UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Washington, D.C. 20460

JUN 13 1989

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Guidance on Limiting Potential to Emit in New Source Permitting

FROM: Terrell E. Hunt
Associate Enforcement Counsel
Air Enforcement Division
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Monitoring

John S. Seitz, Director
Stationary Source Compliance Division
Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards

TO: Addressees

This memorandum transmits the final guidance on conditions in construction permits which can legally limit a source's potential to emit to minor or de minimis levels. We received many helpful comments on the January 24, 1989 draft of this guidance, and have incorporated the comments into the final document wherever possible. A summary of the major changes which have been made to the guidance in response to these comments is provided below.

Several commenters noted that the draft guidance used the term "federally enforceable" to mean both federally enforceable as defined in the new source regulations (40 C.F.R. Sections 52.21(b) (17), 51.165(a) (1) (xiv), 51.166(b) (17)), and enforceable as a practical matter. We have tried to distinguish the places where each term should be used, explained the relationship between the two terms, and indicated that in order to properly restrict potential to emit, limitations must be both federally enforceable as defined in the regulations and practically enforceable.

Some commenters requested that the section on averaging times for production limits be more specific as to when it is appropriate to use limitations which exceed a one month time basis. We have tried to explain why it is not possible to develop generic criteria for making this distinction, and to indicate situations where exceptions to the policy that production and operation limitations not exceed one month may be warranted.

There were some requests for a section on enforcement. We have included a new Section VI which addresses this topic. We also received many good suggestions on the example permit limitations. The section on examples has been substantially reworked to reflect your comments.

Finally, we learned through the comments that in two specific circumstances, short term emission limits are the most useful and reasonable way to restrict and verify limits on potential to emit. These circumstances are: 1) when control equipment is installed but control equipment operating parameters are difficult to measure during enforcement inspections; and 2) in surface coating operations with numerous and unpredictable use of coatings containing varying VOC content, where add-on control equipment is not employed. Therefore, we have made a narrow exception to the flat prohibition on use of emission limits to restrict potential to emit for these specific circumstances, and only when certain additional conditions have been met.

Again, we appreciate the thoughtful comments we have received on this guidance. Please insert this document into your Clean Air Act Compliance/Enforcement Policy Compendium as Item Number H.3. If you have any questions, please contact Judith Katz in the Air Enforcement Division at FTS 382-2843, or Sally Farrell in the Stationary Source Compliance Division at FTS 382-2875.

Addressees:

Regional Counsels
Regions I-X

Regional Counsel Air Branch Chiefs
Regions I-X

Air Management Division Directors
Regions I, III, and IX

Air and Waste Management Division Director
Region II

Air, Pesticides, and Toxics Management Division Directors
Regions IV and VI

Air and Radiation Division Director
Region V

Air and Toxics Division Directors
Regions VII, VIII and X

Air Compliance Branch Chiefs
Regions I-X

New Source Review Contacts
Regions I-X

Alan Eckert
Associate General Counsel

Greg Foote, OGC
Gary McCutchen, NSRS, AQMD
David Solomon, NSRS, AQMD
Sally Farrell, SSCD
Judy Katz, AED

David Buente, Chief

Environmental Enforcement Section

DOJ

LIMITING POTENTIAL TO EMIT IN NEW SOURCE PERMITTING

JUNE 13, 1989

AIR ENFORCEMENT DIVISION
OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE MONITORING

STATIONARY SOURCE COMPLIANCE DIVISION
OFFICE OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING AND STANDARDS

Limiting Potential to Emit in New Source Permitting

I. Introduction

II. The Louisiana-Pacific Case

III. Types of Limitations that will Limit Potential to Emit

IV. Time Periods for Limiting Production and Operation

V. Sham Operational Limits

A. Permits with conditions that do not reflect a source's planned mode of operation are void ab initio and cannot act to shield the source from the requirement to undergo preconstruction review.

