Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH #

Project Title: Imperial County 2009 Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) State Implementation Plan (SIP)

Lead Agency: Imperial County Air Pollution Control District — Contact Person: Monica Soucier

Mailing Address: 150 South Ninth Street — Phone: 760-482-4606

City: El Centro — Zip: 92243 — County: Imperial

Project Location: County: Imperial — City/Nearest Community: Countywide

Cross Streets: _____ — Zip Code: _____

Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): ____° ____′ ____″ N / ____° ____′ ____″ W — Total Acres: _____

Assessor's Parcel No.: _____ — Section: _____ Twp.: _____ Range: _____ Base: _____

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: _____ — Waterways: _____

Airports: _____ — Railways: _____ — Schools: _____

Document Type:

CEQA: ☐ NOP ☐ Early Cons ☑ Neg Dec ☐ Mit Neg Dec — ☐ Draft EIR ☐ Supplement/Subsequent EIR (Prior SCH No.) _____ Other: _____

NEPA: ☐ NOI ☐ EA ☐ Draft EIS ☐ FONSI

Other: ☐ Joint Document ☐ Final Document ☐ Other: _____

Local Action Type:

☐ General Plan Update ☐ General Plan Amendment ☐ General Plan Element ☐ Community Plan
☐ Specific Plan ☐ Master Plan ☐ Planned Unit Development ☐ Site Plan
☐ Rezone ☐ Prezone ☐ Use Permit ☐ Land Division (Subdivision, etc.)
☐ Annexation ☐ Redevelopment ☐ Coastal Permit ☑ Other: _____

Development Type:

☐ Residential: Units _____ Acres _____
☐ Office: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____
☐ Commercial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____
☐ Industrial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____
☐ Educational: _____
☐ Recreational: _____
☐ Water Facilities: Type _____ MGD _____
☐ Transportation: Type _____
☐ Mining: Mineral _____
☐ Power: Type _____ MW _____
☐ Waste Treatment: Type _____ MGD _____
☐ Hazardous Waste: Type _____
☑ Other: 2009 RACT SIP

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

☐ Aesthetic/Visual
☐ Agricultural Land
☐ Air Quality
☐ Archeological/Historical
☐ Biological Resources
☐ Coastal Zone
☐ Drainage/Absorption
☐ Economic/Jobs
☐ Fiscal
☐ Flood Plain/Flooding
☐ Forest Land/Fire Hazard
☐ Geologic/Seismic
☐ Minerals
☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing Balance
☐ Public Services/Facilities
☐ Recreation/Parks
☐ Schools/Universities
☐ Septic Systems
☐ Sewer Capacity
☐ Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading
☐ Solid Waste
☐ Toxic/Hazardous
☐ Traffic/Circulation
☐ Vegetation
☐ Water Quality
☐ Water Supply/Groundwater
☐ Wetland/Riparian
☐ Growth Inducement
☐ Land Use
☐ Cumulative Effects
☑ Other: Rules and Regs

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Project Description: *(please use a separate page if necessary)*
(See Attachment)

The 2009 Reasonably Available Control Technology State Implementation Plan (2009 RACT SIP) has been developed to meet the requirements of the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) for areas classified as "Moderate" or above non-attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for the 1997 8-hour ozone. The CAA requires, as part of any State Implementation Plan (SIP) that RACT be demonstrated for sources subject to Control Technique Guideline (CTG) documents and for major sources of VOC and NOx that are not subject to a CTG.

Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with and "**X**".
If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "**S**".

X	Air Resources Board		Office of Emergency Services
	Boating & Waterways, Department of	X	Office of Historic Preservation
	California Highway Patrol		Office of Public School Construction
X	Caltrans District #	X	Parks & Recreation, Department of
	Caltrans Division of Aeronautics		Pesticide Regulation, Department of
X	Caltrans Planning	X	Public Utilities Commission
	Central Valley Flood Protection Board		Regional WQCB #
X	Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy	X	Resources Agency
	Coastal Commission	X	S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm.
	Colorado River Board	X	San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservancy
X	Conservation, Department of		San Joaquin River Conservancy
	Corrections, Department of		Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy
	Delta Protection Commission	X	State Lands Commission
X	Education, Department of		SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
X	Energy Commission		SWRCB: Water Quality
X	Fish & Game Region #		SWRCB: Water Rights
X	Food & Agriculture, Department of		Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
	Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of	X	Toxic Substances Control, Department of
	General Services, Department of		Water Resources, Department of
	Health Services, Department of		
X	Housing & Community Development		Other:
	Integrated Waste Management Board		Other:
X	Native American Heritage Commission		

Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date June 10,2010 Ending Date July 12, 2010

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm:
Address:
City/State/Zip: El Centro
Contact:
Phone:

Applicant: Imperial County Air Pollution Control District
Address: 150 South Ninth Street
City/State/Zip: El Centro, CA 92243
Phone: 760-482-4606

Signature of Lead Agency Representative: [signature] **Date:** 7/13/10

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

FINAL
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT PROPONENT: Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD)

ADDRESS/LOCATION: 150 S. Ninth Street, El Centro, CA 92243

CONTACT PERSON: Monica N. Soucier, APC Division Manager

PROJECT NAME: 2009 Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) State Implementation Plan (SIP)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The 2009 Reasonably Available Control Technology State Implementation Plan (2009 RACT SIP) has been developed to meet the requirements of the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) for areas classified as "Moderate" or above non-attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for the 1997 8-hour ozone. The CAA requires, as part of any State Implementation Plan (SIP) that RACT be demonstrated for sources subject to Control Technique Guideline (CTG) documents and for major sources of VOC and NOx that are not subject to a CTG.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The 2009 RACT SIP applies to VOC and NOx emission sources located within Imperial County. Imperial County extends over 4,597 square miles within the southeastern portion of California, bordering Mexico to the south, Riverside County to the north, San Diego County to the west and the State of Arizona to the east. The terrain elevation varies from as low as 230 feet below sea level at the Salton Sea to the north to more than 2,800 feet above sea level at the mountain summits to the west. The climate is desert type with hot summers and mild winters, gusty winds frequently occurring during the months of April and May with very little rainfall. The combination of the flat terrain of the valley and the strong temperature differentials, created by intense solar heating, produce moderate winds and deep thermal convection. It is not uncommon to see temperatures above 110° during the month of August.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA):

The 2009 RACT SIP is a "project" as defined by the California Environment Quality Act (CEQA). Under CEQA a lead agency has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project that may have a significant effect upon the environment. Since the

2009 RACT SIP imposes the greatest discretionary authority of approval upon the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD) it is therefore the lead agency for this project.

As part of the review process the ICAPCD examined the 2009 RACT SIP for applicability to CEQA. Because the 2009 RACT SIP does not propose or impose any new regulation and in fact demonstrates attainment of the NAAQS a Class 8 categorical exemption applies. However, in order to provide for optimum public participation and involvement the ICAPCD has opted not to utilize the exemption and instead provide an additional resource for the identification of any potential environmental impacts associated with the 2009 Modified AQMP. Thus, in order to fulfill the purpose and intent of CEQA the ICAPCD prepared an Initial Study to address any potential environmental impacts associated with the 2009 RACT SIP.

The Environmental Evaluation Committee (EEC) met June 10, 2010 at 1:30pm and reviewed the Initial Study making the overall mandatory finding of "No Impact". Subsequently thereafter the ICAPCD released the Public Notice of Proposed Negative Declaration for a 30 day public review on June 11, 2010.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

On July 18, 1997, the U.S. EPA promulgated an 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) of 0.080 parts per million (ppm) in order to promote greater protection of the public health by strengthening the already existing 1-hour ozone NAAQS. In accordance with the provisions of the CAA the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) classified the Imperial County as a "Marginal" non-attainment area on April 30, 2004 for the new ozone NAAQS. Subsequently, on February 13, 2008 the U.S. EPA found that the Imperial County failed to meet attainment for the new ozone NAAQS by the set deadline of June 15, 2007. As a result, Imperial County was reclassified as a "Moderate" non-attainment area and was required under the CAA provisions to develop a revised State Implementation Plan (SIP) by December 31, 2008.

On December 3, 2009, the U.S. EPA issued a final ruling determining that the Imperial County "Moderate" 8-hour ozone non-attainment area attained the new ozone NAAQS. This determination effectively suspended the requirement for the state to submit a full attainment demonstration typical of a SIP. Although the finding of attainment by the U.S. EPA did suspend certain SIP related requirements it did not suspend all the requirements.

One such requirement not suspended is the Subpart 2 Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for VOC's and NOx.

REGULATORY BACKGROUND:

The CAA gives the state primary responsibility for achieving the NAAQS. The NAAQS are set by the U.S. EPA as the maximum concentrations in the atmosphere for specific air contaminants to protect the public health and welfare. The principle mechanism at the state and local level for complying with the CAA is the SIP. A SIP outlines the programs, actions, and commitments a state will carry out to implement its responsibilities under the CAA. The U.S. EPA must approve all SIP's before they can be implemented by the state and local governments. Once approved by the U.S. EPA, a SIP becomes a legally binding document under both state and federal law, and may be enforced by either government.

As mentioned above on December 3, 2009 the U.S. EPA issued a final ruling determining that the Imperial County "Moderate" non-attainment area attained te 197 ozone NAAQS. This ruling suspended certain attainment demonstration requirements except RACT. Therefore, a RACT SIP is required of all areas considered Moderate or above.

PLAN DESCRIPTION:

RACT is defined as the lowest emissions limitation that a particular source is capable of meeting by the application of control technology that is reasonably available considering technological and economic feasibility 944 FR 53762; September 17, 1979). As mentioned above a RACT demonstration is required of "Moderate" or above non-attainment areas demonstrating implementation of RACT on sources subject to CTG documents and for major sources of VOC and NOx that are not subject to a CTG document. Accordingly, a RACt demonstration can be made in one of two ways; 1) by a certification that previously demonstrated RACT controls do currently represent RACt for the 8-hour NAAQS or 2) a new RACT determination with final implementation dates no later than the first ozone season or part there of that occurs thirty (30) months later.

The U.S. EPA provided guidance in the form of letters to help air districts understand the requirements under 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 51 pertaining to RACT SIP's. The following is the basic framework for the RACT SIP submittal.

1. A RACT SIP should provide a description of how source categories within the district are identified as requiring RACT. The description should identify those under a CTG and those that are major non-CTG sources.

2. There should be a section identifying where there are no facilities major or minor within the District subject to a CTG which clearly makes a negative declaration on those sources.

3. There should be a list of state/local regulation that implements RACT for those categories needing RACT. The list should include the date EPA approved the regulations as fulfilling RACT.

4. There should be included a description of the basis for reaching the conclusion that the current regulations fulfill RACT. Supporting documents such as CTGs, Alternative Control Technique Guidance (ACTs), Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standards, New Source Performance Standards (NSPS), California Suggested Control Measures (SCM) and Best Available Retrofit Control Technology (BARCT) determinations, regulations adopted in other Districts, and guidance and rules developed by other state and local agencies should be identified for reference.

5. Should an Air District choose to use the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) Potential all Feasible Measures (AFM) a certification should be provided certifying that local regulations are equivalent to AFM as well as a justification that the assumption that the AFM fulfills RACT when adopted in September 2003. Included in this certification will be an additional certification that no additional controls have become more reasonably available since 2003.

Cover Sheet
Assessment Form
(County of Imperial)

Initial Study # 09-0018 Date: 06/10/2010

Project type/name: 2009 RACT SIP

Applicant's name: Imperial County Air Pollution Control District

Applicant's address: 150 S. 9th Street, El Centro, CA 92243

Name of person preparing Initial Study: Monica N. Soucier

Signature of person preparing Initial Study: _____

I. Project Information

a. Assessor's Parcel Number: Entire County

b. Street address: Entire County

c. Cross street: N/A

d. Township/Section/Range: N/A

e. Project area (acres) ☑: Entire County

II. General Plan Consistency

a. General Plan Designation. N/A

b. Is Project in an Urban area? Various

c. Name of Urban area. Various

d. Is Project within an adopted Specific Plan area? Yes

e. Name of Specific Plan area. Various

f.	Existing zoning.	Various
g.	Proposed zoning, if any.	N/A
h.	Adjacent zoning.	N/A
i.	Is proposal consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?	N/A
j.	Is proposal compatible with existing or surrounding zoning or can it be made compatible?	N/A
k.	Is the proposal consistent with a Specific Plan for the area?	N/A
l.	Is the proposal compatible with existing plans and planned surrounding land uses or can it be made compatible?	N/A
m.	Is the proposal consistent with the land use designation and policies of the 1993 General Plan?	N/A

Comments: (if any)

This is Reasonably Available Control Technology State Implementation Plan – an analysis as Required by the Clean Air Act for areas designated as Moderate non-attainment for the 1997 8-hour Ozone Standard.

PROJECT REPORT

TO: ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

AGENDA DATE: June 10, 2010

FROM: AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

AGENDA TIME 1:30 PM/No. 1

RECEIVED
JUN 15 2010
AIR POLLUTION
CONTROL DISTRICT

PROJECT TYPE: 2009 RACT SIP (Initial Study #10-0018) SUPERVISOR DIST: ALL

LOCATION: Countywide APN: N/A

PARCEL SIZE: Countywide

GENERAL PLAN (existing) N/A GENERAL PLAN (proposed) N/A

ZONE (existing) N/A ZONE (proposed) N/A

GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS ☐ CONSISTENT ☐ INCONSISTENT ☐ MAY BE/FINDINGS

PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION: HEARING DATE:

☐ APPROVED ☐ DENIED ☐ OTHER

PLANNING DIRECTORS DECISION: HEARING DATE:

☐ APPROVED ☐ DENIED ☐ OTHER

ENVIROMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE DECISION: HEARING DATE: 06/10/10

INITIAL STUDY: 10-0018

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION ☐ MITIGATED NEG. DECLARATION ☐ EIR

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS / APPROVALS:

PUBLIC WORKS	☒ NONE	☐ ATTACHED
AG / APCD	☒ NONE	☐ ATTACHED
E.H.S.	☒ NONE	☐ ATTACHED
FIRE / OES	☒ NONE	☐ ATTACHED
OTHER	(See Attached)	

REQUESTED ACTION:

SEE ATTACHED

Planning & Development Services Department
801 MAIN ST., EL CENTRO, CA.., 92243 760-482-4236
(Jurg Heuberger, AICP, Director)

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

IMPERIAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT
INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Project Title:

   2009 REASONABLY AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY (RACT) STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SIP)

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

   Imperial County Air Pollution Control District
   150 South Ninth Street
   El Centro, CA 92243
   (760) 482-4606

3. Contact Person:

   Mr. Reyes Romero, Assistant APCO

   Ms. Monica Soucier, APC Division Manager

4. Project Location:

   The RACT SIP Analysis applies to volatile organic compounds (VOC's) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) emission sources located within the political boundary of the Imperial County (see Exhibit 1, Map of Imperial County). Imperial County extends over 4,597 square miles within the southeastern portion of California, bordering Mexico to the south, Riverside County to the north, San Diego County to the west and the State of Arizona to the east. The terrain elevation varies from as low as 230 feet below sea level at the Salton Sea to the north to more than 2,800 feet above sea level at the mountain summits to the west. The climate is desert type with hot summers and mild winters, gusty winds frequently occurring during the months of April and May with very little rainfall. The flat terrain of the valley and the strong temperature differentials created by intense solar heating produce moderate winds and deep thermal convection. It is not uncommon to see temperatures above 110° during the month of August.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

   Imperial County Air Pollution Control District
   150 South Ninth Street
   El Centro, CA 92243
   (760) 482-4606

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

IMPERIAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT
INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

6. Project Overview

A. Introduction

With the adoption of the 1990 Amendments to the Clean Air Act (CAA) the states were given primary responsibility for achieving the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The NAAQS is set by the U.S. EPA as the maximum concentration in the atmosphere for specific air contaminants to protect the public health and welfare. After the adoption of the CAA Amendments, the ICAPCD was designated a Transitional 185A category non-attainment area until February 13, 2008 when the U.S. EPA found that Imperial County failed to meet attainment of the ozone NAAQS. As such Imperial County was reclassified as a "Moderate" non-attainment area and required under the CAA provisions to develop a revised SIP by December31, 2008.

