

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT 1

PERTINENT STATUTES AND REGULATIONS 1

STATEMENT OF ISSUES 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

I. INTRODUCTION 2

II. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND 5

 A. History And Nature Of The NSR Program 5

 1. The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977 6

 2. The Alabama Power Decision 9

 3. The Puerto Rican Cement Case 14

 4. The “WEPCo” Decision 15

 5. The WEPCo Rule 17

 6. The 2002 Rule 19

 B. State Minor NSR 27

 C. Title V Permitting 27

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 28

STANDARD OF REVIEW 33

ARGUMENT 35

I. INDUSTRY PETITIONERS’ ARGUMENTS ARE WITHOUT MERIT 36

 A. The CAA Does Not Compel EPA to Adopt the NSPS Test to Measure Modifications for NSR Purposes 36

1.	Neither the Language of the CAA Nor its Legislative History Requires That Sources Subject to NSR Meet the NSPS Applicability Test	37
2.	The Courts Have Recognized the Distinction Between NSPS and NSR and Have Approved Different Definitions of the Same Term to Serve Different Purposes	40
B.	Contrary to Industry Petitioners’ Assertion, the 1980 NSR Rules did Not Include an NSPS Hourly Emissions Test	42
1.	The Preamble to the 1980 Rules Clearly Articulated the Actual Annual Emissions Approach and How it Would be Applied	43
2.	Case Law Demonstrates that the 1980 Rules did Not Include an NSPS Hourly-Emissions Test That Must be met Before a Modification Could be Subject to NSR	45
3.	Industry Petitioners Misconstrue the Hours-of-Operation Exclusion	46
4.	Industry Petitioners’ Reliance on Erroneous Statements in Documents From the Early 1980s is Misplaced	50
5.	Industry Petitioners Waived Any Challenge to the Emissions Test Promulgated in The 1980 Rule	53
a.	Industry Petitioners did Not Challenge the Emissions Test in 1980	54
b.	Nothing in the Settlement Agreement or the Court’s Administrative Termination Order Allows Industry Petitioners to Raise New Challenges to The 1980 Rule	56
c.	Industry Petitioners’ Challenge is Untimely Because Industry Petitioners Knew the Test Existed Long Before The 2002 Rule	58
C.	Industry Petitioners’ Claim of Lack of Notice of The 1980 Rule Must be Rejected	60
1.	Industry Petitioners’ Assertion That They had No Notice of a Test Based on Actual Annual Emissions is Waived Because They Failed to File a Petition for Reconsideration	60

2.	EPA’s Decision to Change the PSD Applicability Test in 1980 Met Applicable Procedural Requirements	61
D.	Industry Petitioners’ Assertion That EPA Adopted a New Interpretation of the Actual-to-Potential Test is Wrong	63
II.	STATE/ENVIRONMENTAL PETITIONERS’ CHALLENGES SHOULD BE REJECTED	65
A.	The Revised Baseline is Consistent With the Statute	67
1.	The Statute is Ambiguous	69
a.	The Term “Increase” is Ambiguous	69
b.	The Cases Cited by State Petitioners are Inapposite	71
c.	The Revised Baseline is Consistent With the Statutory Requirement That “Any” Change That Causes an Increase in Emissions be Subject to NSR	72
2.	The Revised Baseline is Based on a Reasonable Interpretation of the Statute	73
a.	The NSR Provision Requires EPA to Balance Economic and Environmental Factors	73
b.	The Purpose of The NSR Program is Not to Compel Existing Sources to Reduce Emissions	73
c.	The Revised Baseline Will Not Impair Achievement of Air Quality Goals	76
3.	EPA Reasonably Determined That the Environmental Impacts of the Revised Baseline Would be Minimal	78
a.	EPA’s Analysis Demonstrates That The 2002 Rule is Environmentally Beneficial	78
b.	The Studies Cited by Petitioners are Flawed	79
4.	EPA’s Determination That The 2002 Rule Will be Economically Beneficial is Supported by the Record	81

