EXHIBIT A

COMMUNITIES FOR A
BETTER
ENVIRONMENT

2/27/98

Greg Stone
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

Re: Proposed Regulation 2, Rule 9; Interchangeable Emission Reduction Credits (IERC)

Dear Mr. Stone,

We are writing to voice our strong opposition to the District's proposed IERC regulation. In addition our comments relate to the scoping under CEQA for this regulation and the issues we bring up in this letter and in the attachments need to be addressed in the environmental impact report process. This rule is likely to result in trading existing and future real and proven emissions reductions at industrial sites (especially at oil refineries and chemical plants) for unenforceable, theoretical reductions from programs like car scrapping. In the similar program of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (the SCAQMD car scrapping program), supposed reductions have been shown by the program's main inspector to be fraught with lax enforcement, providing little, if any environmental benefit, and to be unenforceable. (See attachments.)

It is very surprising that this rule is even under consideration at this time given the clear deficiencies in the main mode1 for this program in the South Coast. The South Coast rule has been suspended by the Air Resources Board once already pending review of it's deficiencies.. The BAAQMD should halt any further consideration of it's own IERC, pending evaluation of the legal, practical, and enforcement issues of the South Coast rule. If this rule is considered in the future, the District should first hold workshops in the communities where the industrial facilities are sited which could take part in the proposed pollution trading. This should include a full review of all testimony and data included during past rulemaking processes for the rules which could be replaced by the IERC rule. More broadly, a full review of all of the environmental benefits of the rules which could be replaced must be done.

The emissions trading proposed in the BAAQMD's IERC rule fails to protect the interests of communities in geographic areas that are highly industrialized. For example, allowing oil refineries to escape the hard won requirements for reductions from measures like tight leak standards for thousands of valves, like controls on marine loading emissions, and from- many other site-specific controls, will increase pollution in industrial neighborhoods by many tons per day, and trade these reductions for a theoretical and very likely non-existant gain to the region at large. Often the neighborhoods with the highest density of these heavy industrial sources and worst impacted are communities of color. These communities and others near these facilities would be hurt by this rule, violating EPA's environmental justice initiative.

500 Howard Street, Suite 506 • San Francisco, CA 94105 • (415) 243-8373
In Southern California: 605 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 850 • Los Angeles, CA 90015 • (213) 486-5114

The IERC rule also does not provide for differentiation of the chemicals produced by different processes. It assumes a VOC reduction is a VOC reduction, when in fact, VOCs are made up of many different pollutants, specific to the source that is generating them, and additional pollutants are present and reduced by site-specific regulations. No discussion of or provision for the speciation of chemicals is provided in the IERC rule in order to evaluate differences in environmental impacts which would occur between specific chemical reductions at a specific site such as a refinery, and differing chemicals reductions from the likely replacement source of car scrapping (or other emission trading). These sources can be significantly different. A full environmental impact review is required of not only the differences in specific air pollutants which would be traded in different geographic areas, but in addition, other changes in pollution. Some of the site-specific regulations result not only in air pollution reduction, but also in increased safety, and in reduction of soil contamination and other environmental benefits, which the IERC general trading program would not provide. These environmental benefits would be removed if the IERC rule were adopted.

In addition the rule incredibly allows trading between pollutants that have different environmental and health impacts! NOx, particulates, and SOx can be traded as if they were interchangeable, even though the district is fully aware that these different pollutants affect human health and the environment in different ways. This will result in environmental impacts which must be assessed under CEQA.

The public interest is being betrayed by this proposed rule. Many members of the public have testified for the adoption of the stationary source (and other rules) which the District has adopted in the past. The replacement rules would discard the input provided by the public, and the decisions made by in the past, and replace them with an ineffective alternative.

In the specific case of car scrapping, a study by Acurex Environmental (Perspective on Vehicles Scrapping in Air Quality Programs, July 1995, attached) found that car scrapping cannot provide major reductions, because as cars are scrapped, older cars will simply be imported into the region to replace low-cost vehicles. In addition, the SCAQMD's main inspector found that its car scrapping program could not show that it resulted in any pollution reductions, and that the cars scrapped were very likely to have been scrapped anyway because of age and disrepair (and would not have been driven otherwise).

