

**BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATOR
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

IN THE MATTER OF)	
)	
Clean Air Act Final Initial)	
Title V Operating Permit)	
)	
Issued to Crestone Peak Operating)	Title V Permit No. 23OPAD524
Resources, LLC for the Mustang)	
Booster Station, Adams County, Colorado)	
)	
Issued by the Colorado Department of)	
Public Health and Environment, Air Pollution)	
Control Division)	

**PETITION TO OBJECT TO FINAL INITIAL TITLE V OPERATING PERMIT
NO. 23OPAD524 FOR CRESTONE’S MUSTANG BOOSTER STATION**

Pursuant to Section 505(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7661d(b)(2), and 40 C.F.R. § 70.8(d), the Center for Biological Diversity and 350 Colorado (“Petitioners”) petition the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (“Administrator” or “EPA”) to object to the final initial Title V Operating Permit (“Title V Permit”) issued by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment’s Air Pollution Control Division (“Division”) authorizing Crestone Peak Resources Operating, LLC (hereafter “Crestone”) to operate the Mustang Booster Station in Adams County, Colorado.

The Center requests the EPA Administrator object on the basis that the Title V Permit fails to assure compliance with applicable requirements under the Clean Air Act.

The Division’s final Title V Permit and supporting Technical Review Document (“TRD”) were issued on April 1, 2026 and are attached as Exhibits 1 and 2, respectively.

THE MUSTANG BOOSTER STATION

The Mustang Booster Station is an oil and gas processing facility. The facility receives gas from nearby wells that is run through separators to remove oil and wastewater and compressed with engines for transport via pipeline and further processing by additional downstream processing facilities. Gas entering the facility contains liquids, including oil and waster, which are removed before and during the compression process using separators, dehydrators, and storage tanks. Liquids are periodically loaded from the tanks and into tanker trucks. A flare is used to control volatile organic compound (“VOC”) emissions from the facility’s dehydrators and storage tanks, and from truck loadout. Sources of air pollution at the

Mustang Booster Station include compressor engines, dehydrators, tanks, truck loadout, flaring, and venting.

The Mustang Booster Station is a large source of nitrogen oxide (“NO_x”) and carbon monoxide (“CO”) emissions, which are released from the engines and flaring, and VOCs, which are released from flaring, venting, and the engines. The facility is also a large source of hazardous air pollutants (“HAPs”), including benzene, a known carcinogen. *See* EPA, “Benzene,” Summary prepared by EPA available at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-09/documents/benzene.pdf> (last accessed May 1, 2026).

NO_x emissions are a byproduct of combustion and include a number of gases known to be harmful to human health and the environment, including nitrogen dioxide. *See* EPA, “Basic information about NO₂,” website available at <https://www.epa.gov/no2-pollution/basic-information-about-no2> (last accessed May 1, 2026). VOCs include a number of gases known to be extremely harmful to public health, including hazardous air pollutants like benzene, toluene, hexane, and xylene. *See* EPA, “Technical Overview of Volatile Organic Compounds,” website available at <https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/technical-overview-volatile-organic-compounds> (last accessed May 1, 2026). Both NO_x and VOCs also react with sunlight to form ground-level ozone, a respiratory irritant and the key ingredient of smog. *See* EPA, “Ground-level Ozone Basics,” website available at <https://www.epa.gov/ground-level-ozone-pollution/ground-level-ozone-basics> (last accessed May 1, 2026).

The Mustang Booster Station is located in the Denver Metro/North Front Range severe ozone nonattainment area. Due to nearly 20 years of ongoing violations of national ambient air quality standards (“NAAQS”) for ground-level ozone, this nine-county region with a population of more than four million people has been classified a “severe” ozone nonattainment area. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 81.306. Emissions of NO_x and VOCs from the Mustang Booster Station contribute to high ozone levels in the region.

Annually, the facility has the potential to emit 17.1 tons of NO_x, 38.7 tons of CO, and 39.3 tons of VOCs, including 2.2 tons of benzene, 1.4 tons of toluene, and 4.8 tons of formaldehyde.

PETITIONERS

The Center for Biological Diversity is a nonprofit, 501(c)(3) conservation organization. The Center’s mission is to ensure the preservation, protection, and restoration of biodiversity, native species, ecosystems, public lands and waters, and public health through science, policy, and environmental law. Based on the understanding that the health and vigor of human societies and the integrity and wildness of the natural environment are closely linked, the Center is working to secure a future for animals and plants hovering on the brink of extinction, for the ecosystems they need to survive, and for a healthy, livable future for all of us.

