

# BP Cherry Point Refinery

Ms. Guilfoil,

On behalf of the BP Cherry Point Refinery, I submit the following comment on the amendments to chapters 173-400 and 173-401 WAC from the CR-102 issued on February 5, 2018.

- WAC 173-400-035 Nonroad Engines – Ecology has amended WAC 173-400-035(4) and 173-400-035(5) by adding the verbiage "a project requires the installation and operation of nonroad engines...". More specifically in 173-400-035(5), Ecology has removed language from the previous version that applied the >2000 bhp applicability threshold for a single engine to multiple engines as a "project". There are concerns with the new language. Ecology has not defined what a "project" is in the WAC 173-400-040 definitions nor in the body of 173-400-035. Is a project a single engine or group of nonroad engines performing the same function within a small footprint (e.g. a group of engines linked to generators temporarily providing electricity to a construction or single maintenance project at an industrial site)? Or is the intent to group all of the nonroad engines within the fenceline or property of an industrial facility, take the "cumulative" bhp of all of the engines no matter how big or small (trash pumps, light plants, small generators etc.) and call those a "project"? For example, a large maintenance event at a large industrial facility or a refinery "turnaround" (TAR) would have several different specific job scopes. If Ecology's intent is to include a broad range of equipment and job scopes into a single cumulative total, it may force regulated parties to make many more requests or notifications of intent to operate in the > 2000 bhp and in in the > 500 and

Thank you for considering our comments.