It is highly likely that car scrapping will be a main source, if not the main alternative emission reductiton measure in the Bay Area. In the South Coast, about 90% of the emissions credits were car scrapping credits purchased by the oil refineries, resulting in increased pollution for people nearby. These issues are documented and must be addressed by the Bay Area in it's environmental review. The Bay Area rule as written would allow the same severe problems.

Please review our attached letter and documents detailing problems with the SCAQMD's car scrapping regulation, which also related to problems which the BAAQMD proposed

IERC rule since it does not include any measures to prevent the same problems. The issues in the attachments, include legal deficiencies regarding unenforcability of the rule, deficiencies relating to compliance with EPA's economic incentives program, etc.

There are many more specific problems with the proposed regulation, but the whole thrust is so flawed, that it is hardly worthwhile to document specific details. The whole concept must be reconsidered to deal with the problems stated in this letter. Emissions reductions from autos are very much needed, but not as a replacement for existing rules. The District is not meeting federal nor state health standards for pollutants, and needs to adopt additional controls, and not dismantle progress already made through a trade for unreal paper reductions.

We look forward to your response. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Julia E. May
CBE Clean Air Program Director,
N. Cal. Region

List of Documents Attached to CBE Comments Submitted to the Bay District on 2/27/98

(these documents are not attached to Part 2 of the case study)

A Deposition of Bruce Lohmann, Air Quality Inspector for the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD"), December 12, 1997, in administrative action pending before the U.S. EPA, CBE v. South Coast Air Quality Management District, California Air Resources Board

B New Times (Los Angeles) weekly paper, February 5-11, 1998, article titled *Smoke Screen, Government smog fighters say they're cleaning the air by junking old cars instead of cutting industrial emissions. But their program's an ineffective farce,* by Marc Cooper

C November 19, 1996 SCAQMD memo from Carol Engelhardt, et. al to Peter Greenwald, et al re: Rule 1610 Vehicle Scrapping Enforcement Problems **(included in Exhibit D to Part 1 of the case study)**

D August 16, 1995 memo from Bruce Lohmann, SCAQMD to David Coel, SCAQMD re: Rule 1610: Study Scrapped & Replacement Vehicles **(included in Exhibit D to Part 1 of the case study)**

E August 2, 1995 Memorandum from Bruce Lohmann, SCAQMD to Laki Tisopulos, SCAQMD re: MSERCS granted for old vehicle scrapping **(included in Exhibit D to Part 1 of the case study)**

F July 1995 Draft Final Report prepared for California Electric Transportation Coalition by Acurex Environmental Corporation, entitled *Perspectives on Vehicle Scrapping in Air Quality Programs*

EXXON COMPANY, U.S.A.
3400 EAST SECOND ST.. BENICIA, CALIFORNIA 94510 - 1097

REFINING DEPARTMENT
BENICIA REFINERY

EXHIBIT B

March 6, 1998

IERC Rule

Mr. Greg Stone
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco California 94109

Dear Greg:

This letter is intended to document Exxon's comments regarding the proposed IERC Regulation (2-9) as discussed at the Workshop on February 5, 1998. From a general standpoint we are in agreement with Mr. Hess's opening comments that this rule should provide advantages to all interested parties in the community. It can offer cost-effective compliance flexibility for industry and at the same time will result in an overall reduction in emissions due to the discounting mechanism, prior offset requirements, and establishment of market place incentives.

We have only two specific requests as briefly noted below:

STEM Account -The use of an account to mitigate short term excedences has been a primary area of interest ever since the initial IERC concepts were discussed in 1996. We were very disappointed that this feature has not been included in the rule. Not only would this feature offer compliance flexibility to industry, the stated objective of the rule, but it would also result in a further reduction in emissions.

Credit Expiration - The draft rule limits an IERC's credit life to 5 years if it was generated from a stationary source. This appears to be an arbitrary criteria and may limit the incentive for generating credits. We request that a longer period of time, such as 8-10 years, be utilized.

Regarding the timing for adopting this rule, we were very disappointed that another delay is planned in order to have another workshop. This rule has now been under discussion for almost two years. Also, it is noted that the CARB guidelines adopted last May called for District adoption no later than last month. It is our sincere hope that this rule can reflect the above modifications and can be progressed in a timely fashion for the benefit of all concerned.

