ENVIRONMENTAL BREAKFAST CLUB
REGULATORY SUMMARY

July 12, 2012

Prepared by:
Elizabeth Morss
Young/Sommer LLC
5 Palisades Drive
Albany, NY 12205
(518) 438-9907, ext. 232
emorss@youngsommer.com
http://www.youngsommer.com

Final Statutes, Regulations and Guidance

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
CLIMATE CHANGE			
NEW YORK STATE **Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Major Electric Generating Facilities** 6 NYCRR Part 251	As required by the 2011 Power NY Act, DEC **adopted regulations establishing carbon dioxide (CO_2) emission limits for new and substantially expanded major electric generating facilities** – defined as facilities that: (1) sell power to the grid; (2) use boilers, combustion turbines or other similar equipment to produce electricity; and (3) have a generating capacity of at least 25 megawatts (MW). Facilities subject to the rule must comply with CO_2 emission limits measured as a 12-month rolling average on either an output (annual total MW generated) or input (annual Btu input) basis. The regulation contains output and input-based CO_2 emission limits for two broad categories of units that apply depending on the specific type of unit. Owners/operators of units that are not subject to these limits must propose and meet a case-specific emission limit for CO_2 based on an analysis of control technologies and operating efficiencies for existing sources and other relevant information. To demonstrate compliance, facilities that are subject to the monitoring, reporting and recordkeeping requirements of 40 CFR Part 75 (the Title IV acid rain program) must comply with those requirements. Facilities not otherwise subject to 40 CFR Part 75 may comply with the monitoring, reporting and recordkeeping requirements of 40 CFR Part 60 (new source performance standards). The rule also contains provisions relating to installing and operating continuous emission monitoring systems, out-of-control periods, maintenance of vendor-certified fuel receipts, and preparation of reports, among other subjects. The regulation can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/propregulations.html.	The regulation applies to new electric generating facilities with a nameplate capacity of at least 25 MW and existing facilities constructing at least 25 MW of additional capacity. Under the authorizing statute, facilities seeking a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need from the new siting board must demonstrate compliance with Part 251 and obtain a permit from DEC that incorporates the requirements of the rule.	The rule took effect July 12, 2012. Per DEC, most conventional units can meet the CO_2 emission limits in the regulations. However, new coal-fired and oil-fired boilers will require controls such as carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) to comply with Part 251. Since CCS technologies are not widely available, the rule has the effect of discouraging construction of coal and oil-fired power plants in New York.

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW			
NEW YORK STATE **Analysis of Environmental Justice Issues Associated with Siting Major Electric Generating Facilities** 6 NYCRR Part 487	As required by the 2011 Power NY Act, DEC established procedures for **conducting environmental justice (EJ) reviews in conjunction with projects requiring Certificates of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need under Article 10 of the Public Service Law**. Under 6 NYCRR Part 487, the following steps must be taken to assess whether proposed major electric generating facilities (i.e., any electric generating facility with a nameplate generating capacity of 25 MW or more) will have a disproportionate impact on minority or low income communities: • Identify the impact study area (a minimum of a one-half mile radius around the proposed location of the facility or larger based on site-specific factors). • Determine whether the impact study area contains one or more EJ areas applying criteria spelled out in the regulation. • Initiate the EJ analysis early in the pre-application process and include EJ information in the preliminary scoping statement. If an EJ area is present in the impact study area or the applicant concludes that a full EJ analysis is necessary, include specified information in the application. • If the applicant is required to complete an EJ analysis and the facility is an air emission source, conduct a cumulative impact analysis of air quality in accordance with a modeling protocol approved by DEC. • Identify comparison areas and prepare comprehensive demographic, economic and physical descriptions of the impact study and comparison areas. • Evaluate whether the impact study area has significant and adverse disproportionate environmental impacts. If impacts are found, identify the measures to be taken to avoid, offset or minimize each impact. The applicant must avoid any disproportionate impacts to the maximum extent practicable. If the impact cannot be avoided, it must be minimized. Any impacts that cannot be minimized must be offset. • Prepare a statement of environmental justice issues summarizing the final EJ analysis. The regulation can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/propregulations.html.	The regulation applies to siting electric generating facilities with a nameplate capacity of at least 25 MW.	The rule takes effect July 12, 2012. Over the years, DEC has issued various guidance documents addressing EJ issues, including Commissioner Policy 29, *Environmental Justice and Permitting*, which provides guidance on incorporating EJ concerns into New York's environmental permit review process and DEC's application of the State Environmental Quality Review Act. DEC's Part 487 regulations represent one of the first times EJ concerns have been directly addressed by a major state statute/regulation.

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
GENERAL/OTHER			
NEW YORK STATE **2012 New York State Legislative Session**	The **New York State Legislature had a relatively quiet session in 2012 from an environmental perspective**. Numerous environmental bills were introduced throughout the session, with many targeting the environmental impact of hydraulic fracturing and the regulation/ prohibition of products containing certain chemicals. Ultimately, however, the legislature passed relatively few major environmental initiatives. Bills of note approved by the legislature include: • ***Sewage right-to-know*** **(A.10585-A/S.6268-D).** This law requires publicly owned treatment works to quickly notify DEC, the local or state health department, local officials, and the general public whenever there are discharges of untreated or partially treated sewage, including combined sewer overflows (other than those authorized by permit). DEC must post the reported information on its website and prepare an annual report summarizing incidents. Within a year, DEC must develop regulations to implement the notification requirement that define what types of incidents may present a threat to public health and so must be reported. • ***Unredeemed deposits*** **(A.10519/S.7525).** This law requires a portion of unredeemed container deposits, most of which are now deposited in the general fund, to be paid into the Environmental Protection Fund (EPF), which is used to finance environmentally-friendly projects. The amount of unredeemed deposits paid into the EPF will increase from $10 million in fiscal year 2013-2014 to $56 million in 2018-2019. • ***Brownfield tax credit extender*** **(A.10593/S.7788).** The legislature extended the brownfield redevelopment tax credits, remediated brownfield credits for real property taxes for qualified sites, and environmental remediation insurance credits authorized under the 2003 Brownfield Cleanup Program from March 31, 2015 to December 31, 2015. These bills can be found on the New York Assembly's website at: assembly.state.ny.us.	Significant attention has focused on the sewer right-to-know bill. The original version would have required immediate reporting of all discharges of untreated or partially treated sewage regardless of the potential threat posed. When municipalities and others objected, the bill was revised to compel DEC to define what types of incidents require reporting. Critics of the brownfield tax credit program charge that it disproportionately allocates benefits to redevelopment rather than cleanup costs, benefitting wealthy developers and doing little to encourage the cleanup of contaminated sites in economically distressed areas. The legislature enacted the extension to ensure cleanups continue while it considers more comprehensive changes to the tax credit program.	

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

Proposed Statutes, Regulations and Guidance

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
AIR			
FEDERAL **National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter** 40 CFR Parts 50, 51, 52, 53 and 58 77 Fed. Reg. 38890 (June 29, 2012)	EPA **proposed to strengthen the 2006 national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) and impose separate PM standards designed to improve visibility**, primarily in urban areas. The proposed standards fulfill EPA's obligation to review each NAAQS every five years; they also respond to a 2009 court decision remanding two of the existing $PM_{2.5}$ standards back to EPA for further review. Among other things, EPA proposed to: • Lower the existing primary (health-based) annual $PM_{2.5}$ standard from 15 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$) to a range of 12 to 13 $\mu g/m^3$, although EPA is accepting comments on alternative levels down to 11 $\mu g/m^3$. According to EPA, recent studies show that the current standard does not adequately protect public health. • Retain the existing 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standard of 35 $\mu g/m^3$. • Retain the existing 24-hour primary standard for coarse particles (PM_{10}) of 150 $\mu g/m^3$. • Establish a new secondary standard for $PM_{2.5}$ of 28 or 30 deciviews, a visibility metric. The higher the deciview value, the greater the level of visibility impairment. Under the proposed rule, an area would meet the standard if the 90th percentile of 24-hour visibility index values in one year, averaged over three years, is no more than the level of the standard. EPA is accepting comments on alternative levels down to 25 deciviews and on alternative averaging times. • Retain the existing secondary standards for PM (with minor changes) to protect against other welfare impacts. As part of the rulemaking, EPA also proposed to: (1) relocate approximately 50 $PM_{2.5}$ monitors to sites near roadways in major cities; (2) revise the air quality index to reflect the new $PM_{2.5}$ standards; and (3) grandfather facilities from compliance with the prevention of significant deterioration program if a draft permit or preliminary determination has been issued for public comment by the effective date of the revised standards. The proposed rule can be found in the June 29, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.	If adopted, EPA's revised standards could result in the designation of additional PM nonattainment areas. According to EPA, however, recent EPA regulations, such as the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, will cut emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ precursors enough to ensure that the vast majority of counties will not be required to undertake additional actions to reduce emissions. Areas with $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment areas can meet the NAAQS by reducing direct emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ and/or emissions of nitrogen and sulfur oxides, both of which can transform into fine particles.	EPA is accepting comments on the proposed rule until **August 31, 2012**. Pursuant to a recent court settlement, EPA must take final action on the revised standards by December 14, 2012.

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
AIR			
FEDERAL **National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines** 40 CFR Part 63, subpart ZZZZ 77 Fed. Reg. 33812 (June 7, 2012)	EPA **proposed changes to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants** (**NESHAP**) **for new and existing stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines (RICE)** located at major and area sources of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). The standards, which are set forth at 40 CFR Part 63, subpart ZZZZ, were adopted in stages, imposing different emission limits, management practice and other requirements on RICE depending on various factors, including the type of source (major versus area), whether the source is new or existing, the type of engine, the type of fuel burned, and whether the unit is used for emergencies. The standards have been the subject of multiple lawsuits and petitions for reconsideration; this rulemaking is intended to address the issues raised in these challenges. Major changes include: • Allowing stationary 4-stroke rich burn spark ignition engines subject to a 76 percent reduction in formaldehyde emissions to demonstrate compliance by showing that the engine is achieving at least a 30 percent reduction in total hydrocarbon (THC) emissions. According to EPA, testing for THC is cheaper and easier than testing for formaldehyde. • Allowing owners/operators of stationary emergency RICE to operate their engines as part of a demand response program within the 100 hours per year that is already permitted for maintenance and testing of such engines. This provision will allow these engines to help stabilize the grid and support local electric system reliability without subjecting them to the stricter standards applicable to non-emergency units. • Allowing emergency units located at area HAP sources to be used for up to 50 hours per year for any non-emergency purpose, including peak shaving, through April 16, 2017. The notice also proposes changes designed to ease compliance for certain units located in remote areas, including parts of Alaska. As part of the rulemaking, EPA also proposed to conform the New Source Performance Standards for internal combustion engines to the revised NESHAPs where necessary. The proposed revisions to the RICE standards can be found in the June 7, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.	Industries identified as potentially regulated under the RICE rule include electric power generation, transmission or distribution, medical and surgical hospitals, natural gas transmission, and crude oil production, among others.	EPA is accepting comments on the proposed rule until **August 9, 2012** (extended from July 23, 2012).

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW			
NEW YORK STATE **Scoping in Advance of Revisions to State Environmental Quality Review Act Regulations** 6 NYCRR Part 617	DEC is conducting a **public scoping of issues relating to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) regulations** prior to proposing amendments designed to streamline the review process. While DEC has not identified any significant adverse environmental impacts from its planned revisions to 6 NYCRR Part 617, it plans to prepare a generic environmental impact statement (GEIS) to identify possible alternatives and maximize opportunities for public participation, and is conducting the public scoping in advance of the GEIS. Changes to the SEQRA regulations under consideration include: • ***Revising the list of Type I actions*** to reduce some of the thresholds for residential subdivisions, add a new threshold for parking spaces, and establish a more realistic threshold for projects involving unlisted actions that occur within or contiguous to a historic resource. • ***Expanding the list of Type II actions*** to reflect experience with the SEQRA review process and encourage environmentally sound projects, including green infrastructure and solar energy development. • ***Revising the scoping provisions*** to require scoping for all EISs. In addition, DEC is considering requiring all scopes to include an explanation of why issues were determined not to be significant with the goal of better targeting the EIS. Finally, DEC is considering barring agencies from rejecting a draft EIS as inadequate based on information submitted following completion of the final scope and not included by the project sponsor in the draft EIS. • ***Revising the rules addressing preparation of the EIS*** to establish more realistic time frames and minimize the potential for multiple reviews. Specific changes include: (1) requiring determinations of adequacy of a resubmitted draft EIS to be based solely on the written list of deficiencies provided by the lead agency following its previous review; (2) requiring preparation of a final EIS within 180 days of the lead agency's acceptance of the draft EIS (rather than the later of 45 days after the close of any hearing or 60 days after acceptance of the draft EIS); and (3) providing that the EIS will be deemed complete if the final EIS is not prepared and filed within the 180-day period. The draft scope can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/permits/83389.html.	The SEQRA process has been widely criticized for being too complicated and taking too long. Per DEC, the planned revisions to the SEQRA regulations are intended to streamline the review process "without sacrificing meaningful environmental review." In general, the changes are intended to: (1) better target projects for environmental review by updating the list of Type I and Type II actions; (2) improve the focus of the SEQRA process by targeting those issues that, in fact, have the potential to result in a significant adverse environmental impact by requiring scoping for all EISs and improving the scoping process; and (3) improving the timeliness of SEQRA decisionmaking by providing more guidance on determining the adequacy of a draft EIS and establishing more meaningful timeframes for completing the final EIS.	DEC is accepting comments on the draft scope until **August 10, 2012**.

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

Other Recent Developments (Final)

AIR

FEDERAL: EPA **revised its regional haze rule to allow states subject to the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) to substitute that rule for the requirement to install best available retrofit technology (BART)** on individual electric generating sources. The CSAPR is an emission cap-and-trade program designed to address ozone and fine particulate matter nonattainment problems in the Northeast by reducing emissions of nitrogen oxides and sulfur dioxide from power plants. The rule, which was scheduled to begin January 1, 2012, establishes state-specific emission budgets based on EPA's quantification of each state's contribution to nonattainment and/or interference with maintenance of the NAAQS downwind. On December 30, 2011, a federal appeals court stayed implementation of the CSAPR pending resolution of petitions by various states and industry groups challenging the rule. The current rulemaking authorizes states to rely on the CSAPR to satisfy their facility-specific BART requirements; in adopting the rule, EPA rejected suggestions that it could not rely on the CSAPR to satisfy BART requirements in light of the stay. The rule can be found in the June 7, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The rule is primarily of interest to electric generating facilities, many of which would be required to comply with individual BART emission limitations in the absence of the CSAPR.

FEDERAL/NEW YORK STATE: EPA finalized **four separate determinations relating to the downstate ozone nonattainment area under the 1-hour and 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS**: (1) the area failed to attain the 1-hour ozone NAAQS by the November 15, 2007 attainment date (based on certified ozone monitoring data for 2005-2007); (2) the area currently is meeting the 1-hour ozone standard (based on certified ozone monitoring data for 2008-2010); (3) the area attained the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS by the June 15, 2010 attainment date (based on certified ozone monitoring data for 2007-2009); and (4) the area currently is meeting the 1997 8-hour ozone standard (based on certified monitoring data for 2008-2010). EPA's determination that the area has attained the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS suspends DEC's obligation to submit an attainment demonstration, reasonable further progress plan, contingency measures and planning SIP requirements relating to attainment of the standard. Notice of the final determinations can be found in the **June 18, 2012** Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The determinations do not relieve any emission sources of their obligations under federal/state regulations limiting ozone precursors. Going forward, DEC must petition EPA to redesignate the downstate area attainment.

NEW YORK STATE: DEC has set the 2012 **fees for Title V facilities** consistent with the sliding scale enacted by the legislature in 2009. That law levies Title V air permit fees based on the quantity of annual emissions as follows: $45.00 per ton for facilities with total annual emissions of less than 1,000 tons; $50.00 per ton for facilities with total annual emissions of 1,000 tons or more but less than 2,000 tons; $55.00 per ton for facilities with total annual emissions of 2,000 tons or more but less than 5,000 tons; and $65.00 per ton for facilities with total annual emissions of 5,000 tons or more. The Clean Air Act requires states to impose fees on Title V

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

facilities sufficient to cover the costs of the Title V program. Applying this principle, DEC calculated Title V fees at $170.84 per ton for 2012; however, the legislature has capped Title V fees as outlined above. Notice concerning the 2012 Title V fees can be found in the June 27, 2012 Environmental Notice Bulletin at: www.dec.ny.gov/enb/20120627_not0.html.

Implications: Title V facilities must pay permit fees according to the schedule above.

OTHER

NEW YORK STATE: DEC revised its rules prohibiting the importation of out-of-state **firewood** that has not been treated to eliminate invasive species, fungi and pathogens. The regulations, which are set forth at 6 NYCRR Part 192, also limit the transportation of untreated firewood within the state to less than 50 miles from the point of origin. With the current rulemaking, DEC reorganized the regulations to make them more user-friendly. In addition, DEC: (1) revised the definition of "firewood" to exclude kiln-dried lumber and make other changes; (2) adopted a new provision clarifying that failure to obey quarantine orders constitutes a violation of the Environmental Conservation Law; (3) authorized alternative methods for treating firewood that achieve results comparable to the methods listed in the regulations with written Department approval; and (4) clarified that persons who produce firewood on their own property for personal use on that property need not document the origins of the wood. DEC previously adopted the firewood restrictions to stop the influx and spread of tree-killing pests such as the emerald ash borer. The revised rule took effect July 3, 2012. Information about the rulemaking can be found on DEC's website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/propregulations.html.

Implications: The revised rule is of potential interest to anyone who produces, transports or uses firewood.

Other Recent Developments (Proposed)

GENERAL/OTHER

FEDERAL: EPA made available for comment a **notice seeking comment on ways EPA and permit applicants can enhance the opportunity and ability of "overburdened" communities to participate in the environmental permitting process**. This environmental justice initiative requires each EPA region to develop, implement, and make publicly available a regional implementation plan outlining the actions they plan to take to promote community involvement in the permitting process. The plan must identify how the region will prioritize EPA permits for enhanced engagement and identify the steps it plans to take to promote greater public involvement, including planning and information gathering measures, intra-agency coordination, and measures for improving communications with the community and permit applicant. The notice also contains as an appendix a summary of best practices for permit applicants to engage communities potentially affected by a project. Subjects addressed include: advanced planning, engagement of community leaders, engaging and communicating effectively, and following up on commitments. The appendix also summarizes the benefits to permit applicants of community outreach. EPA is accepting comments on the notice until **August 27, 2012**; it can be found in the June 26, 2012 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

Implications: The notice is primarily of interest to entities required to obtain environmental permits from EPA.

Recent Decisions

FEDERAL: A federal appeals court recently **dismissed all challenges to EPA's greenhouse gas (GHG) regulations adopted in 2009-2010** following the Supreme Court's 2007 decision in *Massachusetts v. EPA* declaring that EPA has the authority to regulate GHGs as a pollutant under the Clean Air Act (CAA). In *Coalition for Responsible Regulation, Inc. v. EPA,* the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit heard challenges to three EPA rulemakings: (1) its 2009 finding that six specific GHGs pose a threat to human health and the environment and should be regulated ("endangerment finding"); (2) EPA's 2010 GHG emission standards for light-duty motor vehicles; and (3) EPA's 2010 GHG "tailoring rule" establishing special major source thresholds for determining the applicability of the prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) and Title V operating permit programs to stationary sources of GHGs. As described by the court, EPA's 2009 endangerment finding compelled the agency to issue GHG emission standards for motor vehicles under CAA §202(a)(2). Once EPA adopted motor vehicle GHG standards, GHGs became a "regulated air pollutant" for purposes of the PSD and Title V programs. Because GHGs are emitted in significantly larger amounts than other pollutants, EPA adopted higher "tailored" thresholds to prevent the regulation of potentially millions of stationary GHG sources. With respect to each of the three rules, the court found as follows:

- ***Endangerment finding.*** The court concluded that the endangerment finding was consistent with both the Supreme Court's decision in *Massachusetts v. EPA* and the text and structure of the CAA, and was adequately supported by the administrative record. In reaching its decision, the court found, among other things, that: (1) EPA was not required to consider policy issues or regulatory consequences in making its endangerment finding; (2) EPA did not err in relying extensively on research conducted by other organizations; (3) there was substantial scientific evidence supporting the endangerment finding; and (4) EPA was not required to define the atmospheric concentration at which GHGs endanger public health and welfare, the rate/type of climate change that it anticipates will endanger public health or welfare, or the risks/impacts of climate change.
- ***Motor vehicle GHG standards.*** Petitioners did not challenge the substance of the motor vehicle emission standards. Instead, they argued that EPA was arbitrary and capricious in failing to justify and consider the cost of the stationary source permitting requirements triggered by the rule. The court rejected this argument, concluding, among other things, that the plain language of the CAA required EPA to adopt motor vehicle GHG standards once it issued the endangerment finding.
- ***GHG tailoring rule.*** As a preliminary matter, the court considered and rejected petitioners' argument that EPA erred in extending the PSD program to GHGs, concluding that a source must obtain a permit if it emits major amounts of any regulated pollutant and is located in an area that is in attainment or unclassifiable for any pollutant subject to a NAAQS; since GHGs are a regulated air pollutant under the CAA, they are subject to the PSD program if they are emitted above specified threshold quantities. With respect to the specific tailoring rule challenge, the court concluded that the petitioners lacked standing because the regulation eased rather than increased their regulatory burden by reducing the number of sources covered by the program. As a result, petitioners could not show that they were harmed by the rule.

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

The decision can be found at: caselaw.findlaw.com/us-dc-circuit/1604469.html.

NEW YORK STATE: The New York Appellate Division, Third Department, issued a decision **clarifying that a town's zoning authority may extend into navigable waters**. In *Town of North Elba v. Grimditch*, the defendants constructed a pair of boathouses in Lake Placid without obtaining a building permit or complying with the local land use code (LUC). The trial court dismissed the lawsuit brought by the town against the landowners, concluding based on earlier Third Department decisions that the State had exclusive jurisdiction over structures in the lake under Navigation Law §§ 30 and 32. On appeal, the Appellate Division, Third Department reversed, concluding that the Navigation Law does not preempt "the power of local municipalities to administer and enforce local land use laws by conferring upon the State exclusive jurisdiction over structures in navigable waters of the state." It went on to find that the State has exclusive jurisdiction that preempts local land use laws only when it owns title to lands under water in its sovereign capacity. In this case, the court concluded that because Lake Placid is not owned by the State in its sovereign capacity, the local LUC applied to the construction of defendants' boathouses. In reaching its decision, the court declared that several earlier Third Department cases should not be followed to the extent they suggest that "the Navigation Law displaces local land use laws on navigable waters that are not owned by the State in its sovereign capacity." The case can be found at www.leagle.com.

Upcoming Deadlines

NOTE: This calendar contains items of general interest.

August 9, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the NESHAP for reciprocating internal combustion engines (extended from July 23, 2012). See the June 7, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

August 10, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on DEC's draft scope prepared in advance of planned revisions to the SEQRA regulations. See DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/permits/83389.html for details.

August 23, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's draft *Permitting Guidance for Oil and Gas Hydraulic Fracturing Activities Using Diesel Fuels* (extended from July 9, 2012). See the May 10, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

August 27, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's notice seeking comment on ways to improve community engagement in the EPA permitting process. See the June 26, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

August 31, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the PM NAAQS. See the June 29, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.

September 24, 2012: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed national uniform air emission standards for storage vessel and transfer operations, equipment leaks, and closed vent systems and control devices (extended from June 25, 2012). See the March 26, 2012 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

© 2012 YOUNG/SOMMER LLC. This summary provides information about environmental regulatory developments. Young/Sommer assumes no responsibility for any injury and/or damage to persons or property associated with any errors or omissions in the information contained herein. Readers should consult with counsel concerning the specific impact of any developments discussed herein on their operations.