

**South Coast Air Quality Management District
Technology Advancement**

MEMORANDUM

DRAFT

DATE: June 13, 2008
TO: File
FROM: Marty Kay
CC: Howard Lange, Al Baez, Laki Tisopulos
SUBJECT: Rule 1110.2 Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes

Staff met with the Rule 1110.2 Implementation Committee on June 4, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. in Conference Room GB. The Implementation Committee was formed to assist engine operators in complying with new rule requirements adopted by the Board on February 1, 2008. A list of the committee members is attached. The meeting agenda and a list of attendees are also attached. Two people attended by phone: Chuck Smith, Waste Management and Zach Muepo, Sempra Utilities.

Laki Tisopulos welcomed the attendees and turned the meeting over to Marty Kay. Before starting into the agenda items, there were a few questions from the committee about procedural items. David Rothbart (LACSD) asked how the Implementation Committee was selected. Marty Kay responded that it includes organizations that expressed the most interest in and participated in formulation of the recently adopted rule amendment. Dan McGivney (EMWD) suggested that a list of issues and how they are resolved be maintained. Laki Tisopulos responded that there will be minutes of every meeting.

Quarterly Reports

Marty Kay explained that although several organizations have objected to the quarterly reports having to be signed by the responsible official in the case of a Title V facility, Title V does require that all reports required by AQMD rules be certified by the responsible official. Excerpts from a Title V permit (ID 000550, Section K, Item 25), Rule 3004 [paragraph (a)(12)] and AQMD's March 2005 draft Title V Technical Guidance Document (page 84), showing this requirement, were distributed. Vlad Kogan (OCSD) objected on the grounds that certified reports of deviations are already submitted semi-annually. Dan McGivney and Tom Fang objected in that the intent of Title V is to have federally required reports certified, not reports that are only required by a local rule. Barbara Baird said that Title V does require all reports, including those required only by local rules, to be certified. Zach Muepo gave examples of reports required by other rules that are not required to be certified. Laki Tisopulos said that staff would look at the certification requirement again.

David Rothbart asked what parameter deviations must be included in the quarterly reports. Marty Kay responded that deviations of parameters called out in the facility Inspection and Monitoring (I&M) Plan must be included.

Marty Kay said that there have been objections about the due date for the first quarterly report, April 15, coming up too fast after the rule was amended, and the District has decided to apply “enforcement discretion” in this regard.

Zach Muepo said that quarterly reports should not be required until an I&M plan is in place since there will be nothing to report. Marty Kay responded that there still may be something to report because some engine permits already require portable analyzer tests or other monitoring; and if there are no deviations, that should be reported. Zach said that test results obtained by an uncertified technician (i.e., who has not yet completed AQMD’s portable analyzer operator training program) pursuant to existing test requirements in permits should not be reported since the District normally does not recognize data obtained by an uncertified technician. Marty Kay responded that such results should be reported.

Compliance Guide

Marty Kay asked for comments about the Compliance Guide that had been distributed to engine operators. Vlad Kogan said that the Compliance Guide should have been reviewed by the Implementation Committee before being finalized. Marty Kay responded that the Compliance Guide was sent to the Committee for review and some comments were received and incorporated. Laki Tisopulos added that additional comments are still welcome, and a revised version can be released in the future.

Tom Fang asked whether the Compliance Guide added any requirements that are not in the rule. Laki Tisopulos responded that it should be consistent with the rule. Two Committee members said that they had not received copies of the Compliance Guide as released. Marty Kay responded that it will be emailed to all Committee members.

Portable Analyzer Protocol and Training

Marty Kay said that comments on the draft portable analyzer test protocol have been received from Tom Fang and Gregg Arney, and staff agrees with those comments with the exception of Tom’s comment that the protocol exceeds the rule requirements. Gregg added that he believes the protocol goes into too much detail and some of the terminology may be confusing for engine operation and maintenance staff.

Cher Snyder gave a status report on portable analyzer training. Training will basically be web-based and available to the public via AQMD’s web site. However, there will be a first phase of training that will be given face-to-face by AQMD staff. The purpose of this Phase I training is to insure that the web-based training is correctly designed for the audience that will be receiving the training. Availability of the Phase I training will begin in approximately mid-July, and a mailer will be sent out announcing it. The training web site will be initiated soon, starting with a fact sheet. Comments will be welcome. If there is sufficient interest, a group may be convened to help plan the training program. Staff has not yet decided whether or not to recommend that a fee be charged for the training.

