Purpose: To establish standardized application review procedure for projects evaluated by Certified Air Permitting Professionals (CAPP).

I. Objectives:

A. Ensure uniform review process flow of CAPP projects.

B. Define criteria for evaluating the performance of individuals certified under the CAPP program.

C. Track performance of individuals certified under the CAPP program for specific projects using CAPP Project Review Checklist.

II. CAPP Project Review Checklist:

See attached form.

III. Procedure for CAPP Application Review Process:

1. Supervising Air Quality Engineer (AQE) assigns CAPP applications to staff Air Quality Engineer for preliminary review. The staff engineer is responsible for logging in the application, and for determining if the application is complete. Send completeness or incompleteness letter.

2. After the project is deemed complete, the CAPP project is assigned to staff AQE for reviewing the content of the application review (including checks on all emission calculations), updating the Permit Administration System (PAS) database, updating emission profile records, and drafting permit conditions.

3. Staff AQE corrects the errors in the evaluation by marking up errors with corrections, replacing the pages in error, and/or reprinting the revised evaluation after corrections. Staff AQE must obtain written confirmation of amended project proposal from the applicant if the proposal is significantly altered.
4. Supervising AQE reviews the prescreened projects using the CAPP Project Review Checklist to rate the performance of the CAPP. The checklist is used to document if any significant or minor errors existed in the application review.

Examples of significant errors include, but are not limited to:
- Submission of incomplete application package;
- Errors in NSR calculations leading to incorrect final determinations of BACT, offset, and public notice requirements;
- Gross misinterpretation of applicable Rules & Regulations;
- Errors in application of sound engineering principles;
- Gross deviation from approved application review format;
- Incomplete equipment description (lacking identification of major permit components) and conditions which are not practically enforceable;
- Intentional fraud.

Examples of minor errors include, but are not limited to:
- Errors in numerical calculations;
- Typographical and grammatical errors;
- Minor mis-interpretations of applicable Rules & Regulations;
- Minor deviation from approved application review format;
- Incorrect determination of permit unit boundary.

**Scoring Key:**

- P = Perfect
- M = Minor error
- S = Significant error

5. Supervising AQE submits the projects and the complete CAPP Project Review Checklist to the Regional Manager for review. If the overall quality of the application review is determined to be grossly deficient, obtain further guidance from the Regional Manager & Director of Permit Services for possible actions (e.g., disqualification).

6. If the CAPP is suspected of knowingly or negligently submitting false information in connection with the permit action, obtain further guidance from the Regional Manager & the Director of Permit Services for possible actions (e.g., permanent disqualification.)

7. After review and approval by the Regional Manager & Director of Permit Services, prepare feedback letter to the CAPP discussing any significant errors.

8. Use the performance file prepared for each CAPP in the Central Region to track the project records. For each project, staple the checklist (item 4), written letter (item 7), and the pages of application review containing significant errors together, and send the packet to the Central Region for filing. Minor errors not affecting the approvability of the project do not need to be included in the packet.
Facility #: _____________
Project #: ____________
Certified Professional: _______________

CAPP PROJECT REVIEW CHECKLIST

Reviewing Engineer ___________________________ Date ________________

Supervisor Approval ___________________________ Date ________________

P = Perfect  M = Minor Error  S = Significant Error

* Attach examples of significant errors if necessary.

_______ Submission of complete application (if incomplete, a “ Significant error)

_______ Use of correct Application Review format (per District policy GPG-5)

_______ Correct identification of permit unit boundary

_______ Emission calculations, including selecting & referencing emission factors, other than the specific categories of NSR calculations listed as follows.

_______ BACT  _______ Offsets  _______ Public Notice

_______ Quality of draft Authorities to Construct (major components in equipment description, with all necessary and practically enforceable permit conditions)

_______ Identification of all potentially applicable Rules & Regulations, and complete, error-free compliance discussion with the Rules & Regulations

_______ Application of sound engineering principles in technical discussions (e.g. control equipment sizing & selection, etc.)

If applicable, list any other significant errors or problems below:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

_______ Overall quality of the Application Review