5.	EPA’s Analysis of Business Cycles Supports Use of A 10-Year Baseline	83
6.	EPA Did Not Base The Revised Baseline on “Causation Grounds”	85
7.	EPA Reasonably Allowed Facilities to Employ Different Baseline Periods for Different Pollutants	87
B.	Use of the 10-Year Lookback Period to Determine the Amount of Contemporaneous Decreases or Increases is Reasonable	88
C.	The Five-Year Lookback Period for Electric Utility Steam Generating Units is Appropriate	89
D.	The PAL Provisions are Consistent with Clean Air Act Requirements	89
1.	EPA Has Statutory Authority to Allow Facilities to Determine Their Emissions on a Facility Wide Basis	91
2.	The 10-Year Baseline for PALs is Reasonable	92
3.	The PAL Provisions are Consistent with <u>Alabama Power</u>	93
4.	PALs Are Consistent with Statutory Intent	94
E.	The Demand Growth Exception is Reasonable	95
F.	The 2002 Rule is Enforceable	97
G.	The Five-Year Baseline for New Source Performance Standards is Lawful ...	101
H.	The Clean Unit Applicability Test Represents a Reasonable Interpretation of Ambiguous Statutory Language and will Produce Environmental Benefits	102
1.	Regulatory Restrictions on Attaining and Maintaining Clean Unit Status	104
a.	Restrictions on Qualifying for Clean Unit Status via Major NSR	104
b.	Restrictions on Qualifying for Clean Unit Status via Alternative Permitting Process	105

c.	Restrictions on Retaining and Re-qualifying for Clean Unit Status	106
2.	Petitioners Have Failed to Demonstrate That EPA’s Adoption of the Clean Unit Test was Arbitrary or Capricious	108
a.	EPA Reasonably Interpreted Ambiguous Statutory Language .	108
b.	State and Environmental Petitioners Understate the Regulatory Safeguards Surrounding Clean Unit Status	111
c.	EPA Properly Concluded That Clean Unit Status is not Automatically Lost When an Area is Redesignated	114
I.	EPA Reasonably Exempted Projects Designed to Reduce Emissions from NSR	115
1.	Congress Could Not Have Intended That the Installation of Environmentally Beneficial Pollution Control Projects be Subject to NSR	116
2.	The PCP Exclusion Contains Numerous Safeguards to Ensure Environmental Benefit	121
III.	NEWMONT’S PETITION SHOULD BE REJECTED BECAUSE EPA HAS APPROPRIATELY REVISED THE BASELINE REQUIREMENTS	125
IV.	EPA PROPERLY ADOPTED THE APPLICABILITY TESTS CONTAINED IN THE RULE AS ELEMENTS OF THE BASE FEDERAL NSR PROGRAM	128
A.	State Petitioners’ Claim That EPA has Forbidden Them From Adopting Alternative, Equally Stringent, Applicability Tests is Not Ripe	130
B.	State Petitioners’ Procedural Challenge Lacks Merit	133
	CONCLUSION	138

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<u>ASARCO, Inc. v. EPA,</u> 578 F.2d 319 (D.C. Cir. 1978)	8
* <u>Abbott Labs. v. Gardner,</u> 387 U.S. 136 (1967)	131
<u>Abbott Labs. v. Young,</u> 920 F.2d 984 (D.C. Cir. 1990)	41
* <u>Alabama Power Co. v. Costle,</u> 636 F.2d 323 (D.C. Cir. 1979)	5, 6, 7, 9, 29, 37, 40, 41, 69, 71, 93
<u>Alabama Power Co. et al. v. Costle,</u> 606 F.2d 1068 (D.C. Cir. 1979)	9, 10
<u>Allied-Signal, Inc. v. NRC,</u> 988 F.2d 146 (D.C. Cir. 1993)	63
<u>American Airlines, Inc. v. DOT,</u> 202 F.3d 788 (5th Cir. 2000)	39
<u>American Iron & Steel Inst. v. EPA,</u> 886 F.2d 390 (D.C. Cir. 1989)	60, 135
<u>American Petroleum Inst. v. Costle,</u> 665 F.2d 1176 (D.C. Cir. 1981)	57, 61
<u>American Petroleum Inst. v. EPA,</u> 52 F.3d 1113 (D.C. Cir. 1995)	82
<u>American Trucking Ass'ns v. EPA,</u> 283 F.3d 355 (D.C. Cir. 2002)	34, 57, 81
<u>American Water Works Ass'n v. EPA,</u> 40 F.3d 1266 (D.C. Cir. 1994)	120
<u>Appalachian Power Co. v. EPA,</u> 249 F.3 2d 1032, 1064 (D.C. Cir. 2001)	61

* Authorities chiefly relied upon are marked with an asterisk.