B. California Environmental Quality Act

The RACT SIP Analysis is a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Under CEQA a lead agency has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project that may have a significant effect upon the environment. Since the SIP imposes the greatest discretionary authority of approval upon the ICAPCD it is therefore the lead agency for this project.

As part of the review process the ICAPCD examined the 2009 RACT SIP for applicability to CEQA. As directed by section 21084 of the Public Resources Code the Secretary for Resources identified a list of projects determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and which by their very nature are therefore exempt from the provisions of CEQA. Because the Modified AQMP does not propose or impose any new regulation and in fact is a modified plan addressing how the ICAPCD intends to maintain an attainment status a Class 8 categorical exemption applies. A class 8 exemption describes those actions by regulatory agencies which assure the maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of the environment where the regulatory process involves procedures for the protection of the environment. However, in order to provide for optimum public participation and involvement the ICAPCD has opted not to utilize the exemption and instead provide an additional resource for the identification of any potential environmental impacts associated with the Modified AQMP.

Thus, in order to fulfill the purpose and intent of CEQA the ICAPCD has prepared this Draft Initial Study to address any potential environmental impacts associated with the 2009 RACT SIP.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

C. Statement of the Problem

As mentioned above on February 13, 2008 the U.S. EPA found that the Imperial County failed to meet attainment for the new ozone NAAQS by the set deadline of June 15, 2007. As a result, Imperial County was reclassified as a "Moderate" non-attainment area and required under the CAA provisions to develop a revised SIP by December 31, 2008. However, on December 3, 2009 the U.S. EPA issued a final ruling determining that the Imperial County "Moderate" non-attainment area attained the 1997 ozone NAAQS. Although the finding of attainment by the U.S. EPA did susend certain SIP related requirements it did not suspend all the requirements.

One such requirement not suspended is the Subpart 2 Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for VOC's and Nox.

D. Background

Ozone non-attainment areas classified at moderate or above are required by sections 182(b)(2) and 182(f) of the CAA Amendments to implement RACT for sources subject to Control Techniques Guideline (CTG) documents and for all major sources of VOC and Nox that are not subject to a CTG. RACT is defined as the lowest emissions limitation that a particular source is capable of meeting by the application of control technology that is reasonably available considering technological and economic feasibility (44 Federal Register (FR) 53762; September 17, 1979). In essence RACT requirements assure that major sources of ozone precursor emissions are controlled to a "reasonable" extent. The "Final Rule to Implement the 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS" (70 FR 71612; November 29, 2005) explains that a RACT demonstration is required for all areas classified as a moderate non-attainment area and above.

RACT demonstrations can be made in one of two ways; 1) by a certification that previously demonstrated RACT controls do currently represent RACT for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS or 2) a new RACT determination with final implementation dates no later than the first ozone season or part there of that occurs thirty (30) months later.

- Moved

E. Plan Description

40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 51 contains all the information related to the requirements for the preparation, adoption and submittal of SIP's, including RACT SIP's. The U.S. EPA Region 9 provided the basic framework as found in the CFR for RACT SIP submittal and is described here as follows:

1 Describe efforts to identify all source categories within the District requiring RACT, including CTG sources (i.e., covered by an EPA Control Technique Guideline document) and major non-CTG sources.

2 Submit negative declarations where there are no facilities major or minor within the District subject to a CTG.

3 For all categories needing RACT, list the state/local regulation that implements RACT. It may also be helpful to list the date U.S. EPA approved these regulations as fulfilling RACT.

4 Describe the basis for concluding that the regulations fulfill RACT. Documents useful in establishing RACT include CTG's, Alternative Control Technique guidance (ACT's), Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standards, New Source Performance Standards (NSPS), California Suggested Control IMeasures (SCM's) and Best Available Retrofit Control Technology (BARCT) determinations, regulations adopted in other Districts, and guidance and rules developed by other state and local agencies.

5 Some Districts may use the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) September 2003, Potential all Feasible Measures (AFM) Report to help demonstrate RACT. If so, the RACT SIP should certify that local regulations are equivalent to AFM, justify the assumption that the AFM fulfilled RACT in 2003, and include some sort of certification/demonstration that no additional controls have become more reasonably available since then.

7. Other Agencies Whose Approvals Are Required and Permits Needed:

No other agencies have discretionary authority over this project

8. Project Compatibility with Existing Zones and Plans:

Not applicable to this project

9. Name of Person Who Prepared Initial Study:

Monica N. Soucier
APC Division Manager

IMPERIAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT JUNE 2010
INITIAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE 2009 RACT SIP ANALYSIS

B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The following environmental impact areas have been assessed to determine their potential to be affected by the proposed project. Any checked items represent areas that may be adversely affected by the proposed project. An explanation relative to the determination of impacts can be found following the checklist for each area.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use/Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Population/Housing
☐ Utilities/Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	☐ Transportation/Traffic

E.E.C. DETERMINATION

C. After review of the Initial Study, the Environmental Evaluation Committee has:

☒ Found that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ Found that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION wil be prepared.

☐ Found that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ Found that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on th environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 1) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ Found that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, pursuant to applicable standard and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

CALIF. DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
DE MINIMIS IMPACT FINDING ☒ /

VOTE:

YES	NO	ABS	
		✓	Public
✓			EHS
✓			OES
✓			APCD
✓			Planning

I certify that this project was independently reviewed and analyzed and that this document reflects the independent judgement of the Environmental Evaluation Committee.

SIGNATURE: David A. Black 6/10/10

Printed Name: **Brad Poiriez**
Title: **Air Pollution Control Officer**

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

D. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST

The following checklist evaluates the proposed project's potential adverse impacts. For those environmental topics for which a potential adverse impact may exist, a discussion of the existing environment related to the topic is presented followed by an analysis of the project's potential adverse impacts. When the project does not have any potential adverse impacts for an environmental topic, the reasons why there are no potential adverse impacts are described. Control measures previously adopted by the ICAPCD are considered to be part of the existing setting and, therefore, are not evaluated further in the following checklist (e.g. CV CTY 1 - Turf Overseeding).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. *AESTHETICS* Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☑
II. *AGRICULTURE RESOURCES AND FOREST RESOURCES* In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether environmental impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Dept. of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☑

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of , forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☑
III.	***AIR QUALITY*** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☑
IV.	***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES*** Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☑

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
V.	**CULTURAL RESOURCES** Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☑
VI.	***GEOLOGY AND SOILS*** Would the project:				
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☐	☑
i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☑

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☑
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and seiche/tsunami?	☐	☐	☐	☑
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☑
VII. ***GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS*** Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Conflict with an applicable plan or policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☑
VIII. ***HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS*** Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the enviornment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☑

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d)	Be located on a site where is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☑
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☑
IX.	**HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY** Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowing of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alternation of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☑

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☑
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☑
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☑
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☑
X.	***LAND USE AND PLANNING*** would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
XI.	***MINERAL RESOURCES*** Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
XII.	***NOISE*** Would the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☑

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☑
XIII. ***POPULATION AND HOUSING*** Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☑
XIV. ***PUBLIC SERVICES***				
a) would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☑
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☑
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☑
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☑
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☑
XV. ***RECREATION***				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☑

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the *construction or expansion* of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑
XVI.	***TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC*** Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersetions, streets, highways and freeways, predestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standard and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion/management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f)	Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, programs, regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☑
XVII.	***UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS*** Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☑

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☑
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☑

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. *MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE*				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant of animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

(TO BE COMPLETED BY THE EEC AT THE HEARING)

E. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST COMMENTS

The District conducts CEQA review on each rule during the rule development process at which time a better idea of the methods or compliance is known. The discussion of impacts provided below reflects the general level of knowledge now available.

I. *AESTHETICS* — a) thru d) No Impact

Because the RACT SIP Analysis does not propose any new regulation but merely analyzes the current technology imposed upon existing facilities. The RACT SIP would not create aesthetically offensive sites visible to the public and therefore, no significant adverse aesthetic or recreation impacts would be expected from the RACT SIP.

II. *AGRICULTURE RESOURCES AND FOREST RESOURCES* — a) thru e) No Impact

Because the RACT SIP does not propose any new regulation but merely analyzes current technology as imposed upon existing sources there would be no impact. The RACT SIP will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, Williamson Act contracts or timberland.

III. *AIR QUALITY* — a) thru e) No Impact

Based on the fact that the RACT SIP is not proposing new regulation the RACT SIP will not violate any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. The purpose of the RACT SIP is to demonstrate the current technology imposed upon existing sources. No alteration of air movement, moisture, temperature, climate change or creation of objectinable odors will result from the adoption of the RACT SIP.

IV. *BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES* — a) thru f) No Impact

Adoption of the RACT SIP is not expected to adversely affect existing plant or animal species or communities, unique or endangered plant or animal species, or agricultural crops. No additional significant adverse impacts to biological resources will be affected because biological resources are already disturbed on existing sites and area where the RACT SIP is implemented.

V. *CULTURAL RESOURCES* — a) thru d) No Impact

The RACT SIP describes current existing regulation and how it affects facilities which are typically located in apparoximately zoned commercial or industrial areas that have previously been disturbed. Any effects from the current regulations are occuring at exiting sites and areas. As a result, significant impacts to cultural resources are not expected by the RACT SIP because there is no requirement for the destruction of existing buildings or sites with prehistoric, historic, archaeological, religious, or ethnic significance. Adoption of the RACT SIP is not anticipated to result in any activities or promote any programs that could have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources within the Imperial County.

VI. *GEOLOGY AND SOILS* — a) thru e) No Impact

There are no provisions in the RACT SIP that would call for the disruption or over-covering of soil, changes in topography or surface relief features, the erosion of beach sand or a change in existing siltation rates. The ICAPCD does not have land use authority (California Health and Safety Code, Sec. 40716(b)) so the ICAPCD is generally prohibited from encouraging or probating specific land uses in specific locations in the Imperial Valley. As such, adoption of the RACT SIP will not incrase the exposure of people or property to geologic hazards, fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure, seiche, tsunami or volcanic hazard.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

VII. *GREENHOUSE GASES* a) & b) No Impact

Assembly Bill 32 (AB32) was passed in 2006 by the Legislature and signed by Governor Schwarzenegger setting the 2020 greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal into law. Although carbon dioxide has been identified as the largest contributor to greenhouse gases AB32 has identified methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF6), hydrofluorocarbons (HFC's) and perfluorocarbons (PFC's). The Scoping Plan developed by the California Air Resources Board identified sectors which contribute to greenhouse gases. Following is a list of sectors cited with the percentage of contribution if "business as usual" is maintained. Transportation (38%), Electricity (23%), Industry (20%), Commerical and Residential (9%), Agriculture (6%), High global warming potential (GWP) (3%) and Recycling and Waste (1%). Although agriculture is mentioned the identified agricultural greenhouse gases are largely methane emissions from livestock, both from the animals and their waste. Current regulation limiting VOC emissions also reduces Greenhouse gas emissions.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS a) thru h) No Impact

As mentioned before there are no proposed new regulations therefore no anticipated new emissions of hazards and hazardous materials is expected. However, when control measures undergo rule development, hazardous risk assessments and other analyses are conducted to identify any potential hazards. These analyses are addressed in separate CEQA documents accompanying the rule in the rule development and adoption process. For example, some rules regulate VOC content limits from coatings and othe products. These regulated limits can normally be achieved by industry practice in application and handling and reformulation with acetone-exempt solvents and water-based solvents. The trend is to replace solvents with less toxic/less hazardous materials that do not contain hazardous air pollutants. However, no new regulation is proposed under the RACT SIP and therefore no known hazardous materials or hazards are expected either to the public, environment, schools, airport or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

IX. *HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY* a) thru j) No Impact

The RACT SIP does not contain any control measures that increase water usage at any of the affected facilities. The RACT SIP will not generate new structures that could alter existing drainage patterns by altering rthe course of a river or stream that would result in erosion, siltation, or flooding on or offsite, increase the rate or amount of surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, etc. The RACT SIP does not cause or include the new construction or relocation of existing housing or other types of facilities and as such would not require the placement of housing or other structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the RACT SIP would not be involved in creating a significant risk from flooding, expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding or increase existing risks if any, of inuandation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

X. *LAND USE AND PLANNING* a) thru c) No Impact

The RACT SIP does not have any characteristics that would directly change land use, zoning or land use plans or directly affect the land use classification, or location criteria of any public or private residential, commerical, industrial or public lands use facility. Land use planning is handled at the local level and contributes to planning (i.e. growth projections) but the RACT SIP does not affect local government land use planning decisions.

XI. *MINERAL RESOURCES* a) thru b) No Impact

No provision of the RACT SIP would directly result in the loss of availablility of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state or of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delinated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, significant adverse impacts to mineral resources are not anticipated.

XII. *NOISE* a) thru f) No Impact

Because the RACT SIP is not proposing any new regulation the RACT SIP does not require existing industrial owners/operatoars to install new air pollution control equipment or to modify their operations to reduce stationary source emissions. Therefore the RACT SIP is not anticipated to increase groundborne vibration levels, nor directly or indirectly cause substantial noise or excessive groundborne vibration impacts. In addition, there are no components to the RACT SIPthat would increase to any level ambient noise levels, either intermittently or permanently.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

XIII. *POPULATION AND HOUSING* a) thru c) No Impact

The RACT SIP is not anticipted to generate any significant effects, either directly or indirectly, on the Imperial County's population or population distribution. There are no provisions in the RACT SIP that would result in the creation of any industry that would affect population growht or directly or indirectly induce the construction of single - or multiple-family units. Adopting the RACT SIP will not result in any significant changes in population densities or induce significant growth in population.