350 Colorado is a Colorado-based non-profit organization with over 18,000 members throughout the state. 350 Colorado is an independent state affiliate of 350.org, a global

organization with about 490 affiliates focused on building a world powered by clean, accessible, and affordable renewable energy. 350 Colorado’s mission is to build the local grassroots movement to solve the climate crisis and transition to a sustainable future.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The Petitioners submitted comments on the draft Mustang Booster Station Title V Permit on December 13, 2025. *See* Exhibit 3, Center for Biological Diversity and 350 Colorado Comments on Draft Title V Permit (Dec. 13, 2025). The Division responded to the Petitioners’ comments on January 16, 2026. *See* Exhibit 4, Colorado Air Pollution Control Division, “Response to Comments on Initial Operating Permit” (Jan. 16, 2026). The proposed permit was subsequently submitted to EPA for the agency’s 45-day review. The EPA’s 45-day review concluded on March 2, 2026. The Administrator did not object to the proposed permit during this time. The Division issued the final permit on April 1, 2025.

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 7661d(b)(2), this petition is now timely submitted within 60 days following a lack of objection from the EPA during the agency’s 45-day review period.

GENERAL TITLE V PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS

The Clean Air Act prohibits qualifying stationary sources of air pollution from operating without or in violation of a valid Title V permit, which must include conditions sufficient to “assure compliance” with all applicable Clean Air Act requirements. 42 U.S.C. §§ 7661c(a), (c); 40 C.F.R. §§ 70.6(a)(1), (c)(1). “Applicable requirements” include all standards, emissions limits, and requirements of the Clean Air Act, including all requirements in an applicable implementation plan, or state implementation plan (“SIP”) and any term or condition of a permit issued pursuant to Title I of the Clean Air Act. 40 C.F.R. § 70.2. Congress intended for Title V to “substantially strengthen enforcement of the Clean Air Act” by “clarify[ing] and mak[ing] more readily enforceable a source’s pollution control requirements.” S. Rep. No. 101-228, at 347, 348 (1990), *as reprinted in* A Legislative History of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, at 8687, 8688 (1993). As EPA explained when promulgating its Title V regulations, a Title V permit should “enable the source, States, EPA, and the public to understand better the requirements to which the source is subject, and whether the source is meeting those requirements.” Operating Permit Program, Final Rule, 57 Fed. Reg. 32,250, 32,251 (July 21, 1992). Among other things, a Title V permit must include compliance certification, testing, monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements sufficient to assure compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit. 42 U.S.C. § 7661c(c); 40 C.F.R. §§ 70.6(a)(1), (a)(3), (c)(1).

Under the Clean Air Act, “any person” may petition EPA to object to a proposed permit “within 60 days after the expiration of [EPA’s] 45-day review period.” 42 U.S.C. § 7661d(b)(2); *see also* 40 C.F.R. § 70.8. Each objection in the petition must have been “raised with reasonable specificity during the public comment period provided for in § 70.7(h) of this part, unless the petitioner demonstrates that it was impracticable to raise such objections within such period, or unless the grounds for such objection arose after such period.” 40 C.F.R. § 70.8(d). Any

objection included in the petition “must be based on a claim that the permit, permit record, or permit process is not in compliance with applicable requirements or requirements [of 40 C.F.R. Part 70].” 40 C.F.R. § 70.12(a)(2).

Upon receipt of a petition, EPA “*shall* issue an objection within [60 days] if the petitioner demonstrates to the Administrator that the permit is not in compliance with the requirements of this chapter, including the requirements of the applicable implementation plan.” 42 U.S.C. § 7661d(b)(2) (emphasis added); *see also* 40 C.F.R. § 70.8(c) (“The Administrator will object to the issuance of any proposed permit determined by the Administrator not to be in compliance with applicable requirements or requirements under this part.”). When deciding whether a petitioner has met this demonstration requirement, EPA will evaluate the entirety of the permit record, including the statement of basis and response to comments. *See In re Valero Refining-Texas, L.P.*, Order on Petition No. VI-2021-8 (June 30, 2022). Indeed, EPA’s review of a Title V petition is confined to the petition itself, including exhibits, the permitting record, and any final permit that may be available. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 70.13.

GROUND FOR OBJECTION

For the reasons set forth below, the Title V Permit fails to comply with applicable requirements under the Clean Air Act. The issues discussed below were raised in comments on the draft Title V Permit for the Mustang Booster Station.