<u>Appalachian Power Co. v. EPA,</u> 251 F.3d 1026 (D.C. Cir. 2001)	72
<u>Association of Am. R.R.s v. DOT,</u> 38 F.3d 582 (1994)	135, 136
<u>Auer v. Robbins,</u> 519 U.S. 452 (1997)	34
<u>Benkelman Tel. Co. v. FCC,</u> 220 F.3d 601 (D.C. Cir. 2000)	54
<u>*Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.,</u> 467 U.S. 837 (1984)	34, 37, 73, 76, 82, 91, 95, 119, 127
<u>Citizens to Save Spencer County v. EPA,</u> 600 F.2d 844 (D.C. Cir. 1979)	40
<u>Clean Air Implementation Project v. EPA,</u> 150 F.3d 1200 (D.C. Cir. 1998)	128, 131, 132
<u>Comite Pro Rescate De La Salud, et al. v. Puerto Rico Aqueduct and Sewer Auth.,</u> 888 F.2d 180 (1st Cir. 1989)	41
<u>Common Cause v. Federal Election Comm'n,</u> 842 F.2d 436 (D.C. Cir. 1988)	40
<u>Connecticut Light & Power Co. v. NRC,</u> 673 F.2d 525 (D.C. Cir. 1982)	134
<u>Continental Airlines, Inc. v. DOT,</u> 843 F.2d 1444 (D.C. Cir. 1988)	38
<u>Cronin v. Federal Aviation Admin.,</u> 73 F.3d 1126 (D.C. Cir. 1996)	132
<u>Davis v. Michigan Dep't of Treasury,</u> 489 U.S. 803 (1989)	116
<u>Davis County Solid Waste Mgmt. v. EPA,</u> 108 F.3d 1454 (D.C. Cir. 1997)	63
<u>Duquesne Light Co. v. EPA,</u> 166 F.3d 609 (3rd Cir. 1999)	130, 137

<u>Engine Mfrs. Ass’n v. EPA,</u> 887 F.3d 1075 (D.C. Cir. 1996)	61
<u>Environmental Def. Ctr. v. EPA,</u> 344 F.3d 832 (9th Cir. 2003)	100
<u>Environmental Def. Fund Inc. v. EPA,</u> 82 F.3d 451 (D.C. Cir. 1996)	116
<u>Ethyl Corp. v. EPA,</u> 541 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1976)	34
<u>General Motors v. EPA,</u> 363 F.3d 442 (D.C. Cir. 2004)	51, 59
<u>Horsehead Res. Dev. Co., Inc. V. Browner,</u> 16 F.3d 1246 (D.C. Cir. 1994)	134, 135, 136
<u>Independent Equip. Dealers v. EPA,</u> 372 F.3d 420 (D.C. Cir. 2004)	51, 59
<u>In re Nofziger,</u> 925 F.2d 428 (D.C. Cir. 1991)	116, 119
<u>Johnson V. Zerbst,</u> 304 U.S. 458 (1938)	56
<u>LaFleur v. Whitman,</u> 300 F.3d 256 (2d Cir. 2002)	53
<u>Lamie v. United States Trustee,</u> 124 S. Ct. 1023 (2004)	74
<u>Linemaster Switch Co. v. EPA,</u> 938 F.2d 1299 (D.C. Cir. 1991)	72
<u>Michigan v. EPA,</u> 213 F.3d 663 (D.C. Cir. 2000)	77
<u>Molycorp, Inc. v. EPA,</u> 197 F.3d 543 (D.C. Cir. 1999)	59
<u>*Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.,</u> 463 U.S. 29 (1983)	34, 96, 97

<u>National Ass’n of Reversionary Property Owners v. Surface Transp. Bd.</u> , 158 F.3d 135 (D.C. Cir 1998)	60
<u>National Ass’n of Cas. & Sur. Agents, et al. v. Bd. of Governors of the Fed. Reserve Sys.</u> , 856 F.2d 282 (D.C. Cir. 1988)	40
<u>National Lime Ass’n v. EPA</u> , 233 F.3d 625 (D.C. Cir. 2000)	54
<u>National Mining Assoc. v. EPA</u> , 59 F.3d 1351 (D.C. Cir. 1995)	40
<u>Northeast Md. Waste Disposal Auth. v. EPA</u> , 358 F.3d 936 (D.C. Cir. 2004)	63, 136
<u>Oljato Chapter of the Navajo Tribe et al. v. Train</u> , 515 F.2d 654 (D.C. Cir. 1975)	59
<u>PDK Labs. Inc. v. DEA</u> , 362 F.3d 786 (D.C. Cir. 2004)	119
<u>*Paralyzed Veterans of Am. v. D.C. Arena, L.P.</u> , 117 F.3d 579 (D.C. Cir. 1997)	50
<u>Pharmanex v. Shalala</u> , 221 F.3d 1151 (10 th Cir. 2000)	41
<u>Public Citizen v. EPA</u> , 343 F.3d 449 (5th Cir. 2003)	27, 28
<u>*Puerto Rican Cement Co., Inc. v. EPA</u> , 889 F.2d 292 (1st Cir. 1989)	14, 15, 42, 45, 49, 51, 52, 84
<u>Shell Oil Co. v. EPA</u> , 950 F.2d 741 (D.C. Cir. 1991)	137
<u>Sierra Club v. Costle</u> , 657 F.2d 278 (D.C. Cir. 1981)	61
<u>Sierra Club v. Ruckelshaus</u> , 344 F. Supp. 253 (D.D.C. 1972)	5

