

# MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

---

## INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

---

TO: Air Quality Division (AQD) Field Staff

FROM: Christopher Ethridge, Field Operations Manager

DATE: April 2, 2018

SUBJECT: Renewable Operating Permit (ROP) Peer Review Process

### **Introduction**

This memorandum is intended to provide direction to AQD Field Staff as to the utilization of an ROP peer reviewer. The ROP Workgroup has developed this direction to identify the different types of peer reviewing, and to provide direction to the peer reviewer and the ROP writer.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the peer review process is to provide quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) and technical support for ROP Writers. The peer review process is also intended to assure consistency among permit reviews and be a cross reference on the applicable rules and regulations. The peer review process is not intended to make the permit review less efficient. If it appears your permit review progression is being held up in any way, communicate with your peer reviewer the timeframe required. If a resolution cannot be reached, speak with your supervisor so the permit review may move forward.

### **Types of Peer Review**

There are three types of reviews associated with the peer review process and more than one can be used at the same time. Each type of review is individual, depending on the situation, and is described below with a brief description:

#### **General ROP Review:**

- Read thoroughly through the Draft ROP, Staff Report, and Technical Review Notes.
- Check that the most recent "ROP Template Shell NEW" is being used.
- Check that the descriptions in the body of the ROP match the "Emission Unit Summary Table" and "Flexible Group Summary Table."
- Check that the numbering is correct throughout each emission unit, flexible group, and appendix in the ROP.
- Check that the special conditions referenced in the Emission Limit and Material Limit sections match the associated special condition.
- If stack testing is required, verify that the testing language is proper and up-to-date.
- Verify that the monitoring/recordkeeping and reporting are proper and up-to-date language is used for any Rule 213 requirements.
- In the Technical Review Notes, were there any comments under "Staff note changes and corrections to be made to the ROP upon renewal?" Check that all ROP updates (incorporation of new PTIs, rules and regulations) needed for the renewal were made.

- Verify all CAM conditions, MACT, NSPS, etc. included in the ROP are proper and up to date, and discussed in the Staff Report.
- Ensure the Staff Report includes sufficient detail covering any regulatory analysis and any significant changes from the previous ROP, and that the content of the ROP matches the Staff Report.
- Make sure all acronyms are consistent as listed in Appendix A.
- Verify that all appendices are proper and up-to-date, and that correct appendices are referenced throughout the ROP.
- Check all footnotes. The footnotes should be correctly cited, referenced, and the language up-to-date.

### **Subject Matter Technical Review**

- Subject matter includes MACTs, specific source types (power plants, chemical plants, auto plants, coating sources, oil and gas, steel mills, landfills, etc.), Acid Rain Permits, CSAPR, and CAM where the ROP writer may need additional assistance from an expert.
- If a source is required to have Acid Rain Permits or CSAPR requirements, coordinate with the subject matter expert (SME) or specialist as required in the ROP Manual.
- If a source is subject to CAM, coordinate review of the CAM plan, staff report, and permit conditions with the SME or specialist.
- Identify and help with usage of MACT templates, and CAM, CSAPR, and Acid Rain boiler plate templates and language.
- May include identification and development of permit conditions and updating MACT templates as necessary.
- Help facilitate discussions with permit staff when necessary.

### **Response to Comments Review**

- Focuses on consistency in responses to comments.
- Involves SMEs when necessary.
- Reviews the public comment and permit documents to make sure all relevant comments are addressed, and that the response is appropriate and up-to-date.

General ROP reviews and subject matter reviews are meant to be completed before the supervisor reviews the draft ROP documents. If revisions to the ROP documents are needed after the public and/or EPA comment periods, these reviewers could be consulted again. A response to comments reviewer would be assigned after any comments are received.

### **Responsibilities**

The supervisor will determine if a peer reviewer is necessary, and if so, make the request. A peer reviewer can be assigned at any point in the ROP process. Likewise, an ROP writer can request a peer reviewer through their supervisor.

## **ROP Writer**

ROP writer responsibilities include:

- Initiate contact with peer reviewer as soon as the assignment of a peer reviewer is made.
- Identify the schedule for ROP review (including the application processing timeline) and relay it, if applicable.
- Keep the peer reviewer updated on progress of the review.
  - Copy peer reviewer on relevant correspondence regarding conditions and status updates.
- Present the permit documents to the peer reviewer for review prior to sending draft ROP documents to the supervisor for review.
- If the ROP writer does not agree with the type of peer review involved, they will discuss this with their supervisor.

## **Peer Reviewer**

The peer reviewer responsibilities vary depending on the type of review. Examples of responsibilities and questions listed below are not all inclusive and are to provide guidance only.

Some examples of responsibilities of the peer reviewer are as follows:

- Peer Reviewer Responsibilities
  - QA/QC check of documents (check for grammar, spelling, format, etc.)
    - Letters to company and interested parties
    - Technical Review Notes
    - Staff Report
    - Permit Conditions
  - Sign off on final conditions/documents
- Example Questions
  - Were the ROP templates followed?
    - Has the ROP writer modified language from the templates or PTIs that were incorporated? Why?
  - Are the Technical Review Notes complete so the next ROP writer understands what was changed and why?
  - Was an SME used and/or are MACT templates, CAM templates, etc. updated?
  - Have all PTIs, applicable rules and regulations been incorporated into the ROP?

## **Implementation**

A targeted 25% of ROPs will be go through a General ROP Review per district office. District Supervisors should consider the complexity of the ROP, how many changes have occurred to the ROP since last issuance, and any other compelling reasons when deciding which ROPs should be peer reviewed.

When the ROP writer has completed their technical review, a copy of the draft ROP, Staff Report, and Technical Review Notes will be sent to the Field Operations Manager and Peer Review (PR) Coordinator. The assignment of the peer reviewer will then be made. Once the peer review has been completed, the documents and any peer reviewer comments will be sent back to the ROP writer copying the District Supervisor, Field Operations Manager, and PR Coordinator. The ROP writer will then work to incorporate any agreed upon changes before sending the draft documents to the District Supervisor for review.

## **Follow Up**

The ROP Workgroup will meet one year from the issuance of this memorandum to review the effectiveness of the ROP Peer Review Process and this guidance document.

## **ROP Workgroup Members**

Julie Brunner  
Heidi Hollenbach  
Sebastian Kallumkal  
Rebecca Loftus  
Gina McCann  
Kelly Orent  
Caryn Owens