I. The Title V Permit Does Not Ensure Compliance with VOC Control Requirements Applicable to the Dehydrators, Oil and Water Storage Tanks, and Truck Loadout of Oil and Water

The Title V Permit requires Crestone to utilize an enclosed flare, or enclosed combustion device, to control VOC emissions from the facility’s two dehydration units (Unit Numbers DEHY1 and DEHY2), two fixed roof storage vessels used to store water and slop oil (Unit Numbers TK-7050 and TK-7070), and truck loadout of water and oil from the tanks (Unit Number TLO) in order to assure compliance with applicable limits. *See* Title V Permit at Section II, Conditions 1, 2, and 4. These requirements echo those set forth in the underlying construction permit for the Mustang Booster Station, which requires Crestone to “operate and maintain” an “Enclosed Flare” “in order to reduce emissions to less than or equal to the limits established in [the] permit.” *See* Title V Permit at Appendix H, Construction Permit No. 19AD0262, Issuance 2 (July 2, 2024) at Condition 12 (hereafter referred to as the “Construction Permit”).¹ Unfortunately, while the Title V Permit requires Crestone to utilize an enclosed flare to control VOC emissions, it does not assure that the flare achieves the required level of VOC control applicable to the Mustang Booster Station.

¹ Construction Permit No. 19AD0262, Issuance 2 was issued pursuant to Colorado’s SIP construction permitting program approved pursuant to Title I of the Clean Air Act and therefore its terms and conditions are applicable requirements under Title V.

At issue is the failure of the Title V Permit to assure compliance with a 95% control efficiency applicable to the enclosed flare controlling VOC emissions from the dehydrators, storage tanks, and truck loadout. While the Construction Permit for the Mustang Booster Station explicitly requires compliance with a 95% VOC control efficiency, the Title V Permit neither requires compliance with this applicable requirement nor sets forth monitoring that assures compliance. Petitioners raised this objection with reasonable specificity in their comments. *See* Exhibit 3, Comments on Draft Title V Permit at 3-4.

The Construction Permit for the Mustang Booster Station sets forth the applicable requirement that enclosed flare achieve a 95% VOC control efficiency in several conditions:

- Condition 25 states that the dehydration units are subject to emission control requirements set forth in Colorado Air Quality Control Commission (“AQCC”) Regulation No. 7, Section XVII.D.3. This provision of AQCC Regulation Number 7 states that subject dehydrators:

[S]hall reduce uncontrolled actual emissions of hydrocarbons by at least 95 percent on a rolling twelve-month basis through the use of a condenser or air pollution control equipment [and that] [i]f a combustion device is used, it shall have a design destruction efficiency of at least 98% for hydrocarbons[.]

See Exhibit 5, AQCC Regulation No. 7 (Effective Date 01/14/2019) at 120, Section XVII.D.3.² Echoing this regulation, Condition 25 explicitly states that the enclosed flare “shall reduce controlled actual emissions of hydrocarbons by at least 95% on a rolling twelve-month basis through the use of a condenser or air pollution control equipment.”

- Condition 27 states that air pollution control equipment controlling VOCs from the storage tanks must achieve an “average hydrocarbon control efficiency of 95%” and that if a combustion device is used, it must have “a design destruction efficiency of at least 98% for hydrocarbons[.]”
- Condition 8 requires Crestone to use the emission factors in the “Notes to Permit Holder” section of the Construction Permit to calculate emissions from the dehydrators, storage tanks, and truck loadout. The “Notes to Permit Holder” section requires that Crestone calculate emissions from the enclosed flare based on compliance with a 95% VOC control efficiency. *See* Title V Permit at Appendix H,

² This is the version of AQCC Regulation No. 7 that existed at the time of the first issuance of Construction Permit No. 19AD0262 in 2019 and is therefore the applicable requirement. Since that time, AQCC Regulation No. 7 has been renumbered, but the substantive requirements of Section XVII.D.3 remain in the regulations. In the most recent version of AQCC Regulation No. 7 (effective April 14, 2026), Section XVII.D.3 is now set forth under AQCC Regulation No. 7, Part B, Section II.D.3. *See* AQCC Regulation No. 7 (Effective Date 04/14/2026), available at <https://www.sos.state.co.us/CCR/GenerateRulePdf.do?ruleVersionId=12486&fileName=5%20CCCR%201001-9>. Regardless, Construction Permit No. 19AD0262, Issuance 2, continues to refer to Section XVII.D.3, making it the applicable requirement.