<u>Small Refiner Lead Phase-Down Task Force v. EPA,</u> 705 F.2d 506 (D.C. Cir. 1983)	34
<u>Specialty Equip. Market Ass'n v. Ruckelshaus,</u> 720 F.2d 124 (D.C. Cir. 1983)	100
<u>State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Dole,</u> 802 F.2d 474 (D.C. Cir. 1986)	131
<u>Sugar Cane Growers Co-op of Fla. v. Veneman,</u> 289 F.3d 89 (D.C. Cir. 2002)	63
<u>Sur Contra La Contaminacion v. EPA,</u> 202 F.3d 443 (1st Cir. 2000)	53
<u>Texas Mun. Power Agency v. Environmental Prot. Agency,</u> 89 F.3d 858 (D.C. Cir. 1996)	58
<u>United States v. Duke Energy Corp.,</u> 278 F.Supp.2d 619 (M.D. N.C. 2003)	46, 50, 53
<u>United States v. Mead,</u> 533 U.S. 218 (2001)	97
<u>United States v. Ohio Edison Co.,</u> 276 F.Supp.2d 829 (S.D. Ohio 2003)	42, 46, 49, 52
<u>United States v. Ron Pair Enters. Inc.,</u> 489 U.S. 235 (1989)	116
<u>West Virginia v. EPA,</u> 362 F.3d 861 (D.C. Cir. 2004)	56, 77
<u>*Wisconsin Elec. Power Co. v. Reilly,</u> 893 F.2d 901 (7th Cir. 1990)	15, 16, 42, 46, 49, 52, 55, 100

STATUTES

2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(5),(e)(4)	40
42 U.S.C. §§ 7401-7671q	2
42 U.S.C. § 7401(a)(3)	7

42 U.S.C. § 7401(b)(1)	2
42 U.S.C. § 7410	128
42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)	75
*42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(C)	7, 27, 76, 113, 128
*42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)	77
42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(I)	128
42 U.S.C. § 7410(k)(3)	130
*42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(3)	9
*42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(4)	4, 10, 37, 69, 95, 108, 116
42 U.S.C. § 7413(a)(3)	98
42 U.S.C. § 7414(a)(1)(G)	99
42 U.S.C. § 7416	130
42 U.S.C. § 7423	74
42 U.S.C. § 7426(b)	77
42 U.S.C. § 7470(1),(3)	3
42 U.S.C. § 7479	9
*42 U.S.C. § 7479(2)(C)	4, 10, 37
42 U.S.C. §§ 7501-7515	6
42 U.S.C. § 7501(4)	4, 10
42 U.S.C. § 7502(b)	128
42 U.S.C. § 7502(c)(2)	75
42 U.S.C. § 7502(c)(5)	7

42 U.S.C. § 7503(a)(1)	7, 127
42 U.S.C. § 7503(a)(2)	7
42 U.S.C. § 7511(a)(1) (1991)	39
42 U.S.C. § 7511a	74
42 U.S.C. § 7511a(a)(2)(A) (1991)	39
42 U.S.C. § 7511a(a)(2)(B) (1990)	39
42 U.S.C. § 7511a(b)(1)	75
42 U.S.C. § 7511a(e)(2)	121
42 U.S.C. § 7515	133
42 U.S.C. § 7607(b)(1)	1, 29, 58
*42 U.S.C. § 7607(d)	33
42 U.S.C. §7607(d)(7)(B)	57, 60, 72
42 U.S.C. § 7607(d)(8)	57, 83
42 U.S.C. § 7607(d)(8)(D)	134
42 U.S.C. § 7607(d)(9)	34, 63
42 U.S.C. § 7607(d)(9)(D)	134
42 U.S.C. § 7651n	120
42 U.S.C. § 7651n(b)	120
42 U.S.C. § 7661c(a),(c)	28
 CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS	
40 C.F.R. § 51.24(b)(4) (1978)	9
40 C.F.R. § 51.160	7, 27, 113, 124