XIV. *PUBLIC SERVICES* a) No Impact

The RACT SIP will not generate any significant adverse impacts to public services (i.e., fire departments, police departments, and local governments). The RACT SIP would not result in the need for new or physically alter government facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.

XV. *RECREATION* a) & b) No Impact

No provisions of the RACT SIP would directly or indirectly affect land use plans, policies, ordinances, or regulations. Land use and other planning considerations are determined by local governments. No land use or planning requirements, including those related to recreational facilities, would be altered by the adoption of the RACT SIP. The RACT SIP does not have the potential to directly or indirectly induce population growth or redistribution. As a result, the RACT SIP does not increase the use of or demand for existing neighborhood and/or regional parks or other recreational facilities, nor would it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVI. *TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC* a) thru f) No Impact

No provisions of the RACT SIP proposes to increase vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled, result in inadequate parking at any affected facility or increase air traffic levels. In addition the provisions of the RACT SIP would not directly or indirectly increase roadway design hazards or incompatible risks. The provisions of the RACT SIP does not require the construction of any structures that might obstruct emergency access routes at any affected facilities. Therefore, adopting the RACT SIP would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation programs. The RACT SIP is not expected to generate any significant adverse impacts to transporations or traffic systems.

XVII. *UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS* a) thru g) No Impact

The RACT SIP will not result in any demand for new utilities or service systems or result in any substantial demand on existing sources. There are no provisions in the RAQCT SIP that would affect existing communication systems, sewer or septic tanks, or regional water treatment or distribution facilities. The RACT SIP would not result in any demand for new utilities or service systems, or result in any substantial demand on existing sources.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

F. SOURCES

1. IMPERIAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT. *Draft 2009 Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) State Implementation Plan (SIP)*

2. IMPERIAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT. *1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan*

3. UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY. Federal Notice Volume 74, December 03, 2009 Pages 63309 thru 63310 (74 FR 63309-63310)

4. Office of Planning and Research (OPR) CEQA and Climate Change; CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS PROPOSED TO BE ADDED OR AMENDED; www.opr.ca.gov

5. CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD. Greenhouse Gas Protocols; http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/protocols/protocols.htm

6. CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD. Climate Change Scoping Plan December 2008 Pursuant to AB32 http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

FINAL
2009 REASONABLY AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

JULY 13, 2010

IMPERIAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT
2009 REASONABLY AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY (RACT)
STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SIP)

BACKGROUND

On May 3, 1971, the first implementation plan for the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (Air District) was presented and subsequently adopted by the Air Pollution Control District Board in Imperial County. Five months later, the Air District adopted the rules and regulations as prescribed by the implementation plan making the Imperial County an effective part of the Southeast Desert Air Basin (SEDAB) control plan. On or about December 2, 1977 Imperial County was declared a rural nonattainment area for photochemical oxidant matter by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). As outlined by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), rural nonattainment areas were not required to prepare nonattainment plans but were required to adopt all Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACMS). Conforming to section 107(d) of the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) the Air District adopted on October 31, 1978 its "Imperial County Plan to Attain National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Oxidants." This plan revision was formally adopted by the CARB as a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision on February 20, 1979. Revisions to the plan continued meeting the requirements of the CAA until the adoption of the 1990 Amendments to the CAA (CAA Amendments).

The CAA Amendments gives the states primary responsibility for achieving the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The NAAQS are set by the EPA as the maximum concentrations in the atmosphere for specific air contaminants to protect the public health and welfare. The principal mechanism at the state and local level for complying with the CAA Amendments is the SIP. A SIP outlines the programs, actions, and commitments a state will carry out to implement its responsibilities under the CAA Amendments. The EPA must approve all SIPs before they can be implemented by state and local governments. Once approved by the EPA, a SIP becomes a legally binding document under both state and federal law, and may be enforced by either government.

After the adoption of the CAA Amendments, the Air District was designated a Transitional 185A category nonattainment area until 1992 when the Air District was reclassified as a "Marginal" nonattainment area for Ozone under the federal standard. Soon after, the "1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan" (AQAP), addressing the one (1) hour standard was developed and implemented to meet both the "Marginal" designation as prescribed by the CAA Amendments and the "Moderate" state designation. In 1996 the Salton Sea Air Basin (SSAB) was created by which time a number of the commitments contained in the 1991 AQAP were met allowing for compliance with state and federal clean air mandates. Although EPA adopted a new standard for ozone in 1997 which triggered further evaluation of proposed future plans the Air District submitted for review and approval a "Clean Data" finding demonstrating that the Imperial County met the 1997 NAAQS.[1] Therefore, the Air District has developed the 2009 8-hour Modified Air Quality Management Plan (2009 Modified AQMP) which reaffirms how the Air District

[1] The EPA determined on December 3,2 009 that the Imperial County, California moderate 8-hour ozone nonattainment area attained the 1997 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAQS) for ozone. 74FR63309, December 3, 2009

will maintain attainment of the 1997 8-hour Ozone NAAQS. Cumulatively, these plans, as components of the SIP, contain the framework by which the Air District structures its long range strategies to provide clean air for a healthy citizenry which in turn creates a robust commercial consumer base.

Essential to any SIP are the stationary source control measures which outline the basic strategy that an Air District will employ to help maintain a reduction of emissions throughout the region of Imperial County. In essence, stationary source control measures are proven feasible industrial techniques implemented concurrently with industry practices and control devices in order to reduce ozone precursor emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) from identified sources in Imperial County. Examples of control devices include gasoline station vapor recovery systems, landfill gas recovery systems and catalytic emission control systems found on atypical combustion devices. Fundamentally, any strategy developed and incorporated into a SIP must include an evaluation of all stationary source control measures which have been built upon by previous attainment plans. As stated above, the last major attainment plan was the 1991 AQAP which addressed the federal and state one-hour ozone standards.

Because stationary source control measures define the mechanisms for the installation and implementation of emission control techniques and devices they are the framework by which the Air District develops enforceable rules. The Air District rules cover many activities such as open burning, incineration, gasoline storage, paint solvent use, dry cleaning, asphalt paving, chrome plating, fuel combustion and landfills. These rules are the foundation of the stationary source control strategy found within any developed SIP. As demonstrated above SIPs are not one time documents but are living documents which require periodic evaluation, updates and mandated revisions in accordance with changes in scientific technology and governing law. As mentioned above, the Air District submitted for review and approval to EPA a “clean data” demonstration. Subsequently, the EPA reviewed the submittal and found on December 3, 2009 that the Imperial County had indeed attained the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. The finding by EPA did not constitute a re-designation nor a determination that the area met other requirements for re-designation. Although the finding of attainment by EPA did suspend certain SIP related requirements it did not suspend all the requirements. One such requirement not suspended is the Subpart 2 Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for VOC’s and NOx.[2]

Ozone non-attainment areas classified at moderate or above are required by sections 182(b)(2) and 182(f) of the CAA Amendments to implement RACT for sources subject to Control Techniques Guideline (CTG) documents and for all major sources of VOC and NOx that are not subject to a CTG. RACT is defined as the lowest emissions limitation that a particular source is capable of meeting by the application of control technology that is reasonably available considering technological and economic

[2] Clean Air Act sections 182(b)(2) and 182(f)

feasibility (44 Federal Register (FR) 53762; September 17, 1979). In essence RACT requirements, as specified in the CAA Amendments, assure that major sources of ozone precursor emissions are controlled to a "reasonable" extent.

As part of the implementation process as described in EPA's "Final Rule to Implement the 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS" (70 FR 71612; November 29, 2005) a RACT demonstration is required for all areas classified as moderate non-attainment. RACT demonstrations can be made in one of two ways; 1) by a certification that previously demonstrated RACT controls do currently represent RACT for the 8-hour ozone standard or 2) a new RACT determination with final implementation dates no later than the first ozone season or part there of that occurs thirty (30) months later. In any event, there are occasions when an air district may adopt a Negative Declaration declaring that there are no sources, either existing or anticipated, in its area that are subject to RACT requirements making the requirement to adopt a rule for those types of sources inapplicable. As previously mentioned, prior to being designated as a non-attainment for the 1997 8-hour ozone standard, the Air District maintained a subpart 2 marginal classification and as such a RACT SIP was not required.

IMPERIAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT
RACT SIP EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION

40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 51 contains all the information related to the requirements for the preparation, adoption and submittal of Implementation Plans, including RACT SIPs. To help the state and local air districts interpret and understand the requirements for RACT SIP submittal the US EPA provided guidance in three separate letters dated March 9, 2006; April 4, 2006 and May 18, 2006. The first two letters March 9th and April 4th contain information concerning the general requirements for RACT SIP submittal, including a discussion of completeness criteria and a list of current CTG documents. The letter dated May 18th is additional clarification for RACT SIP submittals and is found in a question and answer format. EPA Region 9 provided the basic framework as found in the CFR for RACT SIP submittal and is presented here for easy understanding:

1. Describe efforts to identify all source categories within the District requiring RACT, including CTG sources (i.e., covered by an EPA Control Technique Guideline document) and major non-CTG sources.

2. Submit negative declarations where there are no facilities major or minor within the District subject to a CTG.

3. For all categories needing RACT, list the state/local regulation that implements RACT. It may also be helpful to list the date EPA approved these regulations as fulfilling RACT.

4. Describe the basis for concluding that the regulations fulfill RACT. Documents useful in establishing RACT include CTGs, Alternative Control Technique guidance (ACTs), Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standards, New Source Performance Standards (NSPS), California Suggested Control Measures (SCM) and Best Available Retrofit Control Technology (BARCT) determinations, regulations adopted in other Districts, and guidance and rules developed by other state and local agencies.

5. Some Districts may use the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) September 2003, Potential all Feasible Measures (AFM) Report to help demonstrate RACT. If so, the RACT SIP should certify that local regulations are equivalent to AFM, justify the assumption that the AFM fulfilled RACT in 2003, and include some sort of certification/demonstration that no additional controls have become more reasonably available since then.

DETERMINATION OF RACT SIP

CTG Sources

While CTGs and ACTs both describe available control techniques and their cost effectiveness only CTGs define VOC RACT for those facilities that emit air pollutants. Those facilities subject to CTGs are referred to as CTG sources. EPA headquarters maintains a list of source categories and the applicable CTG in guidance documents at http://www.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/ozone/ctg_act/index.htm.

District staff reviewed the list of CTG documents and compared them to existing rules and sources located in Imperial County. The review included research into all CTG documents as well as any pertinent EPA guidance. Those CTG categories with associated rules are found in Table 1 below and those categories without a corresponding prohibitory District rule can be found in Table 2. Table1 demonstrates the source categories, reference documents, applicable District rules, and the date EPA approved the corresponding district rule. Table 2 demonstrates those category sources for which the district has **no** sources in the county. The analysis was originally arrived at by research of the permit system, emissions inventory and enforcement. To further supplement the review the Air District reviewed the yellow pages pertinent to the area and general and advanced searches through the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes.

Like other districts with a heavy agricultural industry, the Imperial County has substantial agricultural pesticide use which is a substantial source of ROCs. Unfortunately, agricultural pesticide use is not defined as a stationary source and therefore not subject to regulation by the Air District. However, agricultural pesticide application is not without regulation. To protect the general welfare of the public, agricultural pesticide application is heavily regulated by the State of California.

Major Non-CTG Sources

Major non-CTG sources are those sources which are not subject to CTG's but for which RACT may still be required. For this evaluation District staff examined only non-CTG sources which have the potential to emit 25 lbs or more per day of either NOx or VOC. The threshold of 25 lbs per day falls under the category threshold for Rule 207 New and Modified Stationary Source Review (NSR). Under NSR, any facility that has the potential to emit 25 pounds per day or more of any nonattainment pollutant or its precursor is required to apply Best Available Control Technology (BACT). By contrast, the U.S. EPA, under its regulations for the 8-hour ozone, set moderate ozone nonattainment areas new source review threshold as 100 tons per year of either ROC or NOx for major stationary sources.

Table 3 lists all of the 100 tons per year or greater "major source" facilities within Imperial County. Table 3 gives each facility permit number, facility name and the RACT SIP evaluation as it applies to each facility.

HOW DISTRICT RULES WERE DETERMINED TO MEET RACT REQUIREMENTS

As mentioned before district rules must meet RACT requirements in order to perform a proper review of the CTG documents and their applicability to the existing sources in Imperial County. Therefore, the Air District relied on the following criteria:

Generally, district rules that have been approved by EPA are considered as fulfilling RACT requirements at the time when originally approved. If EPA evaluates the submitted rules using EPA guidelines and polices and determines that those submitted rules fulfill RACT requirements then in light of those EPA approvals District rules are said to have met RACT requirements so long as the length of time has not allowed for changes to occur requiring rule amendment to meet RACT. However, the Air District understands that any analysis cannot rely solely on one form of verification. Therefore, the Air District supplemented the RACT analysis by comparing currently adopted rules to other Air District rules for consistency in requirements, emissions limitations and EPA approval. The consistency among Air District rules helps strengthen the determination that the same requirements and emissions limitations are fulfilling RACT.

The same control consistency among rules can be found under the CARB RACT/BARCT determinations. To aid air districts in developing regulations to meet and maintain the state ambient air quality standards, the CARB has developed a series of RACT/BARCT determinations for specific emission source types. As mentioned before, these determinations promote consistency of controls for those emission sources considered similar among districts with the same air quality attainment designations. BARCT under these determinations is widely recognized to exceed RACT as long as a number of years has not passed whereby the initial BARCT determination may no longer apply.

Since the Air District was designated as a "marginal" non-attainment area for ozone the

Air District has strived to develop regulations meeting RACT and in some cases BACT. It is worth pointing out that in addition to the EPA finding that a rule fulfills RACT when submitted for inclusion into a SIP, the H&SC requires Air District staff to perform an analysis for each rule similar to a RACT evaluation. During this process Air District staff reviews the corresponding requirements of CTG's, ACT's, federal New Source Performance Standards (NSPS), National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS) and if applicable MACT standards for the applicable source category as part of the rule development process. Each Air District rule adopted by the Air District is evaluated against applicable CTGs and ACTs, as well as against current existing State law, including a comparison against California's "all feasible measures" requirement. However, the "all feasible measures" analysis was not used to evaluate this RACT SIP. Instead, it serves to maintain an assurance that rule development in Imperial County is consistent with RACT. As is required, both CARB and EPA review Air District rules for a minimum applicability to RACT. Similarly, during the annual permit review process all existing sources are analyzed for compliance with RACT/BACT requirements.

While all existing sources are required to meet RACT as a minimum new or modified sources must meet the requirements of the District's NSR rule. Specifically, any new, replacement, modified or relocated emissions units in Imperial County must apply BACT if it is determined that the source has the potential to emit 25 lbs per day or more of ROC or NOx.