Very truly yours,

S. J. Hammonds
Senior Staff Engineer

SJH:pje

c - Mr. Kevin Buchan - WSPA
Mr. Steve Hill - BAAQMD

WSPA
Western States Petroleum Association

March 19, 1998

SENT VIA FAX

Greg Stone
Supervising Air Quality Engineer
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, California 94109

RE: Comments On Proposed Regulation 2, Rule 9: Interchangeable Emission Reduction Credits, dated January 27, 1998.

Dear Mr. Stone

The Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA) is a trade association that represents the majority of petroleum related interests in the western United States, These interests include production, transportation, refining, and marketing of petroleum and petroleum-based products. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed Regulation 2 - Rule 9: Interchangeable Emission Reduction Credits as presented during the workshop held Friday, February 27, 1998. We offer general comments to the proposed rule in addition to requested changes to the rule language itself.

In general, we are in agreement with the BAAQMD that the intent of this rule should provide emission reductions for the benefit of air quality while affording industry with cost-effective compliance flexibility. We believe however, that arbitrarily limiting the credit generation period and lifetime of non-curtailment IERC's five years or less is not consistent with the intent of SB 456. Senator Kelley's intent for SB 456 was not to place a time limit on credits used in lieu of BARCT.

Timing For Rule Adoption
We request that the schedule for adopting this rule be accelerated. This rule has been under discussion for almost two years. It is our hope that this rule can be progressed in a timely fashion for the benefit of all concerned.

STEM Account
The used of an account to mitigate short-term exceedences has been a primary area of interest since the initial IERC concepts were discussed in 1996. We requested this feature be incorporated into the rule. This feature offers both compliance flexibility to industry and reductions in emissions.

One Concord Centre • 2300 Clayton Road, Suite 1440 • Concord, CA 94520-2148 • (510) 825-9388 • FAX: (510) 825-9403

Rule Language Change Requests

Rule language change requests are written in underline/strikeout format. Underlined text reflects our requested additions, while strikeouts depict requested deletions. Following the requested changes, we have summarized our reasoning for each request.

Section 2-9-204

Best Available Retrofit control Technology (BARCT): Any provision in Regulation 8 or Regulation 9 ~~that was adopted pursuant to the Health and Safety Code section 40918 requirement for ozone non-attainment areas to implement all feasible control measures for ozone precursors.~~

The definition of BARCT should not be limited to Regulation 8 or Regulation 9 provisions that were adopted only pursuant to the Health and Safety Code Section 40918. Health and Safety Code Section 40920.6(c) allows the use of ERCs in lieu BARCT. This Health and Safety Code section does not limit the use of ERCs in lieu of BARCT to provisions adopted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 40918.

Section 2-9-205.2

For ~~any other type of~~ emission reductions from a permitted stationary source that has been shutdown the maximum number of credit generation periods in unlimited ~~five~~.

Section 2-9-205.3

For emission reductions from all other sources, the maximum number of credit generation periods shall be determined on a case by case basis, and in no case shall exceed ten ~~three~~.

The credit generation limits in Section 2-9-205.2 and Section 2-9-205.3 in the proposed rule appear to be arbitrary. Generation periods should be limited only for cases in which the life of the generating sources is limited (e.g., car scrapping). Limitations on generation periods should be developed, verifiable and based on the nature of the emission reductions. Emission reductions from stationary sources that are permanently shut down are RACT adjusted at the time of banking. These reductions are quantifiable, permanent and surplus and therefore should not be limited to a generation period of five years. Since older sources would have to be exchanged with equivalent replacements in order to maintain equivalent operations, the maximum number of credit generation periods for shutdown emission reductions should have an unlimited life. The generation life for reductions from all other sources should not be limited to three years. We request the life of these reductions be determined on a case by case basis, not to exceed 10 years

Section 2-9-207

Curtailment: An emission reduction from permitted stationary source that is due to additional abatement equipment, increased abatement efficiency, or process modification,

including ~~excluding~~ an emission reduction due to reduced hours of operation, throughput, material usage or fuel usage.

Reductions from permitted stationary sources due to reduced hours of operation, throughput, material usage or fuel usage are permanent, quantifiable, surplus and enforceable with permit conditions. Such reductions are bankable under sections of Regulation 2 Rule 4 (Sections 2~~-4-~~301.4 and 2-4-301.7). We believe that these types of reductions should also be included in this definition.

~~**Section 2-9-301.6**~~

~~An IERC is subject to be prevailing environmental discount at the time of its usage~~.

