

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Elizabeth Jones](#)
Subject: FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Private/Before Publication)
Date: Friday, June 24, 2022 3:47:47 PM

From: Texas Sunset Advisory Commission <sunset@sunset.texas.gov>
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2022 3:21 PM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission <Sunset.AdvisoryCommission@sunset.texas.gov>
Subject: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Private/Before Publication)

Submitted on Fri, 06/24/2022 - 13:50

Submitted by: Visitor

Submitted values are:

Choose the agency that you would like to provide input about
[Texas Commission on Environmental Quality](#)

Public Comments

1

First Name

Lance

Last Name

Dunlop

Email

City

Abilene

State

Texas

Your Comments or Concerns

1. Companies operate under permits that essentially unchanged over decades and operate under provisions that allow unauthorized emissions. Take Oxy Salt Creek Gas Plant; when that site went from flaring acid gas in the mid 1990s, to a CO2 flood system, they were permitted large quantities of flare emissions prior to the transistions. The site under normal operating conditions flares very litte. When the plantis under upset conditions the flare emissions are taken asa authorized for the upset and not reported asa an emissions event. The TCEQ will not challange any companies about outdated permit authorizations that could identifiy potential issues at the sites.
2. The agency under the emissions event rules go after the sites that emit and not after the sites that

may be responsible for the emissions, An example is the daisy chain event within the Permian Basin area. One plant may have an upset that causes them to close off any input from several different sites until the emission event is resolved. The site with the emissions event may not exceed an RQ and not report the event. However the blocked in sites have to report their events when they exceed an RQ. The Agency was in the process of permitting these emissions and not identifying the cause of the event and taking actions of the primary cause..

3. The emissions event rules allow for a Chronic Excessive Emissions Event to be cited for sites that have several excessive emissions event determinations. I do not know of any determinations that have been made. The Chronic investigation has to be directed by management according to the emission event guidance.

4. Enforcement actions take years or more to resolve. There should be better oversight on timelines. Buzzi Unichem USA, Lone Star Maryneal had NOEs written for three consecutive years that were allowed to stagnate without any actions. The 1st NOE sat on an enforcement coordinator's desk for over a year without any actions. The second NOE stagnated also.

5. The investigators are severely under paid and top out in their career fields at an EI4 with very little future advancement as an investigator.

Your Proposed Solution

1. The renewal process should require documented operation emissions to prove the emissions are accurate, not just an automatic renewal that is in place now. Investigators with issues on the authorized operating conditions or permit allowable should be investigated. The standard answer of that is in the permit and we do not open the permit for the prior authorizations should not be allowed.

2. Sites that cause daisy chain emissions events should be responsible for the emissions they cause and the actions to resolve future occurrences. There should be an excessive criteria for these sites even if they did not exceed an RQ..

3. Identify the Chronic sites and do something to solve the issues of these excessive events.

4. Develop method to keep the enforcement activities moving towards resolution and not stagnate.

5. A more open career path with higher level as an investigator (not as a manager) should be developed to retain the qualified investigators.

My Comments Will Be Made Public

Yes