Applications for Biogas Engine Permit Modifications

Charlie Tupac presented a status report on biogas engine permit modifications for allowance to use in excess of ten percent natural gas and for adding an efficiency correction factor (ECF) to the permit. Applications have been received from ten facilities for approximately 30 engines to allow greater than ten percent natural gas. These applications are in process, and it should be possible to issue the modified permits (where justified) by the end of July. There have so far been no applications to add ECFs.

Vlad Kogan said that he had been searching for a firm that can measure engine efficiency on a working engine using ASME method PTC-17 and has not been able to find one. Marty Kay advised that OCSD should work with E&C on this. David Rothbart asked

what if it is found that PTC-17 cannot be applied to a working engine. Marty Kay responded that AQMD would then have to allow an alternative method. Marty requested that if anyone finds a provider who can perform PTC-17 on a working engine to please share that information with the committee.

Inspection and Monitoring Plans

Vlad Kogan said that they shouldn't have to submit an I&M plan for their lean-burn engines that have a NOx monitor but not a CO monitor because they are already doing portable analyzer tests. Marty Kay said that doesn't excuse them from the I&M requirement, which applies to engines unless they have both a NOx and CO CEMS. Marty added that this is a clear rule requirement.

David Rothbart said that if an engine will be required to have a NOx and CO CEMS in the future, an I&M plan is not required. Marty Kay said the rule language is not completely clear on this, but after consulting with District Counsel and reviewing District intent from the staff report, it was decided that a future requirement wouldn't excuse an engine from the I&M plan. After all, some of the future CEMS won't be installed until 2011, and some monitoring is needed in the meantime.

David Rothbart said that it seemed improper to interpret rule language based on "intent". Marty Kay responded that this is frequently done. Zach Muepo noted that a presentation given by AQMD on "September 27" indicated that I&M plans would not be required for engines that will eventually be required to have NOx and CO CEMS. Marty Kay responded that a presentation would not override rule language and the staff report in determining staff's intent.

Dan McGivney asked whether emission checks not specifically required by the rule could be done by a non-certified technician. Marty Kay responded that he would check the rule language and respond to this at a future meeting.

Gregg Arney asked whether a "load surrogate" such as speed and manifold air pressure could be used for tests requiring certain loads if there is no direct indication of load. Marty Kay agreed that a valid load surrogate would be acceptable.

Gregg Arney asked what should be in the I&M plan regarding engine maintenance and whether "irrelevant" things such as oil changes can be left out. Marty Kay responded that the plan should include all aspects of the engine's normal maintenance schedule. Gregg asked whether the operator could be cited for deviating from this. Marty responded that inspectors would have to apply enforcement discretion. Zach Muepo commented that this is going too far. Laki Tisopulos said that operators should use judgment as to what is required to be in the plan and allow flexibility for deviations as needed.

Zach said that similar flexibility should apply to AFRCs that do not include O2 sensors but nonetheless function well. He said that AQMD engineers told him their AFRC was not adequate. Marty Kay responded that the rule allows an alternative AFRC but requires the operator to show that the system is equivalent to O2 feedback control.

An audience member asked whether there will be a guidance document to assist owners of only one or very few engines in developing their I&M plans. Marty Kay responded that the rule is very prescriptive on this point and no further guidance should be needed.

Gregg Arney asked whether the I&M plan would supersede permit requirements. Laki Tisopulos responded that it does not. Marty Kay added that they could also apply for a change of permit conditions if necessary.

Non-Resetable Fuel Meter

Marty Kay explained that USEPA had recently requested that a requirement for non-resettable fuel meters be added to the rule. However, Marty explained to USEPA why this requirement was not necessary, and they seemed to be satisfied.

Discussion

Chuck White asked when the biogas engine technology assessment will get started. Laki Tisopulos responded that a guidance committee will be convened in six to twelve months. Marty Kay said that one operator has expressed interest in demonstrating technology and asked that any other entity with a similar interest please contact him.

Marty announced that a standard source test protocol will be released soon, and operators will be able to fulfill the requirement for a source test protocol by simply submitting some engine-specific information and citing the standard protocol.

Two committee members said that the requirement to test at minimum and maximum loads is difficult to achieve in some cases. Marty Kay responded that the rule language only requires testing at loads that are “practically achievable”.

Ed Filadelfia asked whether any engine maintenance, such as an oil change, could be excluded from the requirement that no maintenance be performed within 40 operating hours or one week prior to a source test. Marty Kay said the I&M plan could identify which maintenance items do not affect emissions and which could affect emissions and should not be conducted immediately prior to a portable analyzer check or source test.

Laki Tisopulos said that the next meeting of the committee will take place in six to eight weeks, before August 1.

MK:AB:HL