40 C.F.R. § 51.160(a)	76
40 C.F.R. § 51.160(b)	27
40 C.F.R. § 51.161	7, 27, 77, 113, 124
40 C.F.R. § 51.162	7, 27, 113, 124
40 C.F.R. § 51.163	7, 27, 113, 124
40 C.F.R. § 51.164	7, 27
40 C.F.R. § 51.165	7, 8
40 C.F.R. § 51.165(a)(1)(vi)	88
40 C.F.R. § 51.165(a)(1)(xxviii)(B)(3)	96
40 C.F.R. § 51.166	7, 8
40 C.F.R. § 51.166(a)(7)(ii)(b)	129
40 C.F.R. § 51.166(a)(7) (iv)	128, 129
40 C.F.R. § 51.166(b)	128
40 C.F.R. § 51.166(b)(3)(ii)	88
40 C.F.R. § 51.166(v)(6)(iii)	124
40 C.F.R. § 52.01(d) (1975)	6
40 C.F.R. §52.21	7
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(a)(2)(iv)(e)	103
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(2)(i) (1981)	48
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(2)(iii)(f) (1981)	48
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(2)(iii)(f)	127
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(3) (1978)	9

40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(3) (1988)	42
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(3)(ii)	88
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(21)(iv) (1981)	13
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(b)(42)	104
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(1)	104
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(2)(ii)	107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(2)(iii)	111
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(2)(iv)	107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(3)	106, 107, 112
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(3)(i)	104
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(3)(ii)(a)	104, 112
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(3)(ii)(b)	104
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(3)(iii)	107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(4)(i)	107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(x)(6),(7)	107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(1)	104
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(2)(ii)	107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(2)(iii)	103, 107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(2)(iv)	107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(3)	106, 107, 112
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(3)(i)	104, 105
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(3)(i)(a)	112

40 C.F.R. § 52.21 (y)(3)(ii)	105, 111
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(3)(iv)	107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(4)	105
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(4)(i)	105
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(4)(ii)	106
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(5)	107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(7)	105, 113
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(8)	107, 113
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(9)	107
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(y)(11)	114
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(z)(2)	122
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(z)(3)	125
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(z)(4)	121, 123
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(z)(5)	121, 123, 124, 125
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(z)(6)(i)	124
40 C.F.R. § 52.21(z)(6)(iii)	124
40 C.F.R. § 52.24	7
40 C.F.R. § 60.2	12
40 C.F.R. § 60.14 (1988)	42
40 C.F.R. § 70.2	28

FEDERAL REGISTER

39 Fed. Reg. 45210 (Dec. 5, 1974) 5, 6

43 Fed. Reg. 26,380 (June 19, 1978) 6, 8, 37, 38

44 Fed. Reg. 51924 (Sept. 5, 1979) 6, 9, 10, 11, 12

45 Fed. Reg. 6802 (Jan. 30, 1980) 12

*45 Fed. Reg. 52,676 (Aug. 7, 1980) passim

56 Fed. Reg. 27,630 (June 14, 1991) 18, 53, 117

*57 Fed. Reg. 32,314 (July 21, 1992) passim

*61 Fed. Reg. 38,250 (July 23, 1996) passim

63 Fed. Reg. 39,857 (July 24, 1998) 23, 96

63 Fed. Reg. 57,356 (Oct. 27, 1998) 75

*67 Fed. Reg. 80,186 (Dec. 31, 2002) passim

68 Fed. Reg. 44,620 (July 30, 2003) 26, 66

68 Fed. Reg. 63,021 (Nov. 7, 2003) 26, 27, 66

69 Fed. Reg. 20,550 (Apr. 16, 2004) 121

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BACT	Best Available Control Technology
CAAAC	Clean Air Act Advisory Committee
Clean Unit Test	Clean Unit Applicability Test
Environmental Analysis	Supplemental Analysis of the Environmental Impacts of the 2002 Final NSR Rules
Env. Br.	Proof Opening Brief of Environmental Petitioners
EPA	Respondent United States Environmental Protection Agency
GAO	General Accounting Office
Ind. Br.	Joint Brief of Industry Petitioners
LAER	Lowest Achievable Emissions Rate
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NO _x	Nitrogen Oxides
NSPS	New Source Performance Standards
NSR	New Source Review
PAL	Plantwide Applicability Limit
PCP	Pollution Control Project
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
RACT	Reasonably Available Control Technology
Recons. TSD	Technical Support Document for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment Area New Source Review (NSR): Reconsideration
SIPs	Standard Implementation Plans

SO _x	Sulfur Oxides
State Br.	Brief of Government Petitioners
TSD	Technical Support Document for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Nonattainment Area New Source Review Regulations.
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds