

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SANTA TERESA CITIZEN ACTION GROUP, CITY OF MORGAN HILL, CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC. and DEMAND CLEAN AIR,	)	No. 01-71611
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
Petitioners,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD OF THE UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,	)	PETITIONERS' OPENING BRIEF
	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	
	)	
CALPINE CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
	)	
Intervenor.	)	
	)	

	<p>STEPHAN C. VOLKER LAW OFFICES OF STEPHAN C. VOLKER 436 14th Street, Suite 1300 Oakland, CA 94612 (510) 496-0600 Attorneys for Petitioners Santa Teresa Citizen Action Group, <i>et al.</i></p>
--	---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
CERTIFICATE BY COUNSEL OF COMPLIANCE WITH BRIEF SIZE LIMITS	vii
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION	1
I.    JURISDICTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD	1
II.   APPELLATE JURISDICTION	1
III.  APPEALABILITY	1
IV.  TIMELINESS OF THE APPEAL	1
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES	1
STANDARD OF REVIEW	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
I.    NATURE OF THE CASE	4
II.   COURSE OF PROCEEDINGS	5
III.  DISPOSITION OF BOARD	7
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS	7
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	12
ARGUMENT	14
I.    THE DISTRICT FAILED TO ALLOW FOR MEANINGFUL, ADEQUATE PARTICIPATION IN THE PERMITTING PROCESS.	14
A.    The Clean Air Act Mandates Adequate Opportunity for	

Informed Public Participation In The  
Decisionmaking Process. 14

B. Post-Comment Period Justifications for Rejecting Control  
Measures Should Be Available for Public  
Comment When Such Control Measures  
Are Essential Provisions of The Clean Air  
Act. 15

C. Additional Information Submitted After the Close of the Public  
Comment Period Raises Substantial New  
Questions About the Methodology of The  
District's and Applicant's BACT Analyses.  
19

D. This Court Is Not Constrained by The Board's Purported  
Prescription Against Reopening The Public  
Comment Period to Consider  
Post-Comment Period Information. 21

II. THE DISTRICT DID NOT COMPLY WITH THE CLEAN AIR  
ACT REQUIREMENT THAT IT RESPOND TO ALL  
SIGNIFICANT PUBLIC COMMENTS 22

A. The District's Complete Failure to Respond to Comments Was  
Arbitrary and Capricious 23

B. The District's Response to Comments About Meteorological  
Data and Toxic Emissions Was Inadequate 25

III. THE DISTRICT DID NOT COMPLY WITH THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR DETERMINING BACT IN ISSUING  
THE FINAL PERMIT 27

A. SCONO<sub>x</sub> Is Both Available and Applicable to This Facility  
28

B. SCONO<sub>x</sub> Is Technically Feasible for This Facility 28

C. The District's Analysis Did Not Include the Lowest NO<sub>x</sub> Limit  
31

D. The Collateral Environmental Impacts of SCR Were Not

Adequately Evaluated 32

E. The District Failed to Require BACT for CO Startup and Shutdown Emissions 34

IV. THE BOARD'S FAILURE TO GRANT REVIEW WAS ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS 35

V. THE DISTRICT'S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT WAS ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS 36

A. CEQA Applies to the District's Issuance of a PSD Permit Under Authority Delegated by the EPA 37

B. The District Violated CEQA by Improperly Issuing a PSD Permit Prior to the Issuance of a Project License by the CEC 39

C. The Board's Jurisdiction Includes CEQA Compliance 39

CONCLUSION 41

STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES REQUIRED BY NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL RULE 13(B)(4) 41

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

- AES Puerto Rico L.P.*  
PSD Appeal Nos. 98-29, 98-30 & 98-31 (EAB, May 27, 1999) 16
- American Mining Congress v. US EPA*  
965 F.2d 759 (9th Cir. 1992) 3, 22
- American Soda*  
UIC Appeal Nos. 00-1 & 00-2 (EAB, June 30, 2000) 16
- Amoco Oil Company*  
4 E.A.D. 954, 980 (EAB, Nov. 23, 1993) 17
- Ash Grove Cement Co.*  
7 E.A.D. 387 (EAB 1997) 20-21
- Citizens for Clean Air v. US EPA*  
959 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1992) 4, 22, 27
- Home Box Office v. FCC*  
567 F.2d 9 (D.C. Cir. 1977),  
*cert. denied* 434 U.S. 829, 98 S.Ct. 111, 54 L.Ed.2d 89 (1977) 22
- Idaho Farm Bureau Federation v. Babbitt*  
58 F.3d 1392 (9th Cir. 1995) 20-22
- In re Steel Dynamics, Inc.*  
PSD Appeal Nos. 99-4 & 99-5 (EAB, June 22, 2000) 21-23
- Knauf Fiber Glass, GmbH*  
PSD Appeal Nos. 98-3 through 98-20 (EAB, February 4, 1999) 16, 21, 40
- Masonite Corp.*  
5 E.A.D. 551, PSD Appeal No. 94-1 (EAB, November 1, 1994) 28
- NE Hub Partners, L.P.*  
7 E.A.D. 561; *review denied sub nom. Penn Fuel Gas, Inc. v. U.S. EPA*  
185 F.3d 862 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1999) 16-17, 20, 22