~~**Section 2-9-307**~~

~~Environmental Benefit Discount Prior to any IERC being used, the APCO will discount such IERC by 10 percent of it denominated value. The reduction shall be in addition to, and subsequent to any RACT and/or BARCT adjustment required by either sections of this rule, and any offers raised required by Regulation 2, Rule 2~~.

~~**Section 2-9-406.3**~~

~~Environmental Benefit Discount upon Use Upon withdrawal fro use, an IERC will be subject to the applicable environmental benefit reduction requirement of Section 2-9-307~~.

~~**Section 2-9-606.2**~~

Required IERC's: Subtract the allowable BARCT emissions that were determined per Section 2-9-606.2(B) from the actual emission that were determined in Section 2-9-606.1 (A), ~~Increase this difference by applying the 10 percent environmental discount rate specified in Section 2-9-207~~, as illustrated in the equation below. This is the total amount of IERC's that must be supplied in lieu of BARCT compliance

Required IERC's = (A-B) ~~[(100% + 10%) / (100%)]~~

We request the deletion of environmental benefit discounting on the basis that it would be in conflict with Section 39607.5(3)(B) of the Health and Safety Code. This section was added by AB 1777 and requires the Board to "Ensure that the methodology does not do any of the following: . . . (B) Provide for an additional discount of credits solely as a result of emission reduction credits trading if a district already has discounted the credit as part of its process of identifying and granting those credits to sources." We request that Sections 2-9-301.6, 2-9-307. 2-9-406.3 be deleted, and references to environmental benefit discounting in Section 2-9-606.3 be deleted

~~Section 2-9-304.6~~

~~Any requirement in Regulation 8 or Regulation 9 that is effective on or before January 1, 1998, or sooner. This section...~~

We request deletion of Section 2-9-304.6. Discussions at the February 27, 1998 workshop indicated that the BAAQMD favored the incorporation of a STEM Account. This section as written would preclude the use of a STEM Account. Since backsliding is prevented by NSR and BACT requirements, we do not believe it is necessary to establish provisions for it here.

Section 2-9-401

IERC Application: An application is required in order to conduct any of the transactions listed below. For multiple year emission reductions, annualized certificates will be issued based on the original application. New applications may be required if relevant new BARCT requirements are adopted. All subsequent IERC applications may use the same baseline that was established for the original IERC application for that curtailment. All ~~Such~~ applications shall be submitted on forms specified by the APCO. Fees for such applications... (no additional charges).

We believe that AB 1777 intended issuance of interchangable emission reduction credits for multiple year emission reductions as annualized certificates; it was not intended to require annual application and annual issuance of IERCs for multiple year reduction As currently written, Section 2-9-401 is unclear whether an annual IERC application is required each year for multiple year emission reductions.

Section 2-9-601.3

Each IERC banking certificate shall include the effective date and expiration date of the credits, if applicable.

Section 2-9-601.5

IERC's from stationary sources shall expire ~~five~~ ten years after their effective dates

Section 2-9-601.7

IERC's from mobile ~~and some~~ sources which are not under the regulatory authority of the California Resources Board (CARB) shall expire three years after their effective date. IERC's from area sources not under the regulatory authority of the CARB shall have a life determined on a case by case basis, which shall not exceed 10 years.

WSPA believes that the certificate lives specified in 601.5 and 601.7 are arbitrary and should be determined based on the type of source generating the credit. For example, a certificate life beyond 3 years is warranted for stationary sources given their continuous nature of operation (i.e., emissions would likely be reduced for well beyond any chosen certificate life) while a certificate

life of 3 years for mobile sources would likely be appropriate given the useable foreseeable life of the source. Therefore, we request that the certificate life for stationary sources be set at 10 years.

similarly, we believe that the nature of operation of area sources can differ substantially, and assigning an arbitrarily short certificate life may not be appropriate in some cases. Therefore, we request that the certificate life for area source be determined on a case-by-case (or source-type) basis as the credits are banked, with the maximum life not to exceed 10 years. Another reason to set the life for stationary/area sources to a slightly longer period is that facilities may prefer to have the credits in-hand before proceeding with the detailed planning of projects which would use the credits (mainly for using IERCs under Section 302.3) In this case, it is possible that the IERCs could expire before the project was completed if a short life is assigned. Obviously, this would be more of a concern with internally generated IERC's than externally generated ones.