Construction Permit No. 19AD0262, Issuance 2 (July 2, 2024) at Notes to Permit Holder section at Condition 5 (noting that for purposes of calculating emissions from the dehydrators (Points 008 and 009), storage tanks (Points 010 and 011), and truck loadout (Point 012), calculations are based on a flare control efficiency of 95%).

In spite of these applicable requirements, the Title V Permit does not require the enclosed flare to achieve a 95% VOC control efficiency. Neither Section II, Conditions 1, 2, or 4 explicitly set forth the 95% control efficiency limit. In fact, to the extent the Title V Permit requires compliance with any kind of control requirement for the enclosed flare, it only requires compliance with a 95% destruction efficiency, not a 95% control efficiency.

Indeed, the Title V Permit at Section II, Condition 7.3 sets forth performance testing requirements for the enclosed flare at the Mustang Booster Station, requiring only that Crestone demonstrate that the flare “achieves a minimum destruction efficiency of 95% for VOC and HAPs.”³ The Title V Permit expressly relies on Condition 7.3 to assure the dehydrators, storage tanks, and truck loadout comply with applicable requirements. Section II, Conditions 1.2.1, 2.2.4, and 4.2.1 each state that to meet applicable requirements, the enclosed flare “is subject to the performance testing requirement of Condition 7.3.” However, while Condition 7.3 plainly sets forth performance testing requirements for the enclosed flare, it plainly does not assure compliance with a 95% VOC control efficiency.

As Petitioners explained in their comments on this issue, the difference between flare “destruction efficiency” and “control efficiency” is significant. Citing the Division’s own guidance on the subject, Petitioners explained, “[W]hile ‘destruction efficiency’ refers to the percent removal by weight of hydrocarbon by a combustion device, ‘control efficiency’ refers to the product of the destruction efficiency and process efficiency of the combustion device and vapor capture system.” *See* Exhibit 3, Comments on Draft Title V Permit at 3; *see also* Exhibit 6, Colorado Air Pollution Control Division Permitting Section Memo 20-02, “Oil and Gas Industry Enclosed Combustion Device Overall Control Efficiency Greater than 95%” (Feb. 4, 2020) at 3. As Petitioners explained in their comments:

If the flare is achieving only a 95% destruction efficiency, then it’s overall control efficiency would be lower than 95%, contrary to applicable requirements. The permit must either require testing of the flare to assure compliance with an appropriate destruction efficiency that assures compliance with the applicable control efficiency, such as 98% or higher, or ensure the Title V Permit is written in such a way as to guarantee that the process efficiency is 100% at all times.

Exhibit 3, Comments on Draft Title V Permit at 3-4.

³ Condition 7.3 also provides that if the combustor is certified for the performance requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 60.5412(a)(1)(i), which are set forth under 40 C.F.R. § 60, Subpart OOOO, the permittee does not need to demonstrate compliance with the 95% VOC destruction efficiency. However, as the TRD discloses, the Mustang Booster Station is not subject to any requirements of Subpart OOOO and therefore 40 C.F.R. § 60.5412(a)(1)(i) is not applicable or relevant.

In response to comments, the Division acknowledged the important distinction between control efficiency and destruction efficiency, noting that control efficiency is the product of destruction efficiency and capture efficiency. *See* Exhibit 4, Response to Comments at unnumbered p. 3. In spite of this, the Division asserted that the Title V Permit assured compliance with applicable VOC control efficiency requirements.

In support of its assertion, the Division appears to take the position that the 95% VOC control efficiency requirement is not an applicable requirement under Title V. In response to comments, the Division states it is “requiring federally enforceable performance testing to verify the 95% destruction efficiency which is used to establish the federally enforceable emission limit and state only enforceable performance testing to verify the state only enforceable 95% control efficiency requirement required by Colorado [AQCC] Regulation No. 7.” Response to Comments at unnumbered p. 4. In other words, the Division’s position appears to be that the 95% control efficiency requirement is only required by state regulations, which are not federally enforceable, and therefore the Title V Permit is not required to assure compliance. This position is mistaken.

As discussed above, the terms and conditions of the Construction Permit for the Mustang Booster Station plainly require the enclosed flare to meet a 95% VOC control efficiency. Conditions 25 and 27 of the Construction Permit both plainly require the enclosed flare to have a design destruction efficiency of 98% and to achieve a 95% control efficiency and the “Notes to Permit Holder” section of the permit also requires that emissions from the enclosed flare be calculated based on compliance with a 95% VOC control efficiency. There is no question that these terms and conditions are applicable federally enforceable requirements and that the Title V Permit must assure compliance.