<i>Ober v. U.S. EPA</i>	
84 F.3d 304 (9th Cir. 1996)	<i>passim</i>
<i>RockGen Energy Center</i>	
PSD App. No. 99-1, slip op. at 15, n. 10 (EAB, Aug. 25, 1999)	9, 29
<i>Rybachek v. EPA</i>	
904 F.2d 1276 (9th Cir.1990)	19
<i>State of Cal. ex rel. Air Resources Board v. U.S. E.P.A.</i>	
774 F.2d 1437 (9th Cir. 1985)	22
<i>Sutter Power Plant</i>	
PSD Appeal Nos. 99-6 & 99-73 (EAB Dec 2, 1999)	39
<i>Three Mountain Power, L.L.C.</i>	
PSD Appeal Nos. 01-05 (EAB, May 30, 2001)	35
<i>Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC</i>	
435 U.S. 519, 98 S.Ct. 1197 (1978)	22
<i>Western Coal Traffic League v. U.S.</i>	
677 F.2d 915, 927 (D.C. Cir. 1982)	
<i>cert. denied</i> 459 U.S. 1086 (1983)	23
<i>West Suburban Recycling and Energy Center</i>	
PSD Appeal Nos. 95-1 and 96-1 (EAB, Dec. 11, 1996)	28

STATUTES (federal)

5 U.S.C. § 551	4
5 U.S.C. § 701	4
5 U.S.C. § 704	4
5 U.S.C. § 706	3
42 U.S.C. § 7407	7, 8
42 U.S.C. § 7470	7, 8, 14
42 U.S.C. § 7475	8
42 U.S.C. § 7479	9, 35
42 U.S.C. § 7602	28
42 U.S.C. § 7607	1, 4

STATUTES (state)

Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21000 <i>et seq.</i>	36
Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21061	37
Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21100	37
Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21151	37
Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21067	37
Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21069	37

### ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

14 C.C.R. 15000 <i>et seq.</i>	37-38
14 C.C.R. 15251	38
14 C.C.R. 15253	38
40 C.F.R. 50.4	8
40 C.F.R. 52.21	<i>passim</i>
40 C.F.R. 81.305	5
40 C.F.R. 124	14, 28
40 C.F.R. 124.13	24
40 C.F.R. 124.17	16-17, 22, 42
40 C.F.R. 124.18	16
40 C.F.R. 124.19	1, 14, 17, 19, 40
40 C.F.R. 124.20	6

### OTHER

Environmental Protection Agency “New Source Review Workshop Manual” (Draft, October 1990).	9, 29-34
45 Fed. Reg. 33,290, 33,412 (May 19, 1980)	18
56 Fed. Reg. 4944, Section 1 (February 7, 1991)	38, 40
66 Fed. Reg. 47578 (September 13, 2001)	1, 7
BAAQMD Rule 2-1-426	38
BAAQMD Rule 2-2-208	38
BAAQMD Rule 2-2-213	38
BAAQMD Rule 2-2-401.3	38
BAAQMD Rule 2-2-404.1	38
BAAQMD Rule 2-2-405.1	38
BAAQMD Rule 2-2-407	39
BAAQMD Rule 2-2-407.1	38



## CERTIFICATE BY COUNSEL OF COMPLIANCE WITH BRIEF SIZE LIMITS

I certify pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(C) and Ninth Circuit Rule 32-1, the attached opening/answering/reply/cross-appeal brief is proportionately spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more and contains 12,098 words (opening, answering, and the second and third briefs filed in cross-appeals must not exceed 14,000 word; reply briefs must not exceed 7,000 words).

Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B) states in relevant part:

- (i) A principal brief is acceptable if ... it contains no more than 14,000 words; ...
- (ii) A reply brief is acceptable if it contains no more than half of the type volume specified in Rule 21(a)(7)(B)(i). ...
- (iii) Headings, footnotes, and quotations count toward the word and line limitations. The corporate disclosure statement, table of contents, table of citations, statement with respect to oral argument, any addendum containing statutes, rules or regulations, and any certificates of counsel do not count toward the limitation.

Dated: February 26, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

STEPHAN C. VOLKER  
LAW OFFICES OF STEPHAN C.  
VOLKER  
436 14th Street, Suite 1300  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Attorneys for Petitioners  
Santa Teresa Citizen Action Group, *et al.*

## CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Santa Teresa Citizen Action Group, City of Morgan Hill, Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc. and Demand Clean Air have no parent companies, subsidiaries, or affiliates that have issued shares to the public in the United States.

Respectfully submitted February 25, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPHAN C. VOLKER  
LAW OFFICES OF STEPHAN C.  
VOLKER  
436 14th Street, Suite 1300  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Attorneys for Petitioners Santa Teresa  
Citizen Action Group, *et al.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing

PETITIONERS' OPENING BRIEF

were sent by First Class U.S. Mail as follows:

Environmental Appeals Board  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20460

Robert Kwong, Esq.  
District Counsel  
Bay Area Air Quality Management Dist.  
939 Ellis Street  
San Francisco, CA 94109

Counsel for Calpine/Bechtel  
Daniel M. Steinway, Esq.  
Thomas C. Jackson, Esq.  
J. Barton Seitz, Esq.  
Kelley, Drye & Warren LLP  
1200 19th Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Kara Christenson, Esq.  
Assistant Regional Counsel  
Office of the Regional Counsel  
U.S. EPA, Region IX  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Kerry Willis, Esq.  
Staff Counsel  
California Energy Commission  
1516 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Thomas H. Pacheco, Esq.  
Attorney  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Environmental Defense Section  
301 Howard St., Suite 1050  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Executed February 26, 2002 at Oakland, California.