



Agency Contacts for this Project

Division Contact: William Kenny, Division of Air Pollution Control, 614-644-2039,
William.kenny@epa.ohio.gov

On January 16, 2024, Ohio EPA announced a public comment period for the Supplement to Ohio's Regional Haze State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the Second Implementation Period. On January 30, 2024, Ohio EPA extended that comment period to Monday, March 18, 2024, to allow for a Federal Land Manager (FLM) consultation period in accordance with 40 CFR 51.308(i)(2), which ran concurrently with the public comment period. Ohio EPA held a public hearing on Monday, March 18, 2024, at 10:30 AM. After that public comment period ended and Ohio considered comments received, Ohio drafted Director's Findings and Orders (DFFO) to effectuate the limits set forth in the supplemental analyses. Ohio allowed for an FLM consultation period to run from May 3, 2024, through May 31, 2024. After consideration of FLM comments, Ohio held a public comment period on those DFFOs from June 4, 2024, through July 8, 2024. Ohio EPA held a public hearing on Monday, July 8, 2024, at 2:30 PM This document summarizes the comments and questions received during all of the above comment periods and at the public hearings. By law, Ohio EPA has authority to consider specific issues related to protection of the environment and public health. In an effort to help you review this document, the questions are grouped by topic and organized in a consistent format.

FLM Comments from the first comment period

Comment 1: Comments were received from the National Park Service (NPS) and the Forest Service (FS). Comments from both NPS and the FS centered on two overall topics: the process by which the FLM consultation on this supplement took place, and the facility emission limits in the supplement. (Herbert Frost, NPS; Tracy Calizon, FS)

Response 1: Thank you for your comments. Details about these comments and Ohio EPA's responses may be found below.

Comment 2: Both FLMs expressed concern that the consultation process undertaken by Ohio EPA for this supplement did not satisfy the FLM consultation requirements for Regional Haze plans or plan revisions. (Herbert Frost, NPS; Tracy Calizon, FS)

Response 2: Ohio EPA recognizes that in this situation there was no FLM consultation period prior to the public comment opportunity. As stated above, these were undertaken concurrently. Ohio EPA understands the requirements for a 60-day FLM consultation period prior to public comment opportunity on

implementation plans, plan revisions, or progress reports. Ohio EPA understands the FLM's interpretation of this Supplement as a plan revision. However, it was not Ohio EPA's understanding that this Supplement was classified as any of those and was following a process that was developed with the guidance and approval of U.S. EPA. In the future, Ohio EPA will strive to provide robust FLM consultation on Regional Haze State Implementation Planning.

Comment 3: Both FLMs provided comment expressing concern that the proposed emission limits for the facilities in the supplement are not satisfactory. They claim that the limits will not affect the current level of actual emissions from the facilities and will therefore lead to no improvements in visibility. Additionally, NPS provided further comment with analyses to support suggested changes, including alternative proposed emission rates and control improvements. These analyses assess the results on emissions from the facilities as well as the cost-effectiveness of the suggestions. (Herbert Frost, NPS; Tracy Calizon, FS)

Response 3: Ohio EPA appreciates the suggestions of the FLMs and the analyses provided in their comments. At this time, Ohio EPA believes that Ohio's Regional Haze SIP and this supplement provide what is necessary for reasonable further progress during this period. However, Ohio EPA will take the suggestions and analyses provided by the FLMs under strong consideration during the next Regional Haze planning period.

Comments from the first public comment period

Comment 4: Comments were also received from The National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), Sierra Club, the Coalition to Protect America's National Parks, and the Ohio Environmental Council (OEC) (collectively, the Conservation Organizations). These comments focused on expressing concern that the proposed emissions limits for the facilities in the supplement are not satisfactory. Like the FLMs they also provided further comments with analyses to support suggested changes, including alternative proposed emission rates and control improvements. They also assess the cost-effectiveness of the suggestions and provide examples from Regional Haze SIPs from other states which have resulted in some of the types of controls and cost-effectiveness thresholds they are recommending. (Crystal

Davis, NPCA; Caitlin Miller, NPCA; Philip Francis, Coalition to Protect America's National Parks; Tony Mendoza, Sierra Club; Chris Tavenor, OEC)

Response 4: Ohio EPA appreciates the suggestions of the Conservation Organizations and the analyses provided in their comments. At this time, Ohio EPA believes that Ohio's Regional Haze SIP and this supplement provide what is necessary for reasonable further progress during this period. However, Ohio EPA will take the suggestions and analyses provided by the Conservation Organizations under strong consideration during the next Regional Haze planning period.

Comment 5: Comments were also received from Buckeye Power and OVEC. These comments focused on affirming the sufficiency of the limits laid out in the supplement. Additionally, these comments provided some counterarguments to the FLM assertions regarding the limits being unsatisfactory. (Mike Born)

Response 5: Thank you for your comments.

FLM Comments from second FLM consultation period

Comment 6: Both the NPS and the FS noted that the DFFOs did not substantially change Ohio's January 16, 2024 SIP revision draft and contained limits consistent with those included in that draft SIP revision and therefore they had no further comment but referred to their previously submitted comments from the first FLM consultation period. (Herbert Frost, NPS; Tracy Calizon, FS)

Response 6: Thank you for your comments, and please see responses to comments from first FLM consultation period.

Comments from second public comment period

Comment 7: Both the NPS and the FS indicated that the materials submitted were substantially similar to what they reviewed previously and reiterated their previous comments. (Herbert Frost, NPS; Tracy Calizon, FS)

Response 7: Thank you for your comments, and please see responses to comments from first FLM consultation period.

Comment 8: Additional comments were received from Buckeye Power and OVEC. These comments again focused on affirming the sufficiency of the limits laid out in the supplement and overall approvability of the supplement. (Mike Born)

Response 8: Thank you for your comments.

Comment 9: Additional comments were received from the Conservation Organizations. These comments largely reiterated their previous concerns that the emissions limits are not satisfactory. However, they also included concern about the procedure by which the DFFOs become effective. The DFFOs state that the orders become effective “the date they are entered into the Ohio EPA Director’s journal” which the Conservation Organizations contend could occur “on any date or not at all”. (Caitlin Miller, NPCA; Tony Mendoza, Sierra Club)

Response 9: Ohio EPA will be ensuring the director’s orders are incorporated into the Director’s Journal prior to submitting the supplement to USEPA for SIP approval.

End of Response to Comments