RACT SIP EVALUATION FINDINGS

Table 4 presents all of the District rules District staff evaluated for applicability to the RACT SIP. All rules were identified either as applicable (defined by a CTG or applicable to a major source) or not applicable. An in depth evaluation was conducted only on those rules identified as applicable to RACT. Given for each rule is the rule name, whether there is a corresponding CTG or ACT that appears applicable to each rule, original rule adoption date, date of last rule amendment, Federal Register citation for EPA approval and the corresponding Federal Register publication date.

Table 5 presents summaries of the RACT evaluations for those District rules covered by a CTG or ACT. Table 5 does not include District rules for which there are no corresponding CTG's or ACTs. Table 5 includes the basis for concluding that each District rule evaluated for RACT meets or exceeds RACT. As mentioned above, EPA rule approvals of not only Imperial County rules but of other Air District rules of similar emission limitations and requirements lend strength to a certification that District rules meet RACT. Where appropriate, EPA RACT certification findings were augmented by corresponding CARB RACT/BARCT determinations. These CARB RACT/BARCT determinations tend to be more current and more stringent than RACT. Therefore, in addition to the EPA rule approvals, District concluded that the RACT/BARCT determinations were an appropriate basis for finding that District rules meet RACT.

During an earlier RACT analysis, NOx regulation was found to be much more extensive

in other Air Districts. Table 5 identified Rule 400, Fuel Burning Equipment as the only existing NOx rule which was found to be similar in emissions limitations to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. However, San Joaquin has supplemented its general Fuel Burning Rule with four specific NOx rules. In order to maintain consistency the Air District adopted new regulation addressing NOx emissions from boilers, process heaters, steam generators and stationary gas turbines. Currently, these new NOx rules do not address kilns or mills. In Imperial County the only major source operation using kilns or mills is a wallboard operation. Therefore, the Air District is committed to developing, adopting and implementing a Wallboard Kiln and Mill rule specific to wallboard operations. Preliminary review indicates that a rule could be adopted by June 30, 2011 which would impose a NOx limit approximately within the range of 30 to 40ppm corrected at 3% oxygen. Preliminary review indicates that the proposed limit would fulfill RACT once adopted. In any event, the new NOx rules 400.1 and 400.2 were adopted by the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District Board on February 23, 2010 and submitted to CARB for inclusion into the SIP on March 15, 2010.

Along with the new NOx rules three coating rules, Rule 424 Architectural Coatings, Rule 425 Aerospace Coating Operations, and Rule 427 Automotive Refinishing Operations were amended according to Suggested Control Measures as recommended by CARB. It is important to note that although Rule 425 Aerospace Coating Operations was amended for consistency with other air districts there are no aerospace coating operations in existence or in operation in Imperial County. The amendment was adopted as part of a general review process.

In addition, the Air District commenced review on the impact of Internal Combustion Engines and the potential for a rule addressing IC Engines. The review revealed that currently, there are no major sources of IC Engines within Imperial County. On another note, the Air District reviewed Rules 413 and 417 for consistency with other districts. The preliminary review has revealed that Rule 413 needs clarification regarding the exemption for unheated non-conveyorized cleaning equipment (A.1.c) to be consistent with the recommendations stated on the Technical Support Document (TSD) issued by U.S. EPA on August 2002. Section A.1.c of Rule 413 will clarify that small cold cleaners are only exempt from add on control and not work practices. As such, work practices are being reviewed and will be amended to be consistent with other air districts.

Review of Rule 417 revealed that current limits are consistent with other air district rules. For example Rule 442 from Mojave Desert has emissions limitations for all VOC containing materials of 540 kilograms (1,190lbs) per month per facility which equates to approximately 39.66lbs per day. Similarly, Rule 442 from Southcoast AQMD has a limitation on all VOC containing materials, equipment and processes of 833lbs of VOC per calendar month which equates to approximately 28lbs per day while the Imperial County Rule 417 limits discharge of VOC to 15lbs in any one day but no more than 3lbs in any one hour which is in line with the San Joaquin Rule 4661. Therefore, these rules do abide by existing CTG documents and are essentially RACT according to the determined thresholds under EPA guidance. However, amendments to Rule 413 and 417 are scheduled to be finalized and adopted by June 30, 2011. As such, with the new

regulations and with current rules the Air District's RACT determination is solidified.

CTG Sources

Table 2 demonstrates the CTG source categories for which there are no sources in Imperial County. This determination was made by reviewing the Air District's permit system, emissions inventory, SIC codes, research of the local yellow pages and consultation with the Enforcement Division. Of the CTG categories listed in Table 2 the Offset Lithographic Printing and Letterpress Printing CTG identified by EPA-453/R-06-002 dated September 2006 identified thresholds for printing facilities. In order to determine the need for an Offset Lithographic Printing and Letterpress Printing regulation in Imperial County the Air District conduction a facility inspection on the largest identified printing facility by SIC code in Imperial County, Imperial Printers. The inspection conducted on April 27, 2010 by Air District staff revealed the potential emissions of the facility well below the threshold identified in the CTG. The Offset Lithographic Printing and Letterpress Printing CTG identified a threshold limitation of 15 pounds per day of VOC emission from inks, cleaning materials and solutions. Combined Imperial Printers potential emissions are 3.89 pounds per day well below the required threshold for the Offset Lithographic Printing and Letterpress Printing CTG. The Air District will continue to do spot inspections in the future to verify that potential emissions either remain the same or do not increase. As a result, the Air District does not anticipate any of the sources listed in Table 2 in the future. Therefore, RACT determinations for those CTG source categories are not necessary and the Air District concludes that RACT rules for these sources are not applicable. However, should these sources locate in Imperial County in the future then they will be subject to the District's NSR requirements which are more stringent than RACT. This constitutes the District's negative declaration for the sources listed in Table 2.

Major Non-CTG Sources

District staff evaluated all facilities with the potential to emit 25 lbs per day of NOx or VOC following the Districts NSR requirements. Those facilities are listed in Table 3, along with applicable District rules. All listed are 100 tons per year or greater the NSR threshold for moderate 8-hour ozone non-attainment areas. Currently, all facilities in Table 3 are required to apply BACT which is much more stringent than RACT. Therefore, all of the major non-CTG VOC and NOx sources are subject to District rules, which meet or exceed RACT.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Air District staff commenced its RACT SIP evaluation by reviewing all available CTGs and ACTs, comparing them to Air District rules and existing sources. For each source category Air District staff identified applicable sources and applicable Air District rules. This was accomplished by reviewing and researching the local yellow pages, the SIC codes, the permit system, the emissions inventory and utilization of all associated staff in engineering and enforcement.

There are six (6) major stationary sources in Imperial County under the Air District's current major source threshold. All listed are 100 tons per year or greater composed of one (1) ROG source and five (5) NOx sources.

The criteria used by District staff in evaluation and determination of RACT SIP rules was based on 1) EPA rule approval 2) emission limitation comparison of other Air District Rules and 3) RACT/BARCT determinations issued by the California Air Resources Board.

While EPA rule approval is an appropriate basis for establishing RACT findings and although a number of years may have elapsed, if the limits demonstrated are in accord with other current District limits and state established limits then RACT is still appropriate. That is EPA evaluates rules when originally submitted to determine if they fulfill RACT requirements prior to approval. When a number of years have elapsed and limits have remained in accord with state and other District approved rules then RACT findings are appropriate. RACT/BARCT determinations are an appropriate basis because they are more stringent than RACT.

FINDINGS – CTG SOURCES & MAJOR NON-CTG SOURCES

Based on the foregoing, Air District staff finds that all current Air District rules that apply to ozone precursor emissions fulfill RACT requirements for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. As such, the current rules, at a minimum, meet RACT. Moreover, District staff finds that all CTG sources and major non-CTG sources under its jurisdiction are controlled to RACT or better standards.

RACT FINDINGS – NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS

The Air District has reviewed its permit and emissions inventory systems and consulted with knowledgeable Air District staff and has determined that there are no stationary sources or emitting facilities within the Air District for the CTG categories listed in Table 2. Moreover, the Air District does not anticipate these sources in the future. If such sources locate in Imperial County in the future then they will be subject to the Air Districts New Source Review requirements which are more stringent than RACT. This constitutes the Air District's negative declarations for the 2009 RACT SIP.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

The 2009 RACT SIP is an evaluation of current Air District air pollution rules. This RACT SIP evaluation is not an activity which causes in of itself a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect change in the environment. The RACT SIP evaluation is not part of a local General Plan or element thereof. The RACT SIP is not supported in whole or in part through a public agency contract, grant, subsidy, loan or other form of assistance. Finally, there are no discretionary approvals involving leases, permits, licenses, certificates or other entitlements associated with this RACT

SIP evaluation. Therefore, adoption of the proposed 2009 RACT SIP is not a "Project" as defined in Section 15378(a) of the CEQA Guidelines and therefore is not subject to CEQA review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c)(3).

TABLE 1 - Source Categories, CTG/ACT List and Applicable District Rules

SOURCE CATEGORY	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	FEDERAL REGISTER RULE APPROVAL
PETROLEUM (ROG)						
Gasoline Service Stations	Design Criteria for Stage I Vapor Control Systems – Gasoline Service Stations (PDF 15 pp, 766KB) **EPA-450/R-75-102 1975/11**	Control of gasoline vapors during storage tank filling (Stage I sources). Vehicle fueling (Stage II sources).	415 Transfer and Storage of Gasoline	11/4/1977	5/18/2004	**70 FR 8520 02/22/2005**
Tank Trucks, Gasoline Loading Terminals	Control of Hydrocarbons from Tank Truck Gasoline Loading Terminals (PDF 62 pp, 1.6MB) **EPA-450/2-77-026 1977/10**	Control of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) from tank truck terminals with daily throughputs of greater than 76,000 liters **(20,077 gallons)** of gasoline	415 Transfer and Storage of Gasoline	11/4/1977	5/18/2004	**70 FR 8520 02/22/2005**
Bulk Gasoline Plants	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Bulk Gasoline Plants (PDF 49 pp, 1.3MB) **EPA-450/2-77-035 1977/12**	Control VOC emissions from bulk plants with **daily** throughputs of 76,000 liters **(20,077 gallons)** of gasoline or less. Bulk gasoline plants are typically secondary distribution facilities which receive gasoline from bulk terminals via trailer and store it in above ground storage tanks.	415 Transfer and Storage of Gasoline	11/4/1977	5/18/2004	**70 FR 8520 02/22/2005**
External Floating Roof Tanks, Petroleum Liquid Storage in	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Petroleum Liquid Storage in External Floating Roof Tanks (PDF 66 pp, 2.0MB) **EPA-450/2-78-047 1978/12**	This document is related to the control of volatile organic compounds (VOC) from the storage of petroleum liquids in external floating roof tanks.	Rule 414 - Storage of Reactive Organic Compound Liquids	12/11/1979	5/18/2004	**73 FR 70883 11/24/2008**
Tank Trucks, Gasoline and Vapor Collection Systems	Control of Volatile Organic Compound Leaks from Gasoline Tank Trucks and Vapor Collection Systems (PDF 32 pp, 887KB) **EPA-450/2-78-051 1978/12**	This document is related to the control of volatile organic compounds (VOC) from gasoline tank trucks and vapor collection systems at bulk terminals, bulk plants and service stations. The intent is to define leak tight conditions and related test procedures for vapor collection systems and tank trucks while loading and unloading at these facilities. VOC emitted from leaks in collection equipment are primarily C_4 and C_5 paraffins and olefins which are photochemically reactive.	415 Transfer and Storage of Gasoline	11/4/1977	5/18/2004	**70 FR 8520 02/22/2005**
COATINGS AND SOLVENTS (ROG)						
Solvent Metal Cleaning	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Solvent Metal Cleaning (PDF 229 pp, 7.0MB) **EPA-450/2-77-022 1977/11**	Applies to organic solvent degreasing operations. The categories are cold cleaners, open top vapor degreasers and conveyorized degreasers.	413 Organic Solvent Degreasing Operations	1/16/2001		**67 FR 67313 11/05/2002**

TABLE 1 - Source Categories, CTG/ACT List and Applicable District Rules

SOURCE CATEGORY	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	FEDERAL REGISTER RULE APPROVAL
COATINGS AND SOLVENTS (ROG)						
Storage of Petroleum Liquids in Fixed Roof Tanks	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Storage of Petroleum Liquids in Fixed-Roof Tanks (PDF 43 pp, 1.1MB) **EPA-450/2-77-036 1977/12**	Control of VOC emissions from the storage of petroleum liquids affecting facilities with fixed roof storage tanks with greater than 150,000 liter **(39,626 gallons)** capacity with a true vapor pressure greater than 10.5 kilo-Pascals. This does not apply to tanks with external floating roofs or storage tanks having capacities less than 1,600,000 liters used to store crude oil.	Rule 414 - Storage of Reactive Organic Compound Liquids	12/11/1979	5/18/2004	73 FR 70883 11/24/2008
Industrial Cleaning Solvents	Control Techniques Guidelines for Industrial Cleaning Solvents (PDF 290 pp, 7.6MB) **EPA-453/R-06-001 2006/09**	This document specifies RACT for industrial cleaning solvents resulting in a an evaluation of sources of VOC emissions from the use of industrial cleaning solvents. This category of consumer and commercial products includes the industrial cleaning solvents used by many industries. It includes such products that are used to remove contaminants such as adhesives, inks, paint, dirt, soil, oil and grease.	417 Organic Solvents	9/14/1999		67 FR 67313 11/05/2002
STATIONARY SOURCE (ROG)						
Cutback Asphalt	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Use of Cutback Asphalt (PDF 18 pp, 481KB) **EPA-450/2-77-037 1977/12**	This document addresses the control of volatile organic compounds (VOC) from paving asphalts liquefied with petroleum distillate. Such liquefied asphalt is generally referred to as cutback asphalt. The substitution of emulsions for cutback asphalt nearly eliminates the release of VOC air pollutants from paving operations. The VOC emitted from the cutback asphalts are photochemically reactive (precursors to oxidants).	426 Cutback Asphalt and Emulsified Paving	9/14/1999		**66 FR 20084 04/19/2001**
Automobile Refinishing	Reduction of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Automobile Refinishing (PDF 112 pp, 896KB) **EPA-450/3-88-009 1988/10**	This document identifies automobile refinishing operations and categorizes them into four process steps. Vehicle preparation, primer application, topcoat application and spray equipment cleanup. The emissions of the VOC's are a result of organic solvent evaporation during vehicle preparation and equipment cleanup and during and shortly after the application of primers and topcoats.	413 Organic Solvent Degreasing Operations	1/16/2001		**67 FR 67313 11/05/2002**
			427 Automotive Refinishing Operations	9/14/1999	2/23/2010	66 FR 50319 Version dated 09/14/1999 approved by EPA on 10/03/2001 02/23/2010 submitted for review

