

# Air Emissions Reporting Requirements (AERR) – Misconceptions

MARC HOUYOUX

OFFICE OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING AND STANDARDS

EMISSIONS INVENTORY ANALYSIS GROUP

AAPCA, FALL 2024





# Overview

- ▶ AERR proposal summary
- ▶ Selected misconceptions about AERR proposal related to
  - ▶ Role of state/local/tribe (SLT)
  - ▶ Trivial emissions
  - ▶ Air permits and emissions
  - ▶ Use of the Combined Air Emissions Reporting System (CAERS)
  - ▶ Small entities
  - ▶ Performance test reporting
  - ▶ Reporting about prescribed burning
  - ▶ Costs and benefits



# Key Provisions of AERR Proposal

- ▶ Require owners/operators to report point source hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions
  - ▶ States/locals/tribes (SLTs) can report on their behalf
  - ▶ Emissions reporting thresholds based on risks associated with pollutants
- ▶ Require owners/operators outside of states/locals to report emissions of criteria air pollutants/precursors (CAPs) and HAP
- ▶ Implement other point source reporting changes such as emissions from on-site mobile sources, applicable regulations
- ▶ Require owner/operators to report performance test and performance evaluation data where those tests are required by federal or state regulations
- ▶ Require states/locals to report certain prescribed fire activity data such as acres burned, dates, and locations
- ▶ For nonpoint sources, report activity data and emissions (optionally) and require documentation when non-EPA methods are used



# Misconception 1: EPA wants to cut States out of HAP emissions collection

- ▶ Comment summary: Proposal would make it harder for SLTs to report HAP, so EPA must not want SLTs to be involved



# Misconception 2: EPA intends to collect trivial levels of emissions no matter the burden

- ▶ Comment summary: Reporting “all HAP” emissions from unpermitted parts of a facility would add unwarranted burden



# Misconception 3: Air permits define “insignificant” for emissions inventory purposes

- ▶ Paraphrasing comments related to this:
  - ▶ AERR should define insignificant activities and emissions levels consistent with definitions used for permitting
  - ▶ States collect emissions data only for those activities listed in permits



# Misconception 4: EPA is forcing States to use CAERS

7

- ▶ Related comment summaries:
  - ▶ EPA is effectively imposing the use of CAERS because of short proposed timelines
  - ▶ EPA did not include an option for states to report emissions directly to the Emissions Inventory System (EIS)



# Misconception 5: EPA has not appropriately addressed burden for small entities

- ▶ Comment summary: EPA should provide additional support and guidance to small entities, especially if they are not already subject to reporting



# Misconception 6: The Emissions Reporting Tool (ERT) does not support my test method

- ▶ Commenters said:
  - ▶ The ERT does not support all necessary tests and parameter inputs
  - ▶ My stack testing firm is not familiar with the ERT



# Misconception 7: Prescribed fire data are difficult to collect and not useful

- ▶ Related comment summaries:
  - ▶ Some states have no way to acquire data on prescribed burning and creating a process would be burdensome and may be of little benefit
  - ▶ This burden includes updating laws, data quality assurance, system maintenance and management
- ▶ What EPA has learned by following up on comments:
  - ▶ The National Association of State Foresters (NASF) has implemented and wants to improve fire data collection tools via funding from the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA)
  - ▶ The national Interagency Fire Occurrence Reporting Modules (InFORM) also shows promise for data sharing
  - ▶ EPA has discussed the possibility of data sharing with NASF in the future
  - ▶ Prescribed fires data can assist states with future exceptional events demonstrations for the 2024  $PM_{2.5}$  standard



# Misconception 8: The AERR proposal is not justifiable because of benefits are not quantified

- ▶ Comment summary: The lack of quantified benefits means that the costs are not justified



# In Conclusion

- ▶ The proposed AERR received constructive feedback to inform the final rule
- ▶ EPA intends to continue dialog with stakeholders to implement a final rule:
  - ▶ Build relationships and learn from each other
  - ▶ Develop and provide useful guidance, training, and industry outreach materials
  - ▶ Create the Small Entity Emissions Estimation Tool
  - ▶ Continue to find and implement streamlining opportunities for data collection