WSPA appreciates the opportunity to participate in the development of this rule and looks forward to the continued efforts of the BAAQMD to adopt the the rule on a timely basis. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me in our Concord office at (510)825-9388.

Sincerely,

Kevin Buchan

Kevin Buchan

c c : Scott Folwarkow/WSPA

IERC RULE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

District: Bay Area AQMD **Trading Rule/Program:** Reg 2, Rule 9

STATE REGULATION REQ'TS	DISTRICT RULE CONTENTS AND APPLICABLE PROVISIONS
Purpose	
Does the rule provide for the use of credits as a compliance alternative for meeting district control requirements? (91500)	Yes.
Does the rule provide for the District's certification of credits as being real, permanent, surplus, quantifiable, and enforceable? (91500)	Yes. (601) However, the definition for "quantifiable" may need to be revised to ensure that any calculation methods approved by the APCO comply with applicable federal and state requirements.
Credit Denomination	
Does rule provide for the certification and registration of credits in pounds of pollutant in one year increments? (91503)	Yes. (301; 601)
Banking	
Does rule substantively comply with Health & Safety Code sections 40709-40714.5? (91504(a))	Yes.. (220; 203, 301, 400 et seq.) The following changes are however recommended to improve the rule: 1. Public noticing procedures should be specified or reference made to applicable public notice requirements in related district rules. 2. The rule needs to specify that area and mobile source credits can be generated only to the extent not currently restricted by State or federal requirements or reserved to the ARB.
Does the rule require the district to specify the earliest year in which an IERC can be used? (91504(b))	Yes. (208; 301; 403)

CARB COMMENTS

Does the rule restrict credit use prior to certification and registration or in any instances in which the district determines equivalency is not met? (91504(c))	No. There does not seem to be an equivalency provision in the rule. This is a key deficiency.
Does the rule provide for use of ARB data for credit use subject to ARB regulatory authority? (91504(d))	Yes. (604)
Does the rule ensure a credit retains full value subject to prevailing requirements at time of use? (91504(e))	The rule allows credits to retain full value regardless of whether new SIP measures and/or assumptions change the determination of what is surplus. Without a baseline update or an equivalency determination, credits could lead to excess emissions upon use. The baseline should be re-calculated on a regular basis, optimally at the same time as SIP updates.
Applicability	
Is this rule subject to sections 39616 or 40440.1 of the Health & Safety Code for attainment-based trading? 91505(c))	No.
Does the rule consolidate IERCS and permanent ERCS for interchangeable use? (91505(d))	Yes. (2-9-605; 2-9-406.5; 2-9-401; 2-9-302)
Does the district have banking rules which comply with section 40709-40714.5 of the Health & Safety Code? (91505(d) and 91506(a))	Yes. CHECK TO SEE IF U.S. EPA HAS APPROVED.
Generation & Use	
Does the district have an existing rule that provides for the use of credits in lieu of BARCT? (91505(a))	No.
Does the district provide for a cost-effectiveness analysis of BARCT measures consistent with section 40920.6(d) of the Health & Safety Code? (91506(a)	?
Does the district authorize the use of multi-district banking with a nonattainment area? (91506(b))	No.
Have other districts in the nonattainment area entered	N/A

into an enforceable agreement with the applicable district to allow multi-district banking? (91506(b))	
Does the rule contain enforceable technical protocols for calculating IERCS? (91606(c))	Yes. (602; 603) However, these protocols may not be adequate for U.S. EPA approvability. Also, there will need to be a greater level of specificity for protocols to assure compliance with credit use requirements,
Does the rule contain EPA -approved criteria for development of enforceable technical protocols? Does the rule reference enforceable technical protocols that meet State and federal requirements? (91506(c), 91505(e), and 91507)	No; uncertain if 602 & 603 will be adequate.
Does the rule contain a provision or process for. determining equivalency? (91506(d))	No. This is a major deficiency.
Does the rule provide for the use of enforceable instruments and procedures that will ensure compliance with applicable requirements at both the point of generation and the point of use? (91506(e))	Procedures are provided but they may not be federally approvable.
Does the rule allow the use of IERCS to comply with BACT? NSPS? To avoid NSR? (91506(f))	No. (304)
Does the rule allow the use of IERCS to comply with MACT or ATCMS? (91506(g))	No. (304)
Does the rule allow the use of surplus reductions from sources exempt from district or State regulations? (91506(h))	Yes. (301.1)
Are baseline emissions from qualifying exempt sources contained in the plan emissions inventory? (91506(h))	To be eligible for credits, an exempt source must be included In the emission inventory (301.1 and 301.2) This is acceptable.
Does the rule allow the use of permanent ERCS for purposes other than NSR? (91506(i))	Yes, as IERCS (605; 603; 306)
Are baseline emissions from permanent ERCS	It is not clear if permanent ERCS are accounted for in the plan. Additionally, as the plan has been

