March 14, 2006

(AR-18J)

Don Sutton, Manager
Permit Section
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
P.O. Box 19506
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9506

Dear Mr. Sutton:

Thank you for your January 11, 2006, letter requesting concurrence from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) on a single source determination for General Dynamics, Ordinance & Tactical Systems, Inc. (General Dynamics) under the title V operating permit program. In your letter, you state that the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency has already determined that the four facilities operated by General Dynamics are considered a “single source” under the prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) programs. Based on the information provided in your letter, USEPA concludes that the General Dynamics sites should be considered a single source for title V purposes.

The PSD regulations at 40 CFR 52.21(b)(5) and (6) and the title V regulations at 40 CFR 70.2 define a “stationary source” as any building, structure, facility, or installation that belong to the same industrial grouping, are located on contiguous or adjacent properties, and are under the control of the same person (or persons under common control). Furthermore, according to the preamble to the August 7, 1980, final PSD regulations, "...one source classification encompasses both primary and support facilities, even when the latter includes units with a different two digit SIC code. Support facilities are typically those which convey, store, or otherwise assist in the production of the principal product." The proposed preamble to the part 70 regulations (56 FR 21724) and the initial proposed revisions to part 70 (59 FR 44515) further discuss the support facility concept.

General Dynamic’s sites meet the criteria of having the same SIC code, and the issue of common control is clear as all of the facilities are operated by General Dynamics. However, the sites are separated by up to 8 miles. A specific distance between pollutant emitting activities has never been established by USEPA for determining when facilities should be considered separate or one source for PSD and title V purposes. Whether facilities are contiguous or adjacent is determined on a case-by-case basis, and is based on the relationship between the facilities. The guiding principle behind USEPA guidance on this issue is the common sense notion of a plant. (August 7, 1980 PSD regulations.) Additionally, we have enclosed a May 21, 1998, USEPA Region 8 letter to the Utah Division of Air Quality that further discusses the case-by-case consideration of “adjacent” sources for aggregation purposes. A determination of “adjacent” should include an evaluation of whether the distance between two facilities is sufficiently small that it enables them to operate as a single source.

From the information provided, it appears that the Test Range, Decommissioning Thermal Destruction and Depleted Uranium Operation, and the Small Arms Ammunition Ordnance and Accessories Manufacturing and Demilitarization operations, further processes the components, (or assists in the manufacturing of them), which are manufactured at General Dynamic’s main manufacturing operation. Based on the information in your letter, the activities occurring at these sites all assist in supporting the main operations of General Dynamics. Therefore, we believe that the sites do meet the common sense notion of a plant and should be considered a single source for title V purposes.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me or have your staff contact Constantine Blathras at (312) 886-0671.

Sincerely yours,

/s/

Pamela Blakley, Chief
Air Permits Section

Enclosure