

STAPPA / ALAPCO

STATE AND TERRITORIAL
AIR POLLUTION PROGRAM
ADMINISTRATORS

ASSOCIATION OF
LOCAL AIR POLLUTION
CONTROL OFFICIALS

S. WILLIAM BECKER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DRAFT---June 10, 2005

Air and Radiation Docket--OAR-2003-0180
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPA West Building
Room B102
1301 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

To Whom It May Concern:

The State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators (STAPPA) and the Association of Local Air Pollution Program Officials (ALAPCO), the national associations of air pollution officials in 53 states and territories and more than 165 major metropolitan areas across the country, appreciate this opportunity to comment on the advance notice of public rulemaking (ANPR), entitled "Request for Comment on Potentially Inadequate Monitoring in Clean Air Act Applicable Requirements and on Methods to Improve Such Monitoring." (70 Federal Register 7905) We support EPA's goal of improving monitoring in pre-1990 New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) under 40 CFR Part 60 and National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Pollutants (NESHAP) under 40 CFR Part 61.

The associations believe that monitoring requirements for all facilities should be adequate and sufficiently frequent to enable permitting authorities to determine compliance. EPA's "umbrella monitoring" rule, promulgated on January 22, 2004 (69 Federal Register 3202), cites with approval *Appalachian Power*, which held that periodic monitoring should be included in Title V operating permits when the applicable requirement contains no monitoring provisions. The rule eliminated, however, the authority of state and local agencies to include so-called "gap-filling monitoring" in permits in situations in which applicable requirements contain monitoring provisions, but such provisions are inadequate.

Although we commend the agency for its effort to revise inadequate monitoring in applicable requirements or statutes, such rule revisions will likely take years. EPA should, therefore, reconsider reinstating the ability of the state and local agencies to include "gap-filling monitoring" in Title V permits in the meantime. Furthermore, we believe that deficiencies in monitoring in state implementation plans (SIPs) should be addressed only by states themselves, as they are best able to determine whether rule changes or inclusion of monitoring in individual permits is necessary and appropriate.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the ANPR and support the effort of EPA to address inadequate monitoring. If you have any questions about this letter, or wish to discuss these comments, please do not hesitate to contact one of us or Mary Stewart Douglas.



Bob Hodanbosi



Ursula Kramer