1. Sham permits are not allowed by 40 CFR 52.21(r) (4)

2. Sham permits are not allowed by the definition of potential to emit: 40 CFR 52.21(b) (4), 51.165(a) (1) (iii), 51.166(b) (4)

3. Sham permits are not allowed by the Clean Air Act

B. Guidelines for determining when minor source construction permits are shams.

1. Filing a PSD or nonattainment NSR application

2. Applications for funding

3. Reports on consumer demand and projected productions levels

4. Statements of authorized representatives of the source regarding plans for operation

VI. Enforcement Procedures

VII. Examples

VIII. Conclusion

Limiting Potential to Emit in New Source Permitting

I. Introduction

Whether a new source or modification is major and subject to new source review under Parts C and D of the Clean Air Act is dependent on whether that source or modification has or will have the potential to emit major or significant amounts of a regulated pollutant. Therefore, the definition of "potential to emit" under the new source regulations is extremely important in determining the applicability of new source review to a particular source. The federal regulations define "potential to emit" as:

> the maximum capacity of a stationary source to emit a pollutant under its physical and operational design. Any physical or operational limitation on the capacity of the source to emit a pollutant, including air pollution control equipment and restrictions on hours of operation or on the type or amount of fuel combusted, stored or processed, shall be treated as part of its design if the limitation or the effect it would have on emissions is federally enforceable.

40 C.F.R Sections 52.21(b) (4), 51.165(a) (1) (iii), 51.166(b) (4).

Permit limitations are very significant in determining whether a source is subject to major new source review. This is because they are the easiest and most common way for a source to obtain restrictions on its potential to emit. A permit does not

have to be a major source permit to legally restrict potential emissions. A minor source construction permit issued pursuant to a state program approved by EPA as meeting the requirements of 40 C.F.R. Section 51.160 is federally enforceable. In fact, any permit limitation can legally restrict potential to emit if it meets two criteria: 1) it is federally enforceable as defined by 40 C.F.R. Sections 52.21(b) (17), 51.165(a) (1) (xiv), 51.166(b) (17), i.e., contained in a permit issued pursuant to an EPA-approved permitting program or a permit directly issued by EPA, or has been submitted to EPA as a revision to a State Implementation Plan and approved as such by EPA; and 2) it is enforceable as a practical matter. The second criterion is an implied requirement of the first criterion. A permit requirement may purport to be federally enforceable, but, in reality cannot be federally enforceable if it cannot be enforced as a practical matter.

Non-permit limitations can also legally restrict potential to emit. These limitations include New Source Performance Standards codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 60 and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 61.

The appropriate means of restricting potential to emit through permit conditions has been an issue in recent enforcement cases. Through these cases and through guidance issued by EPA, the Agency has addressed three questions: what types of permit

limitations can legally limit potential to emit; whether long averaging times for production limitations are enforceable as a practical matter; and whether sources may limit potential to emit to minor source levels as a means of circumventing the preconstruction review requirements of major source review.

II. The Louisiana-Pacific Case

In United States v. Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, 682 F. Supp. 1122 (D. Colo. Oct. 30, 1987) and 682 F. Supp. 1141 (D. Colo. March 22, 1988), Judge Alfred Arraj discussed the type of permit restrictions which can be used to limit a source's potential to emit. The Judge concluded that:

> ... not all federally enforceable restrictions are properly considered in the calculation of a source's potential to emit. While restrictions on hours of operation and on the amount of materials combusted or produced are properly included, blanket restrictions on actual emissions are not.

682 F. Supp. at 1133.

The Court held that Louisiana-Pacific's permit conditions which limited carbon monoxide emissions to 78 tons per year and volatile organic compounds to 101.5 tons per year should not be considered in determining "potential to emit" because these blanket emission limits did not reflect the type of permit conditions which restricted operations or production such as limits on hours of operation, fuel consumption, or final product.

The Louisiana-Pacific court was guided in its reasoning by the D.C. Circuit's holding in Alabama Power v. Costle, 636 F. 2d 323 (D.C. Circuit 1979). Before Alabama Power, EPA regulations required potential to emit to be calculated according to a source's maximum uncontrolled emissions. In Alabama Power, the D. C. Circuit remanded those regulations to EPA with instructions that the Agency include the effect of in-place control equipment in defining potential to emit. EPA went beyond the minimum dictates of the D.C. Circuit in promulgating revised regulations in 1980 to include, in addition to control equipment, any federally enforceable physical or operational limitation. The Louisiana-Pacific court found that blanket limits on emissions did not fit within the concept of proper restrictions on potential to emit as set forth by Alabama Power.

Moreover, Judge Arraj found that:

> ...a fundamental distinction can be drawn between the federally enforceable limitations which are expressly included in the definition of potential to emit and (emission) limitations.... Restrictions on hours of operation or on the amount of material which may be combusted or produced ... are, relatively speaking, much easier to "federally enforce." Compliance with such conditions could be easily verified through the testimony of officers, all manner of internal correspondence and accounting, purchasing and production records. In contrast, compliance with blanket restrictions on actual emissions would be virtually impossible to verify or enforce.

Id. Thus, Judge Arraj found that blanket emission limits were not enforceable as a practical matter.

Finally, the Court reasoned that allowing blanket emission limitation to restrict potential to emit would violate the intent of Congress in establishing the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program.

III. Types of Limitations that will Restrict Potential to Emit

As an initial matter in this discussion, a few important terms should be defined. Emission limits are restrictions over a given period of time on the amount of a pollutant which may be emitted from a source into the outside air. Production limits are restrictions on the amount of final product which can be manufactured or otherwise produced at a source. Operational limits are all other restrictions on the manner in which a source is run, including hours of operation, amount of raw material consumed, fuel combusted, or conditions which specify that the source must install and maintain add-on controls that operate at a specified emission rate or efficiency. All production and operational limits except for hours of operation are limits on a source's capacity utilization. Potential emissions are defined as the product of a source's emission rate at maximum operating capacity, capacity utilization, and hours of operation.

To appropriately limit potential to emit consistent with the opinion in Louisiana-Pacific, all permits issued pursuant to 40 C.F.R. Sections 51.160, 51.166, 52.21 and 51.165 must contain a

production or operational limitation in addition to the emission limitation in cases where the emission limitation does not reflect the maximum emissions of the source operating at full design capacity without pollution control equipment. Restrictions on production or operation that will limit potential to emit include limitations on quantities of raw materials consumed, fuel combusted, hours of operation, or conditions which specify that the source must install and maintain controls that reduce emissions to a specified emission rate or to a specified efficiency level. Production and operational limits must be stated as conditions that can be enforced independently of one another. For example, restrictions on fuel which relates to both type and amount of fuel combusted should state each as an independent condition in the permit. This is necessary for purposes of practical enforcement so that, if one of the conditions is found to be difficult to monitor for any reason, the other may still be enforced.

When permits contain production or operational limits, they should also have recordkeeping requirements that allow a permitting agency to verify a source's compliance with its limits. For example, permits with limits on hours of operation or amount of final product should require an operating log to be kept in which the hours of operation and the amount of final product produced are recorded. These logs should be available

for inspection should staff of a permitting agency wish to check a source's compliance with the terms of its permit.

When permits require add-on controls operated at a specified efficiency level, permit writers should include, so that the operating efficiency condition is enforceable as a practical matter, those operating parameters and assumptions which the permitting agency depended upon to determine that the control equipment would have a given efficiency.

An emission limitation alone would limit potential to emit only when it reflects the absolute maximum that the source could emit without controls or other operational restrictions. When a permit contains no limits on capacity utilization or hours of operation, the potential to emit calculation should assume operation at maximum design or achievable capacity (whichever is higher) and continuous operation (8760 hours per year).

The particular circumstances of some individual sources make it difficult to state operating parameters for control equipment limits in a manner that is easily enforceable as a practical matter. Therefore, there are two exceptions to the absolute prohibition on using blanket emission limits to restrict potential to emit. If the permitting agency determines that setting operating parameters for control equipment is infeasible in a particular situation, a federally enforceable permit

containing short term emission limits (e.g. lbs per hour) would be sufficient to limit potential to emit, provided that such limits reflect the operation of the control equipment, and the permit includes requirements to install, maintain, and operate a continuous emission monitoring (CEM) system and to retain CEM data, and specifies that CEM data may be used to determine compliance with the emission limit.

Likewise, for volatile organic compound (VOC) surface coating operations where no add-on control is employed but emissions are restricted through limiting VOC contents and quantities of coatings used, emission limits may be used to restrict potential to emit under the following limited circumstances. If the permitting agency determines for a particular surface coating operation that operating and production parameters (e.g. gallons of coating, quantities produced) are not readily limited due to the wide variety of coatings and products and due to the unpredictable nature of the operation, emission limits coupled with a requirement to calculate daily emissions may be used to restrict potential to emit. The source must be required to keep the records necessary for this calculation, including daily quantities and the VOC content of each coating used. Emission limits may be used in this limited circumstance to restrict potential to emit since, in this case, emission limits are more easily enforceable than operating or production limits.

IV. Time Periods For Limiting Production and Operation

As discussed above, a limitation specifically recognized by the regulations as reducing potential to emit is a limitation on production or operation. However, for these limitations to be enforceable as a practical matter, the time over which they extend should be as short term as possible and should generally not exceed one month. This policy was explained in a March 13, 1987 memorandum from John Seitz to Bruce Miller, Region IV. The requirement for a monthly limit prevents the enforcing agency from having to wait for long periods of time to establish a continuing violation before initiating an enforcement action.

EPA recognizes that in some rare situations, it is not reasonable to hold a source to a one month limit. In these cases, a limit spanning a longer time is appropriate if it is a rolling limit. However, the limit should not exceed an annual limit rolled on a monthly basis. EPA cannot now set out all inclusive categories of sources where a production limit longer than a month will be acceptable because every situation that may arise in the future cannot now be anticipated. However, permits where longer rolling limits are used to restrict production should be issued only to sources with substantial and unpredictable annual variation in production, such as emergency

boilers. Rolling limits could be used as well for sources which shut down or curtail operation during part of a year on a regular seasonal cycle, but the permitting authority should first explore the possibility of imposing a month-by-month limit. For example, if a pulp drier is periodically shut down from December to April, the permit could contain a zero hours of operation limit for each of those months, and then the appropriate hourly operation limit for each of the remaining months. Under no circumstances would a production or operation limit expressed on a calendar year annual basis be considered capable of legally restricting potential to emit.

V. Sham Operational Limits

In the past year, several sources have obtained purportedly federally enforceable permits with operating restrictions limiting their potential to emit to minor or de minimis levels for the purpose of allowing them to commence construction prior to receipt of a major source permit. In such cases where EPA can demonstrate an intent to operate the source at major source levels, EPA considers the minor source construction permit void ab initio and will take appropriate enforcement action to prevent the source from constructing or operating without a major source permit.

The following example illustrates the kind of situation addressed in this section: An existing major stationary source proposes to add a 12.5 megawatt electric utility steam generating unit, and applies for a federally enforceable minor source permit which restricts operation at the unit to 240 hours per year. Because the project is designed as a baseload facility, EPA does not believe that the source intends to operate the facility for only 240 hours a year. Further investigation would probably uncover documentation of the source's intent to operate at higher levels than those for which it is permitted.

This situation raises the question of whether a source can lawfully bypass the preconstruction or premodification review requirements of Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and nonattainment New Source Review by committing to permit conditions which restrict production to a level at which the source does not intend to operate for any extensive time. If, after constructing and commencing operation, the source obtains a relaxation of its original permit conditions prior to exceeding them, does this constitute a violation of the preconstruction review requirements? This section discusses why it is improper to construct a source with a minor source permit when there is intent to operate as a major source, and provides guidelines for identifying these "sham" permits.

A. Permits with conditions that do not reflect a source's planned mode of operation are void ab initio and cannot act to shield the source from the requirement to undergo preconstruction review.

1. Sham permits are not allowed by 40 CFR Section 52.21(r) (4) Section

52.21(r) (4) states:

> At such time that a particular source or modification becomes a major stationary source or major modification solely by virtue of a relaxation in any enforceable limitation which was established after August 7, 1980 on the capacity of the source or modification otherwise to emit a pollutant, such as a restriction on hours of operation, then (PSD) shall apply to the source or modification as though construction had not yet commenced on the source or modification.

When a source that is minor because of operating restrictions in a construction permit later applies for a relaxation of that construction permit which would make the source major, Section 52.21(r) (4) prescribes the methodology for determining best available control technology (BACT). However, it does not foreclose EPA's ability, in addition to the retroactive application of BACT and other requirements of the PSD program, to pursue enforcement where the Agency believes that the initial minor source permit was a sham. EPA will limit its activity to requiring application of 40 CFR 52.21(r) (4) only for the cases where a source legitimately changes a project after finding that the operating restrictions which were taken in good faith cannot be complied with. Whether a source has acted in good faith is a factual question which is answered by available evidence in the particular case.

2. Sham permits are not allowed by the definition of potential to emit:

40 C.F.R. Sections 52.21(b) (4), 51.165(a) (1) (iii), 51.166(b) (4).

The definition of potential to emit enables sources to obtain federally enforceable permits with operational restrictions as a means of limiting emissions to minor source levels. However, implicit in the application of these limitations is the understanding that they comport with the true design and intended operation of the project.

3. Sham permits are not allowed by the Clean Air Act

Parts C and D of the Clean Air Act exhibit Congress's clear intent that new major sources of air pollution be subject to preconstruction review. The purposes for these programs cannot be served without this essential element. Therefore, attempts to expedite construction by securing minor source status through the receipt of operational restrictions from which the source intends to free itself shortly after operation are to be treated as circumvention of the preconstruction review requirements.

B. Guidelines for determining when minor source construction permits are shams.

EPA's determination that a purportedly federally enforceable construction permit is a sham is made based on an evaluation of specific facts and evidence in each individual case. The following are criteria which should be scrutinized when making such a determination:

1. Filing a PSD or nonattainment NSR permit application

If a major source or major modification permit application is filed simultaneously with or at approximately the same time as the minor source construction permit, this is strong evidence of an intent to circumvent the requirements of preconstruction review. Even a major source application filed after the minor source application, but either before operation has commenced or after less than a year of operation should be looked at closely.

2. Applications for funding

Applications for commercial loans or, for public utilities, bond issues, should be scrutinized to see if the source has guaranteed a c ertain level of operation which is higher than that in its construction permit. If the project would not be funded or if it would not be economically viable if operated on an extended basis

(at least a year) at the permitted level of production, this should be considered as evidence of circumvention.

3. Reports on consumer demand and projected production levels.

Stockholder reports, reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission, utility board reports, or business permit applications should be reviewed for projected operation or production levels. Ifreported levels are necessary to meet projected consumer demand but are higher than permitted levels, this is additional evidence of circumvention.

4. Statements of authorized representatives of the source regarding plans for operation.

Statements by representatives of the source to EPA or to state or local permitting agencies about the source's plans for operation can be evidence to show intent to circumvent preconstruction review requirements.

Note that if a determination is made that a permit is a "sham" for one pollutant and, therefore, the source is a major source or major modification, the permit may possibly still contain valid limits on potential to emit for other pollutants.

In such cases, the entire source must still go through new source review, during which, for PSD review, all pollutants for which there is a net significant increase must be analyzed for BACT. In nonattainment new source review, new sources must have LAER determinations only for pollutants for which they are major. Major modifications, however, must have LAER determinations for all nonattainment pollutants emitted in significant amounts. If the valid limits in a partially void minor source construction permit keep certain pollutants below significance levels, then those pollutants would not have to be analyzed for BACT or LAER. However, if a source or modification is determined to be major for PSD or NSR because part of its minor permit is deemed void, it would have to undergo BACT or LAER analysis for all significant pollutants.

VI. Enforcement Procedures

This guidance has discussed permit conditions which will legally restrict potential to emit, shielding a source from the requirement to comply with major new source permitting regulation. Failure by a permitting agency to adhere to these guidelines may result in a permit that does not legally restrict potential to emit, thereby subjecting a source to major new source review. If that source has not gone through preconstruction review, it is a significant violator of the Clean Air Act and is subject to enforcement for constructing or

modifying without a major new source permit.

The enforcement options available to EPA in these situations include administrative action under Sections 167 or 113 (a) (5) of the Act or federal judicial action under Sections 113 (b) (2), 113 (b) (5), 113(c), or 167. Which enforcement option is selected depends on the facts of the particular situation. (See July 15, 1988 guidance on EPA Procedures for Addressing Deficient New Source Permits.)

VII. Examples

The following examples are provided to illustrate the type of permit restrictions which would and would not legally limit potential to emit to less than major source thresholds. These examples are provided for purposes of clarifying the potential to emit and averaging time guidance only. They are not intended to reflect all the permit conditions necessary for a valid permit. Specific test methods, compliance monitoring and recordkeeping and reporting requirements are necessary to make permit limitations enforceable as a practical matter. The use of examples where averaging times are the longest times allowed under EPA policies is not intended to necessarily condone the selection of the longest averaging times; averaging times should in practice be as short as possible.

1. The minor source construction permit for a boiler contains the following restrictions: 250,000 gal fuel/month; 0.8% S fuel; 8000 hours/year.

These conditions are federally enforceable production and operation limits, but do not limit potential to emit because one of them does not meet EPA policies on enforceability as a practical matter. The averaging time for hours of operation, one of the operational limits necessary to restrict emissions to less than 250 tpy, exceeds a monthly or rolling yearly limit. If, instead of 8000 hours/year, the hourly restriction were stated as 666 hours/month, the permit would serve to keep the source a minor source, assuming the permit contains appropriate recordkeeping provisions.

2. A waferboard plant which has the physical capacity to emit over 300 tpy of carbon monoxide in the absence of using specific combustion techniques has the following permit restriction as the sole emission limitation: 249 tpy.

This does not limit potential to emit since an operational or production restriction is necessary for the source to be restricted to 249 tpy. The permit must contain a restriction on hours of operation or capacity utilization which, when multiplied by the maximum emission rate for the CO sources at the plant, results in emissions of 249 tpy. Additionally, while the

emission limit alone cannot restrict potential to emit, the emission limit is unenforceable as a practical matter since it is limited on an annual basis. The permit should contain a short term emission limit (in addition to the annual emission limit), consistent with the compliance period or parameter in the applicable test method for determining compliance.

3. A small scale rock crushing plant that cannot emit more than 240 tpy under maximum operation without controls (including plant-wide particulate emissions from transfer and storage operations) has the following permit restriction as the sole emission limitation: 240 tpy particulate matter.

Since no operational limitations are necessary for the source to emit below 250 tpy, no operational restrictions need be in the permit to limit potential to emit. However, although this is not a major source, the state agency should express the emission limit in this permit as a lb/hour measure or gr/dscf so that it will be enforceable as a practical matter.

4. A plant consisting solely of a small rock crusher has the following permit restrictions: 0.05 lb gr PM/dscf; fabric filter must be employed and maintained at 99% efficiency.

Assuming that maintaining the fabric filter at 99% efficiency will result in emissions of less than 250 tpy, this permit would limit

potential to emit if it also contained either 1) parameters that allowed the permitting agency to verify the fabric filter's operating efficiency or 2) a requirement to install and operate continuous opacity monitors (COMs) and a specification that COM data may be used to verify compliance with emission limits. Note that if this second alternative were adopted, it would not be necessary to require that the fabric filter be maintained at 99% efficiency.

To determine potential to emit, the efficiency rate of the fabric filter would be multiplied by the maximum uncontrolled emission rate, the maximum number of operating hours and maximum throughput capacity since there are no other operating or production limits. However, the efficiency rate of the fabric filter would not be enforceable as a practical matter unless there were an enforceable means to monitor ESP performance on a short term basis. The two alternatives mentioned above would satisfy this requirement.

5. A surface coating operation has the capability of utilizing 15,000 gal coating/month, with the following permit restrictions: 3.0 lb VOC/gal coating minus water; 20.5 tons VOC/month; monthly VOC emissions to be determined from records of the daily volumes of coatings used times the manufacturers specified VOC content.

This does not limit potential to emit since the source has the physical capacity to exceed 250 tpy of VOC, and the permit does not contain a production or an operational limitation. A monthly limit on gallons of coating used which when multiplied by 3.0 lb/gal equates to less than the 250 tpy threshold 13,500 gallons/month), with appropriate recordkeeping, would generally be necessary to limit potential to emit. If, however, the permitting agency determines, due to the wide variety of coatings employed and products produced, that restrictions on operation or production are not practically enforceable, then the above emission limits could restrict potential to emit if there are requirements that the source calculate emissions daily, and keep the appropriate records.

If the source was alternatively to meet the 20.5 ton/month limit by employing add-on controls, the permit would need to contain an operational limit, such as the requirement to install and operate an incinerator at 99% efficiency. A requirement to monitor incinerator efficiency (either directly or indirectly via temperature monitoring for example), and appropriate recordkeeping retirements to verify compliance with each of the permit conditions would also be necessary to make the permit conditions enforceable as a practical matter. Note, however, that in the case where add-on controls are employed, the source may be able to meet a shorter term emission limit than the ton per month figure.

VIII. Conclusion

We hope this guidance will help EPA Regions identify sources which have the potential to emit major amounts of an air pollutant which will subject those sources to the requirements of preconstruction new source review. Every source which is subject to these requirements but has not obtained a major new source permit should be seriously considered for enforcement action.