In response to comments, the Division seems to take the position that because Conditions 25 and 27 of the Construction Permit incorporate or otherwise reference state-only regulations—or regulations that are not incorporated into the Colorado SIP, namely provisions of AQCC Regulation No. 7, Section XVII—that these conditions are also state-only enforceable and therefore not applicable federally enforceable requirements. However, simply because a construction permit term or condition may incorporate or reference a state-only regulation does not mean that that term or condition is not federally enforceable.

While the Colorado SIP at AQCC Regulation No. 3, Part A, Section I.B.12.a provides that construction permits may incorporate state-only terms or conditions that are state-only enforceable and not applicable requirements, such terms or conditions must be identified or designated as state-only enforceable in the permit. Indeed, the Construction Permit for the Mustang Booster Station contains many such “state-only” designated terms and conditions, including Conditions 20, 21, 24, and 40, all of which are clearly identified and designated as “State only enforceable.” Neither Condition 25 nor 27 are similarly identified and designated as “State only enforceable,” meaning they are federally enforceable permit conditions.

The intention the Division brings in designating state-only enforceable terms and conditions in construction permits is emphasized further by the Mustang Booster Station Construction Permit. While Conditions 24, 25, 27, and 28 all reference or incorporate specific

requirements of AQCC Regulation No. 7, Section XVII, only Condition 24 is explicitly identified and designated as state-only enforceable. This further underscores that if the Division intended Conditions 25 and 27 to be state-only enforceable, they would have been identified and designated as such.

In fact, the Division always approves construction permits with “state-only” terms and conditions identified and designated, a clear recognition that without such designation, the terms and conditions of a construction permit are otherwise federally enforceable. Attached are several recently approved construction permits illustrating the Division’s regular practice of distinguishing state-only enforceable terms and conditions, including:

- Construction Permit No. 15WE1401, Issuance 7, issued April 28, 2026 for Fundare Resources Company, LLC’s Razor Federal 30K oil and gas well production facility in which Conditions 11, 13, 14, and 15 are identified as “State only enforceable.” Exhibit 7, Construction Permit No. 15WE1401, Issuance 7 (April 28, 2026).
- Construction Permit No. 22WE0468, Issuance 2, issued April 28, 2026 for PDC Energy, Inc.’s Richter oil and gas well production facility in which Conditions 7, 9, 10, and 11 are identified as “State only enforceable.” Exhibit 8, Construction Permit No. 22WE0468, Issuance 2 (April 28, 2026).
- Construction Permit No. 25WE0409, Issuance 1, issued April 23, 2026 for PDC Energy, Inc.’s Huron-Ledford 22 Sec HZ oil and gas well production facility in which Conditions 13, 15, and 16 are identified as “State only enforceable.” Exhibit 9, Construction Permit No. 25WE0409, Issuance 1 (April 23, 2026).
- Construction Permit No. 25WE0459, Issuance 1, issued April 15, 2026 for Noble Energy, Inc.’s Green USX EE oil and gas well production facility in which Conditions 13, 15, and 16 are identified as “State only enforceable.” Exhibit 10, Construction Permit No. 25WE0459, Issuance 1 (April 15, 2026).

These are just a few examples of how the Division always identifies and designates state-only enforceable terms in construction permits.

Notably, while the attached construction permit examples expressly identify and designate state-only enforceable terms and conditions, the permits do not similarly designate as state-only enforceable many terms and conditions that incorporate or reference state-only enforceable rules. For example, while Conditions 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 in Construction Permit No. 15WE1401, Issuance 7, all incorporate and reference requirements set forth under AQCC Regulation No. 7, Part B, which is state-only enforceable, only Conditions 14 and 15 are explicitly designated as state-only enforceable in the permit. Here, as with all construction permits issued in Colorado, the Division intentionally determined that some terms and conditions incorporating state-only rules should be federally enforceable while others should not.

The fact that Conditions 25 and 27 incorporate or reference a state-only regulation does not create a per se state-only enforceable condition. The Construction Permit for the Mustang

Booster Station was issued pursuant to the Colorado SIP's process for establishing federally enforceable terms and conditions. Under the Colorado SIP, the Division "shall include such terms and conditions in any permit as it deems necessary for the proposed project or activity to qualify for the permit." AQCC Regulation No. 3, Part B, Section III.E. Here, the Division clearly determined it was necessary to incorporate or reference some state-only regulation into the federally enforceable construction permit. Simply because federally enforceable terms or conditions are derived from state-only regulation does not mean they are any less federally enforceable.