incorporated or otherwise accounted for in the adopted plan? (91506(i))	found deficient by U.S. EPA, a new plan and emissions Inventory may be required, changing the baseline by which are credits are calculated.
If the IERC program is subject to sections 39616 or 40440.1 of the Health & Safety Code, has the district completed a study and made findings pursuant to section 91506(j) of the State regulation'? Has the ARB concurred with the findings? (91506(j))	N/A
Does the rule provide for assessment and consideration of potential localized impacts that use of IERCS may have on public exposure to air pollution resulting from trading? (91506(k)); Does the rule apply to VOC trading? if so, does the rule contain or reference district requirements that restrict VOC credit generation or use that exceed a district-established significance threshold based on reference levels established by OEHHA? (91506(I))	Subsection 305 establishes a 100 in a million threshold; it is not clear however if this number has been approved by the District Board as an enforceable threshold or whether this is only District policy that is not applied consistently. How would the process be implemented? Does the District toxics policy require public noticing and permitting of air toxic sources and how does this provision in the trading rule comply with air toxics requirements? These questions must be addressed in order to determine if the rule would meet State trading regulation requirements. There are no provisions in the rule that address how the district will address the potential of localized impacts from PM trading. This is a key deficiency.
Does the rule provide for public disclosure of any increase in toxic emissions resulting from generation or use of credits which results in a total facility-wide cancer health risk greater than 10 in a million or a total facility hazard index greater than 1? (91506(I))	No. This is a key deficiency.
Calculation *Methodology*	
Has the district identified, and does the rule refer to, adopted calculation criteria or protocols that will be used to quantify the value of IERCS? (91507(a))	Yes. See above comments on adequacy of these provisions.
Do these criteria or protocols satisfy State and federal requirements? (91507(a) and (b))	See above. At a minimum, mobile and area source categories that have the potential of generating credits must use district adopted calculation protocols.
Does the rule provide for calculation criteria or protocols that require the use of the most stringent of historic actual emissions, applicable requirements, the	No. In addition, there may be a problem because the RACT levels for establishing the baseline may no longer be federally approvable due to the recent SIP call.

district's air quality plan, the federally-approved SIP, or more stringent levels as established in an implementing rule or regulations? (91507(b))	
Does the rule calculation criteria or protocols provide for or reference the following: (91507(b))	
(1) methods to quantify reductions, including formulae that account for emissions rate, operating period, activity level, and technical uncertainty;	Not to the extent U.S. EPA may require.
(2) procedures for annualizing multi-year credits;	Not specifically.
(3) procedures to ensure IERCS are surplus and available for use pursuant to equivalency determination;	No.
(4) procedures to incorporate emission inventory updates and changes in source category baselines, air quality plans, and applicable requirements into the credit calculation protocols;	No.
(5) methods to determine the time period a banked credit is available for use, including a tie-in to the equivalency determination and applicable expiration dates;	Credits will have specified starting and ending dates; however, there is no lie in to equivalency.
(6) provisions to use applicable ARB data affecting mobile sources and consumer products including calculation methodology, emission facts, certification standards, baseline data, and expiration dates;	Yes. (604)
(7) MRR requirements.	No. There only seems to be a place holder with too much left to EO discretion. EPA is not likely to approve this.
Program Reporting	

Does the rule provide for annual reporting or audits that document the following: (91508) (1) quantity of IERCS generated and used, by pollutants; (2) IERCS used, by rule and source category, to comply with BARCT, and how they were accounted for in the air quality plan: (3) summary of any changes made affecting calculation methodology criteria or protocols; (4) actions taken to comply with generation and use requirements In the State regulation; (5) a finding of compliance with the equivalency requirement in the State regulation.	Yes. (408) However, without an equivalency process in place, it is unclear how reporting will comply with State requirements or lead to corrective actions.
Does the rule provide for an evaluation of program performance as part of the plan's triennial progress assessment? (91508)	Yes.