TABLE 1 - Source Categories, CTG/ACT List and Applicable District Rules

SOURCE CATEGORY	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	FEDERAL REGISTER RULE APPROVAL
STATIONARY SOURCE (ROG)						
Aerospace	Aerospace MACT (PDF 37 pp, 5.6MB) **59 FR-29216 6/06/94 1994/06**	This limits the emissions of hazardous air pollutants (HAP) from new and existing commercial, civil and military aerospace original equipment manufacturing (OEM) and rework facilities that are major sources of HAP emissions. **Note – See also EPA-453/R-97-004.**	Rule 425 Aerospace Coating Operations	8/5/1989	2/23/2010	70 FR 28826 Version dated 05/18/2004 approved by EPA on 05/19/2005 02/23/2010 submitted for review
Aerospace	Aerospace (CTG & MACT) (PDF 62 pp, 288KB) **EPA-453/R-97-004 1997/12**	This documents explains the Control Techniques for the control of VOC emissions from coatings and solvents used in the aerospace industry. - Supersedes any potential applicability of the Miscellaneous Metal Part and Products requirements for manufacturing **Note – See also 59 FR-29216, June 6, 1994.**	Rule 425 Aerospace Coating Operations	8/5/1989	2/23/2010	70 FR 28826 Version dated 05/18/2004 approved by EPA on 05/19/2005 02/23/2010 submitted for review
STATIONARY SOURCE NOx						
Stationary Combustion Turbines	NOx Emissions from Stationary Combustion Turbines (PDF 399 pp, 1.2MB) **EPA-453/R-93-007 1993/01**	This document identifies as a category stationary gas turbines as emitting more than 25 tons of Nitrogen oxide (NOx) per year. NOx emission levels and ACT must be analyzed for applicability for every gas turbine according to the size and design of the turbine, the operating duty cycle, site conditions, and other site-specific factors must be taken into considertion.	400 Fuel Burning Equipment - Oxides of Nitrogen	2/21/1972	9/14/1999	68 FR 14161 Version dated 9/14/1999 approved by EPA on 03/24/2003
			400.1 Stationary Gas Turbines	2/23/2010		**Submitted to EPA for review**
			403 General Limitations on the Discharge of Air Contaminants	11/19/1985	5/18/2004	69 FR 67058 11/16/2004

TABLE 1 - Source Categories, CTG/ACT List and Applicable District Rules

SOURCE CATEGORY	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	FEDERAL REGISTER RULE APPROVAL
STATIONARY SOURCE NOx						
Process Heaters	NOx Emissions from Process Heaters (PDF 277 pp, 2.5MB) **EPA-453/R-93-034 1993/09** Note **– Revised September 1993.**	This document has identified process heaters as a category which emits more than 25 tons of nitrogen oxide (NOx) per year. This document identifies ACT for the control of NOx emissions from prcess heaters.	403 General Limitations on the Discharge of Air Contaminants	11/19/1985	5/18/2004	69 FR 67058 11/16/2004
			400.2 Boilers, Process Heaters and Steam Generators	2/23/2010		**Submitted to EPA for review**
Stationary Internal Combustion Engines	NOx Emissions from Stationary Internal Combustion Engines (PDF 340 pp, 13.3MB) **EPA-453/R-93-032 1993/07 Note – Updated September 2000.**	This document identifies stationary reciprocating engines as emitting more than 25 tons of nitrogen oxide (NOx) per year. The ACT and corresponding achievable Nox emission levels may not be applicable for every reciprocating engine application. The size and design of the engine, the operating duty cycle, site conditions and other site-specific factors must be taken into consideration and the suitability of an alternative control technique must be determined on a case by case basis.	400 Fuel Burning Equipment - Oxides of Nitrogen	2/21/1972	9/14/1999	68 FR 14161 Version dated 9/14/1999 approved by EPA on 03/24/2003
			403 General Limitations on the Discharge of Air Contaminants	11/19/1985	5/18/2004	69 FR 67058 11/16/2004
Cement Manufacturing	NOx Emissions from Cement Manufacturing (PDF 198 pp, 624KB) **EPA-453/R-94-004 1994/03 Note – Updated September 2000.**	This document identifies cement kilns as a stationary source which emits more than 25 tons of nitrogen oxide (NOx) per year. There are four different types of cement kilns used in the industry: long wet kiln, long dry kilns, kilns with a preheater and kilns with a precalciner.	400 Fuel Burning Equipment - Oxides of Nitrogen	2/21/1972	9/14/1999	68 FR 14161 Version dated 9/14/1999 approved by EPA on 03/24/2003
			403 General Limitations on the Discharge of Air Contaminants	11/19/1985	5/18/2004	69 FR 67058 11/16/2004

TABLE 1 - Source Categories, CTG/ACT List and Applicable District Rules

SOURCE CATEGORY	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	FEDERAL REGISTER RULE APPROVAL
STATIONARY SOURCE NOx						
Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Boilers	NOx Emissions from Industrial, Commercial & Institutional Boilers (PDF 589 pp, 776KB) **EPA-453/R-94-022 1994/03**	This document identifies industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) boilers as source categories which emit more than 25 tons of oxides of nitrogen (NOx) per year. ICI boilers include steam and hot water generators, the applications for these boilers range from commercial space heating to proces steam generation. The furnace design, method of fuel firing, condition of existing equipment, operating duty cycle, site conditions, and other site-specific factors must be taken into consideration to properly evaluate the applicability and performance of any given control technique.	403 General Limitations on the Discharge of Air Contaminants	11/19/1985	5/18/2004	69 FR 67058 11/16/2004
			400.2 Boilers, Process Heaters and Steam Generators	2/23/2010		**Submitted to EPA for review**
Utility Boilers	Alternative Control Techniques Document – NOx Emissions from Utility Boilers (PDF 538 pp, 18.8MB) **EPA-453/R-94-023 1994/03**	This document identifies fossil fuel fired utility boilers as sources which emit more than 25 tons of nitrogen oxide (NOx) per year. Three principal NOx forms are "thermal" NOx, "prompt" NOx, and "fuel" NOx. Thermal and fuel NOx account for the majority of the NOx formed in coal - and oil-fired utility boilers.	403 General Limitations on the Discharge of Air Contaminants	11/19/1985	5/18/2004	69 FR 67058 11/16/2004
			400.2 Boilers, Process Heaters and Steam Generators	2/23/2010		**Submitted to EPA for review**

TABLE 1 - Source Categories, CTG/ACT List and Applicable District Rules

SOURCE CATEGORY	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	FEDERAL REGISTER RULE APPROVAL
STATIONARY SOURCE NOx						
Stationary Sources - Second Edition	Control Techniques for Nitrogen Oxides Emissions from Stationary Sources – Second Edition (PDF 396 pp, 14.0MB) EPA-450/1-78-001 1978/01 **Note – This document is the second edition of the EPA document entitled: Control Techniques for Nitrogen Oxides Emissions**	This guidance document stress the importance of equipment process conditions and fuel type as important in the determination of Nox emissions, the characterization of emissions and the evaluation of control potential. Detailed classification of stationary sources according to factors known to influence NOx formation.	400 Fuel Burning Equipment - Oxides of Nitrogen	2/21/1972	9/14/1999	68 FR 14161 Version dated 9/14/1999 approved by EPA on 03/24/2003
			400.1 Stationary Gas Turbines	2/23/2010		**Submitted to EPA for review**
			400.2 Boilers, Process Heaters and Steam Generators	2/23/2010		**Submitted to EPA for review**
			403 General Limitations on the Discharge of Air Contaminants	11/19/1985	5/18/2004	69 FR 67058 11/16/2004

TABLE 2 - CTG/ACT Listing with no applicable sources

POLLUTANT	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	APPLIED SOURCES
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources – Volume II: Surface Coating of Cans, Coils, Paper, Fabrics, Automobiles, and Light-Duty Trucks (PDF 232 pp, 2.7MB) **EPA-450/2-77-008 1977/05**	Applies to Automobile and light duty truck, can, coil, fabric and paper coating operations. The limitations are stated in terms of solvent content of the coating and are different for the Can Industry, Coil Coating Industry, Fabric Coating, Paper Coating and Automotive and Light Duty Truck Assembly Plants. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County.	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Refinery Vacuum Producing Systems, Wastewater Separators, and Process Unit Turnarounds (PDF 50 pp, 1.3MB) **EPA-450/2-77-025 1977/10**	Control of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) from petroleum refineries specifically vacuum producing systems, wastewater separators and process unit turnarounds. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources – Volume III: Surface Coating of Metal Furniture (PDF 66 pp, 1.9MB) **EPA-450/2-77-032 1977/12**	VOC reductions of surface coating of metal furniture. Metal furniture includes any furniture made of metal or any metal part which will be assembled with other metal, wood, fabric, plastic or glass parts to form a furniture piece. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources – Volume IV: Surface Coating of Insulation of Magnet Wire (PDF 44 pp, 1.1MB) **EPA-450/2-77-033 1977/12**	VOC emissions from wire coating ovens. Magnet wire coating to electrical insulating varnish or enamel to aluminum or copper wire for use in electrical machinery. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	**No current Rule**			**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources – Volume V: Surface Coating of Large Appliances (PDF 70 pp, 2.1MB) **EPA-450/2-77-034 1977/12**	Applies to large appliance industry. VOC emissions from coating of these large appliances. Coatings are typically, epoxy, expoyacrylic, acrylic or polyester enamels. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources – Volume VI: Surface Coating of Miscellaneous Metal Parts and Products (PDF 82 pp, 2.6MB) **EPA-450/2-78-015 1978/06**	This document deals with the surface coating of miscellaneous metal parts and products, and is intended to provide guidance on VOC emission control for job shop and original equipment manufacturing (OEM) industries which apply coatings on metal substrates. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	**No current Rule**			**No Sources**

TABLE 2 - CTG/ACT Listing with no applicable sources

POLLUTANT	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	APPLIED SOURCES
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources – Volume VII: Factory Surface Coating of Flat Wood Paneling (PDF 66 pp, 2.0MB) **EPA-450/2-78-032 1978/06**	It deals with the surface coating of metal furniture. "Metal furniture" includes any furniture made of metal of any metal part which will be assembled with other metal, wood, fabric, plastic or glass parts to form a furniture piece. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Compound Leaks from Petroleum Refinery Equipment (PDF 78 pp, 6.0MB) **EPA-450/2-78-036 1978/06**	This document addresses the control of volatile organic compounds (VOC) from equipment leaks in petroleum refineries . Equipment considered includes pump seals, compressor seals, seal oil degassing vents, pipeline valves, flanges and other connections There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Manufacture of Synthesized Pharmaceutical Products (PDF 134 pp, 3.8MB) **EPA-450/2-78-029 1978/12**	This report deals with volatile organic emissions from the production of synthesized pharmaceutical products. The pharmaceutical industry uses many volatile organic compounds either as raw materials or as solvents. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	**No current Rule**			**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Manufacture of Pneumatic Rubber Tires (PDF 72 pp, 1.6MB) **EPA-450/2-78-030 1978/12**	This document is concerned with emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) from rubber tire manufacturing plants and applicable air pollution control technology. Tire manufacture includes passenger car, light and medium duty truck tires There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources – Volume VIII: Graphic Arts-Rotogravure and Flexography (PDF 64 pp, 1.9MB) **EPA-450/2-78-033 1978/12**	The report deals with VOC emissions from the graphic arts operations which utilize inks containing volatile organic solvents. This guideline is applicable to both the flexogrphic and totogravure processes as applied to both publication and packaging printing. It does not apply to offset Lithography or letterpress printing. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**

TABLE 2 - CTG/ACT Listing with no applicable sources

POLLUTANT	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	APPLIED SOURCES
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Large Petroleum Dry Cleaners (PDF 174 pp, 5.0MB) **EPA-450/3-82-009 1982/09**	Identifies petroleum dry cleaners as offered by industrial and commercial operations only. It is described as a service industry involved in cleaning and/or renting of articles ranging from personal clothing to mops and mats. The model plants were based on 15.5 to 45 kg VOC per 100 kg of clothes cleaned. Typically, dry cleaning plants are classified by their throughputs, which are reflected in the type and size of equipment present. There are no known industrial size sources of this magnitude in Imperial County.	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Manufacture of High-Density Polyethylene, Polypropylene, and Polystyrene Resins (PDF 308 pp, 14.0MB) **EPA-450/3-83-008 1983/11**	The manufacturing process of high-density polyethylene, polypropylene and polyetyrene. Raw material storage and preparation. The polymerization reaction and material recovery. Product finishing and storage. Fabrication, blending or formation of resin materials. There are no known sources in Imperial County	**No current Rule**			**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Compound Equipment Leaks from Natural Gas/Gasoline Processing Plants (PDF 194 pp, 6.3MB) **EPA-450/3-83-007 1983/12**	This document applies to natural gas/gasoline processing plants. The gas may be compressed at field stations for the purpose of transporting to a treatment or processing facility. There are no known sources in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Compound Leaks from Synthetic Organic Chemical Polymer and Resin Manufacturing Equipment (PDF 148 pp, 6.2MB) **EPA-450/3-83-006 1984/03**	This document applies to equipment in process units operated to produce one or more of the synthetic organic chemicals listed in Appendix E of the proposed standards of performance for SOCMI and polymer manufacturing industries. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Air Oxidation Processes in Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industry (PDF 259 pp, 9.4MB) **EPA-450/3-84-015 1984/12**	This document describes the air oxidation industry structure, its processes and the associated emissions. Includes Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industries as well as those industries which combine ammonia and air or halogens and air. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**

TABLE 2 - CTG/ACT Listing with no applicable sources

POLLUTANT	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	APPLIED SOURCES
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Reactor Processes and Distillation Operations in Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industry (PDF 277 pp, 8.7MB) **EPA-450/4-91-031 1993/08**	RACT for the control of Volatile Organic Compound emissions from two types of process vents occurring at plants in the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industry: Reactors (other than those involving air oxidation processes) and distillation. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) Subpart NNN, Subpart RRR	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Wood Furniture Manufacturing Operations (PDF 288 pp, 13.8MB) **EPA-453/R-96-007 1996/04**	This document identifies the Wood Furniture Industry and those products manufactured of wood and wood products. The document identifies the low-, medium-, and high-end furniture designations. In addition, the finishing process and the application techniques. **Note – Wood Furniture (CTG-MACT) – Draft MACT out 5-1994; Final CTG issued 4-1996. See also 61 FR-25223, May 20, 1996 and 61 FR-50823, September 27, 1996.** There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	**No current Rule**			**No Sources**
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Shipbuilding and Ship Repair Operations (Surface Coating) (PDF 30 pp, 4.0MB) **61 FR-44050 8/27/96 1996/08**	This document identifies the Control Technologies for the control of Volatile Organic Control (VOC) emissions from surface coating operations in the shipbuilding and ship repair industry. **Note – See also EPA-453/R-94-032.** There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	**No current Rule**			**No Sources**
VOC	Aerospace MACT (PDF 37 pp, 5.6MB) **59 FR-29216 6/06/94 1994/06**	This limits the emissions of hazardous air pollutants (HAP) from new and existing commercial, civil and military aerospace original equipment manufacturing (OEM) and rework facilities that are major sources of HAP emissions. **Note – See also EPA-453/R-97-004.** There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	Rule 425 Aerospace Coating Operations	8/5/1989	2/23/2010	**No Sources**

TABLE 2 - CTG/ACT Listing with no applicable sources

POLLUTANT	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	APPLIED SOURCES
VOC	Aerospace (CTG & MACT) (PDF 62 pp, 288KB) **EPA-453/R-97-004 1997/12**	This documents explains the Control Techniques for the control of VOC emissions from coatings and solvents used in the aerospace industry. - Supersedes any potential applicability of the Miscellaneous Metal Part and Products requirements for manufacturing **Note – See also 59 FR-29216, June 6, 1994.** There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	Rule 425 Aerospace Coating Operations	8/5/1989	2/23/2010	**No Sources**
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Offset Lithographic Printing and Letterpress Printing (PDF 52 pp, 349KB) **EPA-453/R-06-002 2006/09**	This document provides control recommendations for reducing VOC emissions stemming from the use of fountain solutions, cleaning materials and inks in offset lithographic printing and cleaning materials and inks in letterpress printing. The threshold trigger for regulation according to the CTG is when Offset Lithographic Printing and Letterpress Printing operations emit at least 6.8 kg/day (15 lb/day) of actual emissions. There are no known sources equalling or meeting the CTG threshold in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**[a]
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Flexible Package Printing (PDF 33 pp, 216KB) **EPA-453/R-06-003 2006/09**	This Control Technology Guideline recommends the reduction of VOC emissions from inks, coatings, adhesives and cleaning materials used in flexible packaging printing. The threshold trigger for regulation according to the CTG is when flexible packaging printing operations emit at least 6.8 kg/day (15 lb/day) of actual emissions. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	**No current Rule**			**No Sources**
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Flat Wood Paneling Coatings (PDF 27 pp, 212KB) **EPA-453/R-06-004 2006/09**	The control of VOC emissions from surface coating operations that include flat wood paneling. Applies to facilities that apply flat wood paneling coatings that emit at least 6.8 kg/day of VOC before consideration of controls. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	**No current Rule**			**No Sources**

TABLE 2 - CTG/ACT Listing with no applicable sources

POLLUTANT	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	APPLIED SOURCES
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Paper, Film, and Foil Coatings (PDF 102 pp, 488KB) **EPA 453/R-07-003 2007/09**	This document recommends techniques for the control of VOC emissions stemming from the use of coatings in paper, film and foil surface coating operations. These controls apply to facilities with a total actual VOC emissions from all paper, film and foil There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	**No current Rule**			**No Sources**
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Large Appliance Coatings (PDF 44 pp, 374KB) **EPA 453/R-07-004 2007/09**	This document recommends techniques for the control of VOC emissions stemming from the use of coatings in large appliance coating operations. Coatings include paints, sealants, caulks, inks, adhesives and maskants. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Metal Furniture Coatings (PDF 100 pp, 293KB) **EPA 453/R-07-005 2007/09**	This document recommends techniques for the control of VOC emissions stemming from the use of coatings in metal furniture surface coating operations. Coatings include paints, sealants, caulks, inks, adhesives and maskants. There are no known sources of this type in Imperial County	1101 - New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	9/14/1999		**No Sources**
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Miscellaneous Metal and Plastic Parts Coatings **EPA 453/R-08-003 2008/09**	This CTG provides control recommendations for reducing VOC emissions from the use of coatings in miscellaneous metal products and miscellaneous plastic parts surface coating operations. The CTG applies to manufacturers of miscellaneous metal and plastic parts that surface-coat the parts they produce. An example of product type are fabricated metal products, molded platic parts, small and large farm machinery, pleasure craft, laboratory and medical equipment etc.	No current Rule			**No Sources**
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Fiberglass Boat Manufacturing Materials **EPA 453/R-08-004**	This CTG provides control rcommendations for reducing VOC emissions from the use of gel coats, resins, and materials used to clean application equipment in fiberglass boat manufacturing operations	No current Rule			**No Sources**

TABLE 2 - CTG/ACT Listing with no applicable sources

POLLUTANT	REFERENCED DOCUMENT	APPLICABILITY	ICAPCD RULE	DATE ADOPTED	LAST AMENDED	APPLIED SOURCES
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Miscellaneous Industrial Adhesives **EPA 453/R-08-005**	This CTG provides control recommendations for reducing VOC emissions from miscellaneous industrial adhesives and adhesive primer application processes. The miscellaneous industrial adhesives product category does notinclude adhesives that are addressed by CTG's already issued for categories listed under CAA Section 183(e) or by earlier CTG's	No current Rule			**No Sources**
VOC	Control Techniques Guidelines for Automobile and Light-Duty Truck Assembly Coatings **EPA 453/R-08-006**	This CTG provides cotnrol recommendations fro reducing VOC emissions stemming from the use of coatings in automobile and light-duty truck assembly coating operations. All automobile and light-duty truck surface coating facilities within an ozone non-attainment area are considered as emitting above the set threshold of 6.8 Kg/day (15 lb/day) of VOC or more.	No current Rule			**No Sources**

[a]The Air District examined potential sources and did not find any of these entities falling within the RACT recommendations for the identified CTG.

TABLE 3 - MAJOR SOURCES IN IMPERIAL COUNTY

POLLUTANT	FACILITY	PERMIT NUMBER	Evaluated Rules which apply to Major Source facilities in Imperial County															
			109	110	207*	400	400.1	400.2	403	413	414	415	416	417	425	426	427	1022
NOx	Imperial Irrigation District (Rockwood)	1365		√	√	√	√	√	√									
NOx	Holly Sugar	1697			√	√	√	√	√									
NOx	Imperial Valley Resource Recovery	1929	√	√	√	√	√	√	√									
NOx	Imperial Irrigation District (ECGS)	2152		√	√	√	√	√	√									
NOx	USG	2834			√	√			√			√						
VOC	ORMAT Nevada, Inc	1641	√		√													
VOC	CalEnergy	1894			√													
VOC	GEM Resources (ORMESA,LLC)	2002			√				√									
VOC	SFPP, L.P.	2046			√		√	√	√		√	√						

* Rule 207, New and Modified Stationary Source Review was submitted to EPA for review on 05/26/2000, to date EPA has not acted on the Rule

TABLE 4 - District Rules Evaluated for RACT SIP

Rule Number	Title	CTG/ACT?	Original Adoption Date	Date Last Amended	FR Publication Date	Federal Register Rule Approval
Regulation 1 - General Provisions						
100	Rule Citation	**NO**	9/14/1999		10/10/2001	66 FR 51578
101	Definitions *CARB REVIEW PENDING SUBMITTAL TO EPA*	**NO**	1/11/2005	10/10/2006 2/23/2010	11/15/2007	72 FR 64156
102	Public Records	**NO**	11/19/1985		2/3/1989	54 FR 5448
103	Inspection of Public Records	**NO**	Prior to 11/04/1977	9/14/1999	8/11/1978	43 FR 35694
104	Administrative Penalties	**NO**	Prior to 11/04/1977	9/14/1999		
106	Abatement	**NO**	Prior to 11/04/1977	9/14/1999		
107	Land Use	**NO**	Prior to 1/04/1977	9/14/1999	8/11/1978	43 FR 35694
109	Source Sampling	**NO**	Prior to 11/04/1977	9/14/1999	8/10/2001	66 FR 42126
110	Stack Monitoring	**NO**	11/19/1985	9/14/1999	8/10/2001	66 FR 42126
112	Notice to Comply	**NO**	4/4/2000			
113	Circumvention	**NO**	11/19/1985	9/14/1999	10/10/2001	66 FR 51578
114	Severability Clause	**NO**	Prior to 11/04/1977	9/14/1999	8/11/1978	43 FR 35694
115	Legal Application and Incorporation of Other Regulations	**NO**	11/19/1985	9/14/1999	3/21/2003	68 FR 13846
116	Emissions Statement and Certification	**NO**	2/23/2010	*Under review by CARB pending submittal to EPA*		
Regulation 2 - Permits						
201	Permits Required	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979	10/10/2006	1/3/2007	72 FR 9
202	Exemptions (Use to be 402)	**NO**	Prior to 11/19/1985	10/10/2006	2/3/1989	54 FR 5448
203	Transfer	**NO**	11/19/1985	9/14/1999	1/3/2007	72 FR 9
204	Applications	**NO**	11/19/1985	9/14/1999		
205	Cancellation of Applications	**NO**	11/19/1985	9/14/1999	1/3/2007	72 FR 9
206	Processing of Applications	**NO**	2/21/1972	10/10/2006	1/3/2007	72 FR 9
207[b]	New & Modified Stationary Source Review	**NO**	Prior to 03/17/1980	9/14/1999	10/12/1983	Proposed Conditional App By EPA
207-1	Federal Major Modification	**NO**	10/10/2006			
208	Permit to Operate	**NO**	11/19/1985	9/14/1999	1/3/2007	72 FR 9
209	Implementation Plans	**NO**	11/19/1985	9/14/1999	11/10/1980	45 FR 74480
210	Denial of Application	**NO**	3/17/1980	9/14/1999		
211	Appeals	**NO**	Prior to 02/21/1972	9/14/1999		

TABLE 4 - District Rules Evaluated for RACT SIP

Rule Number	Title	CTG/ACT?	Original Adoption Date	Date Last Amended	FR Publication Date	Federal Register Rule Approval
212	Annual Renewal	NO	11/19/1985	9/14/1999		
213	Temporary Permit To Operate	NO	9/14/1999			
214	Emission Reduction Credit Banking	NO	9/7/1993	10/10/2006		
214-1	Mobile Source Emission Reduction Credit Banking	NO	10/10/2006			
215	Community Bank & Priority Reserve	NO	9/7/1993	9/14/1999		
216	Construction or Reconstruction of Major Stationary Sources that Emit Hazardous Air Pollutants	NO	6/23/1998			
217	Large Confined Animal Facilities Permits Required	NO	10/10/2006			
Regulation 4 - Prohibitions						
400	Fuel Burning Equipment	YES	11/19/1985	9/14/1999	3/24/2003	68 FR 14161
400.1	Stationary Gas Turbine(s) - Reasonably Available Control Technology	YES	*CARB review pending EPA submittal*			
400.2	Boilers, Process heaters and Steam Generators	YES	*CARB review pending EPA submittal*			
401	Opacity of Emissions	NO	11/19/1985	9/14/1999	2/2/1989	54 FR 5448
403	General Limitations on the Discharge of Air Contaminants	YES	11/19/1985	5/18/2004	11/16/2004	69 FR 67058
405	Sulfur Compounds Emissions Standards, Limitations and Prohibitions	NO	9/14/1999	5/18/2004	11/16/2004	69 FR 67058
407	Nuisances	NO			5/31/1972	37 FR 10842
408	Frost Protection & Orchard Heaters	NO	11/9/1982	9/14/1999	7/11/2001	66 FR 36170
409	Incinerators	NO	11/9/1982	9/14/1999	7/11/2001	66 FR 36170
412	Soil Decontamination Operations	NO	1/16/2001		11/5/2002	67 FR 67313
413	Organic Solvent Cleaning	YES	1/16/2001		11/5/2002	67 FR 67313
414	Storage of Organic Liquids at Terminals & Bulk Loading Facilities	YES	12/11/1979	5/18/2004	11/24/2008	73 FR 70883
415	Transfer and Storage of Gasoline	YES	9/14/1999	5/18/2004	2/22/2005	70 FR 8520
416	Oil Effluent Water Separator	YES	12/11/1979	9/14/1999	7/26/2001	66 FR 38939
417	Organic Solvents	YES	Prior to 11/04/1977	9/14/1999	11/5/2002	67 FR 67313
418	Disposal & Evaporation of Solvents	NO	6/6/1972	9/14/1999	1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
419	Reduction of Animal Matter	NO	11/4/1977	9/14/1999	1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
420	Beef Feedlots formerly Livestock Feed Yards	NO	11/19/1985	10/10/2006	2/26/2003	68 FR 8839
421	Open Burning	NO	11/19/1985	9/14/1999	7/11/2001	66 FR 36170
424	Architectural Coatings *CARB REVIEW PENDING SUBMITTAL TO EPA*	NO	11/9/1982	2/23/2010	1/4/2007	72 FR 267
425	Aerospace Coating Operations[a] *CARB REVIEW PENDING SUBMITTAL TO EPA*	YES	9/14/1999	2/23/2010	5/19/2005	70 FR 28826
426	Cutback Asphalt and Emulsified Paving Materials	YES	9/14/1999		4/19/2001	66 FR 20084
427	Automotive Refinishing Operations *CARB REVIEW PENDING SUBMITTAL TO EPA*	YES	9/14/1999	2/23/2010	10/3/2001	66 FR50319

TABLE 4 - District Rules Evaluated for RACT SIP

Rule Number	Title	CTG/ACT?	Original Adoption Date	Date Last Amended	FR Publication Date	Federal Register Rule Approval
Regulation 6 - Emergency Regulations						
601	General	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
602	Episode Criteria Levels	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
603	Episode Stages	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
604	Division of Responsibility for Abatement Action	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
605	Administration of Emergency	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
606	Advisory of High Air Pollution	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
607	Declaration of Episode	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
608	Episode Action State 1 (Health Advisory - Alert)	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
609	Episode Action Stage 2 (Warning)	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
610	Episode Action Stage 3	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
611	Episode Termination	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
612	Stationary Source Curtailment	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
613	Episode Abatement Plan	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
614	Enforcement	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979		1/27/1981	46 FR 8472
Regulation 7 - Agricultural Burning						
701	Agricultural Burning	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979	9/14/1999	1/31/2003	68 FR 4929
702	Range Improvement Burning	**NO**	Prior to 10/15/1979	9/14/1999	7/11/2001	66 FR 36170
Regulation 8 - Fugitive Dust Emissions						
800	Fugitive Dust Requirements for Control of Fine Particulate Matter (PM-10)	**NO**	10/10/1994	11/8/2005		
801	Construction and Earthmoving Activities	**NO**	11/8/2005			
802	Bulk Materials	**NO**	11/8/2005			
803	Carry-Out and Track-Out	**NO**	11/8/2005			

TABLE 4 - District Rules Evaluated for RACT SIP

Rule Number	Title	CTG/ACT?	Original Adoption Date	Date Last Amended	FR Publication Date	Federal Register Rule Approval
804	Open Areas	**NO**	11/8/2005			
805	Paved and Unpaved Roads	**NO**	11/8/2005			
806	Conservation Management Practices	**NO**	11/8/2005			
Regulation 9						
900	Procedures for Issuing Permits to Operate for Sources Subject to Title V of the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990	**NO**	12/14/1993	6/26/2001		
901	Acid Deposition Control	**NO**	3/21/1995			
902	Request for Synthetic Minor Source Status	**NO**	8/22/1995			
903	Potential to Emit	**NO**	8/22/1995			
910	Enhanced Monitoring	**NO**	3/21/1995			
925	Conformity	**NO**	11/29/1994		4/23/1999	64 FR 19916
926	Transportation Conformity	**NO**	12/13/1994			
Regulation 10						
1001	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS)	**NO**	9/14/1999			
1002	California AirBorne Toxic Control Measures	**NO**	9/14/1999	11/8/2005		
1003	Hexavalent Chromium Emissions from Cooling Towers	**NO**	8/30/1994	9/14/1999		
1022	Perchloroethylene AirBorne Toxic Control Measure - Dry Cleaning Operations	**YES**	3/21/1995			
Regulation 11						
1101	New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	**NO**	9/14/1999			

a No sources in operation in Imperial County

b Revision submitted to EPA pending Action by EPA

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	400	474	No General NOx Rule	4301	474
TITLE	Fuel Burning Equipment	Fuel Burning Equipment		Fuel Burning Equipment	Fuel Burning Equipment - Oxides of Nitrogen
ADOPTED	2/21/1972	5/7/1976		5/21/1992	5/7/1976
LAST AMENDED	Sep 14, 1999	Aug 25, 1997		Dec 17, 1992	Dec 04, 1981
EMISSIONS LIMITS	140 lbs/hr Nitrogen Oxides (NO_2)	125 ppm by volume (ppmv) when operated on gaseous fuel; 225 ppmv when operated on liquid and/or solid fuels		Combustion point of discharge, 0.1 grain per cubic foot of gas calculated to 12% of carbon dioxide at dry standard conditions. 200lbs/hr of sulfur compounds ($SO_{2)}$; 140 lbs/hr of nitrogen oxides (NO_2); Ten (10) lbs/hr of combustion contaminants as defined in Rule 1020 (Definitions)	3% oxygen on a dry basis averaged over a minimum of 15 consecutive minutes: Ranges GAS: 300 ppm to 125 ppm and LIQUID or SOLID: 400 ppm to 225 ppm based on level of Kilogram Thermal Calories of 140 to ±540 or British Thermal Units of 555 to ±2143. Steam (NO2) calculated at 3% oxygen on a dry basis averaged over a minimum of 15 minutes: GAS 125 ppm LIQUID or SOLID 225 ppm based on Kilogram Calories of 140 or more and British Termal Units of 555 or more.
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	05/31/1972	01/11/1999		05/18/1999	07/06/1982
FEDERAL REGISTER	37 FR 10842	64 FR 1517		64 FR 26876	47 FR 29231

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	400.1	1159	74.23	4703	1134 1135
TITLE	Stationary Gas Turbine(s) - Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT)	Stationary Gas Turbines	Stationary Gas Turbines	Stationary Gas Turbines	Emission of Oxides of Nitrogen from Stationary Gas Turbines Emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen from Electric Power Generating Systems
ADOPTED	2/23/2010	2/22/1995	3/14/1995	8/18/1994	*8/4/1989
LAST AMENDED		Sep 28, 2009	Jan 08, 2002	Sep 20, 2007	Aug 08, 1997 Jul 19, 1991
EMISSIONS LIMITS	Applies to new or existing Stationary Gas Turbines of 1 megawatt (MW) and/or larger -NOx limits on any new or existing Stationary Gas Turbine(s) - 42 ppmv when operated on a gaseous fuel. 65 ppmv when operated on a liquid fuel except when operating less than 400 hours per calendar year or during startup, shutdown or a change in load	Applies to new or existing non-utility, commercial, industrial or institutional Stationary Gas Turbine of 0.3 MW and larger - Units operating > 877 hrs/yr with ratings > 10 MW NOx Limits are 5ppmv for gas fuel, 25ppmv for liquid fuel. Units 2-10MW range between 25-35ppmv for gas fuel and 65ppmv for liquid fuel.	Applies to all stationary gas turbines rated 0.3 MW or greater - 0.3 and less 42 ppmv for gaseous fuel and 65ppmv for liquid. Greater than 0.3 but <10.0 25x E/25ppmv for gaseous fuel and 65ppmv for liquid.	Applies to all stationary gas turbines with ratings of 0.3 MW or greater - Tier 1 Limits 4MW and > operating <877 hrs/yr and units Units >.3 <10 operating ≥877 hrs/yr 42ppmv for gas and 65 ppmv for oil. Units 10MW and > operating ≥877 hrs/yr range 15xEFF/25 & 9xEFF/25 for gas and 42xEFF/25 & 25xEFF/25 for liquid.	Applies to all existing stationary gas turbines 0.3 MW and > - Units < 2.9MW to over 10MW range in limits from 9ppm to 25ppm. For Rule 1135 District wide Daily limits set for Southern California Edison, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, City of Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	400.1	1159	74.23	4703	1134 1135
		Units <2MW 42ppmv for gas fuel and 50ppmv for liquid fuel. Units operating < 877 hrs/yr and >10 MW 25ppmv for gas fuel and 42ppmv for liquid fuel. - Specific limits apply for specific model turbines belonging to the Southern California Gas Company	Units 10.0 and greater range between 9xE/25 to 15xE/25ppm for gaseous fuel and 25xE/25 to 42xE/25ppm for liquid. Units operating <877 hrs/yr rated at 4.0 and up 42ppmv for gaseous fuel and 65 for liquid fuel. **Where E= unit efficiency.**	Specific unit limits 18xEFF/25 & 50 for gas and 42xEFF/25 & 50 for liquid. Tier 2 Specific model and systems-standard and enhanced limits range between 3ppmvd to 50ppmvd for gas fueland 25ppmvd to 65ppmvd for liquid. Tier 3 operating < or >877 hrs/yr from < 3MW to >10MW limits range from 5ppmvd to 25ppmvd for gas fuel and 25ppmvd to 42ppmvd for liquid fuel.	
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	PENDING	2/22/1995 version approved on 04/09/1996	06/23/2003	10/21/2009	08/01/2000 08/11/1998
FEDERAL REGISTER		61 FR 15719	68 FR 33018	74 FR 53888	65 FR 46876 63 FR 42721

* Both referenced rules have the same adoption date

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SAN JOAQUIN
RULE NUMBER	400.2	1157	74.15	4351	4352
			74.15.1	4305	
TITLE	Boilers, Process heaters and Steam Generators	Boilers and Process Heaters	*Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters	Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters - Phase I	Solid Fuel Fired Boilers, Steam Generators and Process heaters
				Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters - Phase 2	
ADOPTED	2/23/2010	10/26/1994	3/28/1989	10/20/1994	9/14/1994
			5/11/1993	12/16/1993	
LAST AMENDED		May 19, 1997	Nov 08, 1994	* Aug 21, 2003	May 18, 2006
			Jun 13, 2000		
EMISSIONS LIMITS	Applies to new or existing Process Heaters, Boilers or Steam Generators heat input rating of 5 million Btu per hour - NOx limits 30ppmv or 0.036lbs/million Btu on gaseous fuel; 40ppmv or0.052lbs/million Btu on liquid fuels - combined gas and liquid heat-input weighted average of the limits. - ppmv limits at dry stack-gas conditions and 30% volume stack-gas oxygen hrly average.	Applies to new and existing boilers, steam generators, and process heaters rated heat ≥ 5 million Btu/hr - RACT standards, NOx in excess of 70ppmv and/or 0.084lbs/MMBtu of heat input gaseous fuel, NOx in excess of 115ppmv and/or 0.150lbs/MMBtu of heat input liquid or solid fuels, NOx in excess heat input weighted average of the limits in combined gas and liquid and/or solid fuels.	Applies to boilers, steam generators and process heaters ≥ 5 million Btu/hr annual heat input rate ≥ $9x10^9$ Btu's per calendar year - NOx 40ppmv. ≥ 5 million Btu/hr annual heat input rate less $9x10^9$ Btu's/calendar year operational requirements. Rule 74.15.1 applies to ≥ 1 million Btu/hr and < 5 million Btu/hr.- Annual heat input rate ≥ $1.8x10^9$ BTU,	Applies to boiler, steam generator or process heater rated heat input > 5 million Btu/hr (Major NOx source) - less then 9 million Btu/yr operating requirements. Units> 9 million Btu/yr gas fuel 95ppmv, natural & induced 147ppmv; Distillate Oil 115ppmv,natural & Induced 155ppmv; Residual Oil 165ppmc,natural & Induced 194ppmv; Crude oil 165ppmv, natural & Induced 194ppmv.	SOLID FUEL - Municipal Solid Waste, Biomass (Hearth Furnace) and all others Tier I NOx limits 200ppmv, .35 lb/MMBtu and .20 lb/MMBtu. Tier 2 NOx limits 200ppmv, 115ppmv and 115ppmv respectively.

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SAN JOAQUIN
RULE NUMBER	400.2	1157	74.15	4351	4352
			74.15.1	4305	
	≤ 30% annual capacity fact 70ppmv gas and liquid fuel. Biomass - exhaust 120ppmv corrected to 12% 3 hr average. NOx reduced 80% uncontrolled exhaust gas steam.		emissions excess 30ppmv and/or annual heat input rate ≥$0.3x10^9$ BTU	Phase 2- Gas fuel 30ppmv, box or cabin 147ppmv; Liquid fuel 40ppmv, box or cabin 155ppmv. Combined fuels NOx limit heat input weighted average of limits. Phase 3 - not analyzed as it pertains to refineries	
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	PENDING	04/20/1999	02/09/1996	05/18/2004	05/30/2007
			10/10/2001		
FEDERAL REGISTER		64 FR 19277	61 FR 4887	69 FR 28061	72 FR 29886
			66 FR 51576		

* Referenced rules either have the same title or date

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	1146
	1146.1
TITLE	Emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen From Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters
	Emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen From Small Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters
ADOPTED	9/6/1988
	10/5/1990
LAST AMENDED	** Sep 05, 2008
EMISSIONS LIMITS	Applies to units ≥5 million Btu/hr - NOx limits All units gaseous fuel 30ppm, non-gaseous fuels 40ppm, Landfill gas 25ppm, Digester gas 15ppm, Atmospheric units 12ppm: Group I - 5 ppm, Group II and III 9ppm. Enhanced limited are 5ppm. **Rule 1146.1** - NOx limits any units landfill gas 25ppm, and Digester gas 15ppm, Atmospheric units 12ppm. Natural gas 9ppm

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	1146
	1146.1
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	11/17/2000 Version approved on 04/08/2002
	05/13/1994 version approved on 04/06/1995
FEDERAL REGISTER	67 FR 16640
	60 FR 46220

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	413	1104	74.6	4662	1122 1171
TITLE	Organic Solvent Degreasing Operations	Organic Solvent Degreasing Operations	Surface Cleaning and Degreasing	Organic Solvent Degreasing Operations	Solvent Degreasers Solvent Cleaning Operations
ADOPTED	1/16/2001	9/28/1994	5/29/1979	4/11/1991	3/2/1979 8/2/1991
LAST AMENDED			Nov 11, 2003	Sep 20, 2007	Oct 01, 2004
EMISSIONS LIMITS	Design, Control and safety switch requirements: Freeboard height shall provide Freeboard Ratio greater than or equal to 0.75 High Volatility Solvents use of water cover and overall capture and control of 85%	Manufacturer recommendations. No leaks, stored in closed containers, containers must be labeled, disposal according to reclamation service or licensed facility or recycle.	Solvent Cleaning: Maximum limits: ROC composite Partial Pressure 33 mm Hg@20ºC and ROC content 900 grams per liter all other solvent cleaning 25 grams per liter. Cold Cleaners has operating requirements	Till Sep 20, 2008 use non-halogenated cleaning material with VOC content of 50grams VOC per liter solvent or less. Sep 20, 2008 use non-halogenated cleaning material with VOC content of 25grams VOC per liter solvent or less. Design, operation and VOC emission control systems with an overall capture and control efficiency of 85% by weight.	Cold Cleaners, Open-Top Vapor Degreasers, conveyorized degreasers, air-tight and airless cleaning systems with VOC or NESHAP halogenated solvent. Work practice requirements, Design requirements, Cleaning requriements and NESHAP compliance. For Standards Both Batch-Loaded Cold Cleaners and Conveyorized shall have a VOC content of 25grams/liter or less.| Cleaning activity VOC Limits in grams/liter range from 25 to 800 depending on activity.
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	11/05/2002	01/11/1999	01/08/2002 version approved on 6/4/2002	12/20/01 version approved on 07/22/2002	02/08/2006 06/13/1997 on 08/13/1999. Current version under review

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	413	1104	74.6	4662	1122 1171
FEDERAL REGISTER	67 FR 67313	64 FR 1517	67 FR 38396	67 FR 47701	71 FR 6350 64 FR 44134

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	414	463	71.2	4623	463
TITLE	Storage of Reactive Organic Compound	Storage of Organic Liquids	Storage of Reactive Organic Compound	Storage of Organic Liquids	Organic Liquid Storage
ADOPTED	12/11/1979	1/9/1976	6/20/1978	4/11/1991	8/15/1977
LAST AMENDED	May 18, 2004	Nov 02, 1992	Sep 26, 1989	May 19, 2005	May 06, 2005
EMISSIONS LIMITS	No storage with Tank capacity less than 40,000 gallons with a true vapor pressure equal to or greater than .5 lbs/sq inch absolute (psia) must have a submerged fill pipe or a vapor loss control device. Tank capacity greater than or equal to 40,000 with a tue vapor pressure equal to or greater than 1.5 psia must have a vapor control device. Tank capacity of 10,000 or more but less than 20,000 with a 1.5 psia must have a pressure vacuum relief valve. Tank capacity of 20,000 or more but less than 40,000 with a 1.5 psia must have a vapor loss control device. No storage tank with a true vapor pressure equal to or greate than 11.0 without having a working pressure tank.	No storage with Tank capacity 39,630 gallons or less with a true vapor pressue of 77.5 mm Hg (1.5 psia) or greater. Tank capacity more than 39,630 gallons with a true vapor pressure of 77.5 mm Hg (1.5 psia) or greater.	No storage with Tank capacity equal to or less than 40,000 gallons with a modified vapor pressure greater than 0.5 lbs/sq inch absolute (psia) must have a submerged fill pipe or vapor loss control devices. Above ground storage tanks equal to or greater than 10,000 gallons and less than 20,000 gallons for crude oil and ROC liquids with a modified Reid Vapor Pressure of 1.5 psia or greater must have a pressure-vacuum relief valve with minimum pressure and vacuum settings of 90% of the maximum, safe	Tank capcity of 1,100 gallons or greater with ranging true vapor pressure variations between 0.5 psia to greater than 11 psia require relief valve, internal, external floating roofs, vapor recovery systems or pressure vessel. All must be maintained leak free.	Organic liquid tank capacity 75,000 liter or 19,815 gallons or greater and gasoline between 950 liters (251 gallons) and 75,000 liters (19,815 gallons) Tank roof requirements, external floating roof, internal floating type cover, and vapor recovery system

