include the following:

[New Section]

(j)(6) An owner or operator of a Fixed Roof Tank, an External Floating Roof Tank, an Internal Floating Roof Tank, and Domed External Floating Roof Tank shall be exempt from OGI inspections required by subparagraph (f)(4) if the subject tank is Out of Service.

WSPA appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments related to PAR 1178. As outlined above, there are multiple items requiring further analysis and thorough discussion prior to rule adoption. The District and stakeholders need more time to ensure the necessary changes are incorporated into the rule. The District should bifurcate the rule such that the language necessary to address the EPA disapproval of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Oil and Gas Regulation is incorporated in a timely manner, while still allowing the necessary time for stakeholder comment, further analysis, and revisions as appropriate.

We look forward to continued discussion of this important rulemaking. If you have any questions, please contact me at (310) 808-2144 or via e-mail at psenecal@wspa.org.

Sincerely,



Cc: Wayne Natri, SCAQMD
Sarah Rees, SCAQMD
Michael Krause, SCAQMD
Rodolfo Chacon, SCAQMD
Melissa Gamoning, SCAQMD
James McCreary, SCAQMD