In response to comments, the Division explains that in addition to performance testing required by Condition 7.3, the enclosed flare is also "subject to additional performance testing under the state only enforceable provisions of Colorado Regulation No. 7, Part B, Section II.B.2.h." Exhibit 4, Response to Comments at unnumbered p. 3-4. While Petitioners appreciate that state only regulations set forth at AQCC Regulation No. 7, Part B, Section II.B.2.h set forth performance testing of enclosed flares to assure compliance with a 95% control efficiency, this rule is state-only enforceable, as acknowledged by the Division. A Title V permit cannot rely on state-only enforceable monitoring to assure compliance with applicable federally enforceable limits. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 7661c(a); 40 C.F.R. § 70.6(b)(1) and (2); *see also In the Matter of HighPoint Operating Corporation, Anschutz Equus Farms 4-62-28* Order on Petition No. VIII-2024-6 (July 31, 2024) at 11.

The Division asserts that the Title V Permit's performance testing requirements, in conjunction with parametric monitoring, will "assure compliance" with applicable requirements. Exhibit 4, Response to Comments at unnumbered p. 5. However, as is clear, the performance testing requirements will not assure compliance with the applicable VOC control efficiency limit for the enclosed flare at the Mustang Booster Station.

CONCLUSION

Title V permits must contain emission limitations and standards that assure compliance with applicable requirements. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 7661c(a) and 40 C.F.R. § 70.6(a)(1). Further, Title V permits must set forth monitoring requirements to assure compliance with applicable requirements. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 7661c(c). To this end, a Title V permit must contain "periodic monitoring sufficient to yield reliable data from the relevant time period that are representative of the source's compliance with the permit[.]" 40 C.F.R. § 70.6(a)(3)(i)(B); *see also* 40 C.F.R. § 70.6(c)(1) (Title V permits must contain monitoring requirements "sufficient to assure compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit.").

Here, the Title V Permit for the Mustang Booster Station does not assure compliance with applicable requirements. It does not assure that the enclosed flare used to control VOCs and HAPs from the facility's dehydrators, storage tanks, and from truck loadout operates in compliance with applicable 95% control efficiency requirement. To the extent the Title V Permit sets forth monitoring of flare performance, it does not set forth monitoring that assures compliance with the applicable 95% control efficiency requirement. Accordingly, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 7611d(b)(2) and 40 C.F.R. § 70.8(d), the Administrator must object to the issuance of

the Title V Permit over its failure to assure compliance with applicable requirements and requirements under Title V of the Clean Air Act and require the Division to revise and reissue the Permit in a manner that complies with the requirements of the Clean Air Act.

DATED: May 1, 2026

Respectfully submitted,



Jeremy Nichols
Senior Advocate
Environmental Health Program
Center for Biological Diversity
1536 Wynkoop St., Ste. 421
Denver, CO 80202
303-437-7663
jnichols@biologicaldiversity.org

and

Bobbie Mooney
Staff Attorney
350 Colorado
bobbie@350Colorado.org

Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 70.8(d), copies of this petition have been concurrently transmitted to the following parties:

Michael Ogletree, Director
Colorado Air Pollution Control Division
4300 Cherry Creek Drive South
Denver, CO 80246

Civitas Resources, Inc.
555 17th Street, Suite 3700
Denver, CO 80202

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit

1. Final Mustang Booster Station Title V Permit
2. Final Mustang Booster Station Title V Permit Technical Review Document
3. Comments of the Center for Biological Diversity and 350 Colorado on the draft initial Title V Permit for the Mustang Booster Station
4. Colorado Air Pollution Control Division Response to Comments
5. AQCC Regulation No. 7 (Effective Date 01/14/2019)
6. Air Pollution Control Division, "Oil and Gas Industry Enclosed Combustion Device Overall Control Efficiency Greater than 95%," Permitting Section Memo 20-02 (Feb. 4, 2020)
7. Construction Permit No. 15WE1401, Issuance 7 (April 28, 2026)
8. Construction Permit No. 22WE0468, Issuance 2 (April 28, 2026)
9. Construction Permit No. 25WE0409, Issuance 1 (April 23, 2026)
10. Construction Permit No. 25WE0459, Issuance 1 (April 15, 2026)