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	414	463	71.2	4623	463
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	Version adopted 05/18/2004 approved 11/24/2008	Superseded by rule 461 by EPA 5/13/1995	12/06/1993	09/13/2005	01/04/2007
FEDERAL REGISTER	73 FR 70883	60 FR 21702	58 FR 64157	70 FR 53937	72 FR 267

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	415	461	70	4621	461
TITLE	Transfer and Storage of Gasoline	Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing	Sorage and Transfer of Gasoline	Gasoline Transfer into Stationary Storage Containers, Delivery Vessels, and Bulk Plants	Gsoline Transfer and Dispensing
ADOPTED	11/4/1977	1/9/1976	6/25/1974	4/11/1991	1/9/1976
LAST AMENDED	May 18, 2004	May 25, 1994	Nov 11, 2003	Dec 20, 2007	Mar 07, 2008
EMISSIONS LIMITS	Stationary container capacity of more than 250 gallons must have permanent submerged fill pipe, phase I Vapor Recovery System, vapor return lines are connected between tank truck and stationary storage container, all lines gravity drained, pressure vacuum relief valve, vapor control systems, vapor pressure of 11 psia or greater not allowed.	Stationary Storage container with a capacity of more than 251 gallons must comply with Rule 463-Storage of Organic Liquids or have a permanent submerged fill pipe and vapor recovery system with 95% recovery, along with proper connection of all lines, hatch openings limited to no more than 3 minutes, gravity drained lines, above ground tanks equipped with dry breaks, no defects.	Storage of gasoline in containers more than 40,000 are regulated by Rule 71.2-Storage of Reactive Organic Compound Liquids. Stationary Storage conatiner with a capacity of more than 250 gallons must have a permanent submerged fill pipe, phase I vapor recovery system preventing 95% displaced vapors, leak free and gravity drained.	Storage at bulk plants greater than 250 gallons but less than 19,800 gallons. Others are 250 gallons and greater. Loading and vapor collection equipment must be leak free. Gasoline storage and liading must have ARB certified permanent submerged fill pipe and ARB certified Phase I vapor recovery system, ARB pressure-vacuum relief valve set at 3.0±0.5 inches and 8.0±2.0 inches water column vacuum relief.	Phase I: Stationary capacity 950 liters (251 gallons) or more - Mobile 454 liters (120 gallons): Underground tanks CARB certified enhanced vapor recovery system with efficiency of 98%. Above ground tanks CARB certified vapor recovery system with efficiency of 95%. All fill tubes and dry breaks have vapor tight caps and seals. Gasoline transfer requires Phase II requirements.

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	415	461	70	4621	461
			Storage tanks greater than 250 gallons must have CARB certified pressure-vacuum relief valve. Phase II vapor recovery required when dispensing into motor vehicles preventing 95% displacement of vapors		
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	02/22/2005	05/03/1995	12/06/1993	Approved 06/18/1998 version on 4/19/2000	Approved 06/13/2005 version on 04/11/2006
FEDERAL REGISTER	70 FR 8520	60 FR 21702	58 FR 64157	65 FR 20912	71 FR 18216

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	416	464	74.8	4625	1176
TITLE	Oil Effluent Water Separator	Oil-Water Separators	Refinery Vacuum Producing Systems, Wastewaster Separators and Process Turnarounds	Wastewater Separators	VOC Emissions from Wastewater Systems
ADOPTED	12/11/1979	5/7/1976	6/19/1979	4/11/1991	11/3/1989
LAST AMENDED	Sep 14, 1999	Aug 25, 1997		Dec 17, 1992	Dec 04, 1981
EMISSIONS LIMITS	Recovery of 200 gallons or more petroleum in any one day from equipment with a Reid vapor pressure of 0.5 lbs/sq inch or greater. Vapor recovery system which reduces the emission of all hydrocarbon vapors and gases into the atmosphere by at least 90% by weight	Vapor loss control devices required; fixed cover or floating cover with required seals and enclosure of liquid contents. All vapors are routed to a control device with an overall control efficiency of at least 90% by weight of VOC's. All forebays must have a fixed cover such that no liquid surface is exposed to the atmosphere. Requirements for covers and fugitive vapor leak constitutes a violation	Use of control equipment such as a firefox, a flare or additions of vapors to refinery fuel gas or feedstocks. Inlet heater or compartment of a wastewater separator must be equipped with a solid cover, a floating cover with specified dimensions. Venting not allowed, uncondensed ROC gases are to the fuel gas system or to a flare.	Must use vapor loss control devices: solid cover all openings sealed and totally enclosed, a floating pontoon or double-deck type cover with closure seals with no holes or tears. The vapor recovery system shall have a control efficiency of at least 90% by weight. All wastewater separator forbays shall be covered.	Wastewater systms and closed vent systems shall not emit VOC emissions greater than 500 ppm above background levels according to specific compliance dates. Several Unit, Equipment, Device and Control requirements.
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	07/26/2001	09/27/1995	04/17/1987	1/2/2008	10/07/2002

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	416	464	74.8	4625	1176
FEDERAL REGISTER	66 FR 38939	60 FR 49772	Unknown	73 FR 48	67 FR 62376

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	417	442	74.6.1	4661	442
TITLE	Organic Solvents	Usage of Solvents	Batch Loaded Vapor Degreasers	Organic Solvents	Usage of Solvents
ADOPTED	11/4/1977	5/7/1976	11/11/2003	5/21/1992	5/7/1976
LAST AMENDED	Sep 14, 1999	Feb 27, 2006	Jul 01, 2004	Sep 20, 2007	Dec 15, 2000
EMISSIONS LIMITS	Solvent exposure to flame, baking or oxidizing: no discharge of more than 15 lbs in ony one day nor more than 3 lbs in any one hour of organic solvent vapors. Using or applying photochemically reactive solvent no discharge of more than 40 lbs in any one day nor more than 8 lbs in any one hour.	No VOC discharge in excess of 540 kilograms (1,190 lbs) per month per facility. No VOC organic solvent excess of 272 kilograms (600 lbs) per day as calculated on a thirty (30) day rolling average. Use of VOC emission collection and control system with a reduction of 85%. Storage shall be in non-absorbent, non-leaking containers kept closed at all times.	No specific limit addressed work practices include freeboard specifications; spray capabilities, condenser flow and switches, automated parts handling systems and control devices such as superheated vapor zone. Minimizing solvent carryout, controlling leaks, storage and disposal.	Solvent subject to heat: no discharge of more than 15 lbs of VOC emissions in any one (1) day. Any VOC emissions control system must be approved by the APCO and have an overall capture and control efficiency of at least 85% by weight. Photochemically reactive solvents: no discharge of more than 40lbs of VOC emissions in any one(1) day. On and after March 21, 2008 no discharge in excess of 833 lbs VOC per calendar month per	No discharge unless emissions reduced by at least 85%. Materials exposed to heat not to exceed 6.5 kilograms (14.3lbs)/day. Materials exposed photochemically are limited to 18 kilogram (39.6lbs)/day. Material not exposed to photochemical reactive solvent~~w~~s are limited to 272 kilograms (600lbs)/day. Effective 01/01/2003 emissions in excess of 833 lbs/month per facility are not allowed.
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	11/05/2002	09/17/2007	11/11/2003 version approved on 10/25/2005	05/16/2002 version approved on 9/16/2003	05/23/2002
FEDERAL REGISTER	67 FR 67313	72 FR 52791	70 FR 61561	68 FR 54167	67 FR 36105

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	424	1113	74.2	4601	1113
TITLE	Architectural Coatings	Architectural Coatings	Architectural Coatings	Architectural Coatings	Architectural Coatings
ADOPTED	11/9/1982	2/20/1979	6/19/1979	4/11/1991	9/2/1977
LAST AMENDED	Jan 11, 2005	Feb 24, 2003	Nov 13, 2001	Oct 31, 2001	Jul 13, 2007
EMISSIONS LIMITS	VOC content limits effective 05/01/2005 Coating limits range from 100 to 730 grams of VOC per liter of Coating. VOC content limits effective 01/01/2011 and 01/01/2012 have coating limits range from 50 to 730 grams of VOC per liter of Coating. Most restrictive VOC content limit applies.	VOC content limits effective 01/01/2004 coating limits range from 100 to 730 grams of VOC per liter of Coating Most restrictive VOC content limit applies	VOC Content Limits effective 01/01/2004 Coating limits range from 120 to 730 grams of VOC per liter of Coating. Most restrictive VOC content limit applies	VOC Content Limits effective 01/01/2004 Coating limits range from 100 to 730 grams of VOC per liter of Coating. Most restrictive VOC content limit applies	VOC Content Limits effective 07/01/2008 Coating limits range from 50 to 730 grams of VOC per liter of Coating. Most restrictive VOC content limit applies
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	01/04/2007 CARB RACT/BARCT Determination last updated 10/1998	01/02/2004	01/02/2004	01/02/2004	11/08/1996 version approved on 6/21/1999
FEDERAL REGISTER	72 FR 267	69 FR 34	69 FR 34	69 FR 34	64 FR 33018

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	425	1118	74.13	4605	1124
TITLE	Aerospace Coating Operations	Aerospace Vehicle Parts and Products Coating Opeations	Aerospace Assembly and Component Manufacturing Operations	Aerospace Assembly and Component Coating Operations	Aerospace Assembly and Component Manufacturing Operations
ADOPTED	8/5/1989	10/28/1996	4/15/1986	12/19/1991	7/6/1979
LAST AMENDED	Feb 23, 2010		Nov 11, 2003	Sep 20, 2007	Sep 21, 2001
EMISSIONS LIMITS	ROC Content Limits for Primers, Coatings, Adhesives, Sealants, Maskants and Lubricants range from 250 to 1000 grams/liter	VOC limits for Primers, Coatings, Adhesives, Sealants, Maskants and Lubricants range from 50 to 1000 grams/liter	ROC Content Limits for Primers, Coatings, Adhesives, Sealants, maskants and Lubricants range from 50 to 1000 grams/liter	VOC limits for Primers, Coatings, Adhesives, Sealants, maskants and Lubricants range from 50 to 1000 grams/liter	VOC Content Limits for Primers, Coatings, Adhesives, Sealants, Maskants and Lubricants range from 250 grams/litter to 1000g/liter
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	05/19/2005 CARB RACT/BARCT Determination last updated 10/1998	08/17/1998	10/25/2005	02/20/2001 version approved on 11/14/2003	08/13/2002
FEDERAL REGISTER	70 FR 28826	63 FR 43884	70 FR 61561	68 FR 64537	67 FR 52611

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	426	1103	74.4	4641	1108 1108.1
TITLE	Cutback Asphalt and Emulsified Paving Materials	Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt	Cutback Asphalt	Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt, paving and Maintenance Operations	Cutback Asphalt Emulsified Asphalt
ADOPTED	2/10/1981	12/21/1994	6/19/1979	4/11/1991	5/4/1979 8/3/1979
LAST AMENDED	Sep 14, 1999		Jul 05, 1983	Dec 17, 1992	Feb 01, 1985 Nov 04, 1983
EMISSIONS LIMITS	Not use Rapid, Medium, Slow cure Cutback Asphalt or Emulsified Asphalt containing petroleum solvents in excess of 3% by volume	Not use Rapid cure cutback asphalt; medium cure cutback asphalt or slow cure cutback asphalt containing more than 0.5% by volume of VOC which evaporates at 260ºC (500ºF) as determined by ASTM Method D244-92.	Not use Rapid cure cutback asphalt; except when used solely as a penetrating prime coat or where the National Weather Service official forecast of the high temperature for the 24-hour period following applications. Road oils used for highway or street paving or maintenance applications shall contain no more than 0.5% of organic compounds which boil at less than 500ºF as determined by ASTM D402.	Not use for penetrating prime coat, tack coat, dust palliative, or other paving and maintenance operations Rapid cure cutback asphalt, medium cure cutback asphalt or Slow cure asphalt containing more than 1/2 (0.5)% of organic compounds which evaporate at 500ºF or Emulsified asphalt containing organic compounds in excess of three(3)% by volume which evaporates at 500ºF or lower.	Not use, sell or offer for sale cutback asphalt containing more than 0.5% by volume organic compound which evaporates at 260ºC (500ºF) or lower as determined by ASTM Method D402 or other test method as approved by the Executive Officer. |No emulsified asphalt with organic compounds which evaporates at 260ºC (500ºF) or lower as determined by ASTM Method D402 or other test method as approved by the Executive Officer: Slow, Rapid or Medium setting type with 3% by volume

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	426	1103	74.4	4641	1108 1108.1
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	04/19/2001	02/05/1996	04/17/1987	01/02/2008	07/12/1990 01/24/1985
FEDERAL REGISTER	66 FR 20084	61 FR 4215	Unknown	73 FR 48	55 FR 28624 50 FR 3338

TABLE 5 - RACT SIP SUMMARY

DISTRICT	IMPERIAL COUNTY	MOJAVE DESERT	VENTURA	SAN JOAQUIN	SOUTH COAST
RULE NUMBER	427	1116	74.18	4602 4612	1115
TITLE	Automotive Refinishing Operations	Automotive Refinishing Operations	Motor Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Coating Operations	Motor Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Coating Operations Motor Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Coating Operations Phase II	Motor Vehicle Assembly Line Coating Operations
ADOPTED	9/14/1999	3/2/1992	1/28/1992	4/11/1991 9/21/2006	3/2/1979
LAST AMENDED	Feb 23, 2010	Apr 26, 1999	Nov 11, 2008	Sep 21, 2006 Sep 20, 2007	May 12, 1995
EMISSIONS LIMITS	VOC Limits for Primers, Topcoats, Coatings range from 60 to 680 grams/liter	VOC Limits for Group I and Group II Vehicles for Primers, Topcoats, Coatings range from 250 to 750 grams/liter	ROC Limits for automotive coatings for motor vehicles, mobile equipment for Primers, Topcoats, Coatings range from 60 to 680 grams/liter	VOC Limits for Group I and Group II Vehicles during finishing or refinish using Primers, Topcoats, Coatings have a range from 250 to 600 grams/liter. |VOC Limits fro Group I and Group II Vehicles using Primers, Topcoats, Coatings have a range from 250 to 680 grams/liter	Electrophoretic primer: VOC content in excess of 145 grams/liter (1.2lbs/gal) of coating not allowed. Final repair coating: VOC content in excess of 580grams/liter (4.8lbs/gal) of coating not allowed. Alternatives include an Emission Control Plan and An approved Emission Control System with a reduction equivalent or greater than the required limits.
RULE APPROVAL BY EPA	9/14/1999 revision was approved 10/3/2001	04/10/2000	09/10/96 revision approved on 4/19/2001	12/20/2001 version approved on 06/26/2002 Pending Review	07/14/1995
FEDERAL	66 FR 50319	65 FR 18901	66 FR 20086	67 FR 42999	60 FR 36227