

Statement of Basis

**Permit to Construct No. P-2015.0045
Project ID 61584**

**Mikey's Graphics Inc. - Jerome
Jerome, Idaho**

Facility ID 053-00034

Final

February 8, 2016
Shawnee Chen, P.E.
Senior Air Quality Engineer

The purpose of this Statement of Basis is to satisfy the requirements of IDAPA 58.01.01. et seq, Rules for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho, for issuing air permits.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| ACRONYMS, UNITS, AND CHEMICAL NOMENCLATURE..... | 3 |
| FACILITY INFORMATION..... | 5 |
| Description..... | 5 |
| Permitting History..... | 6 |
| Application Scope..... | 6 |
| Application Chronology..... | 6 |
| TECHNICAL ANALYSIS..... | 7 |
| Emissions Units and Control Equipment..... | 7 |
| Emissions Inventories..... | 8 |
| Ambient Air Quality Impact Analyses..... | 11 |
| REGULATORY ANALYSIS..... | 11 |
| Attainment Designation (40 CFR 81.313)..... | 11 |
| Facility Classification..... | 11 |
| Permit to Construct (IDAPA 58.01.01.201)..... | 12 |
| Visible Emissions (IDAPA 58.01.01.625)..... | 12 |
| Title V Classification (IDAPA 58.01.01.300, 40 CFR Part 70)..... | 13 |
| PSD Classification (40 CFR 52.21)..... | 13 |
| NSPS Applicability (40 CFR 60)..... | 13 |
| The facility is not subject to any NSPS requirements..... | 13 |
| NESHAP Applicability (40 CFR 61)..... | 13 |
| MACT Applicability (40 CFR 63)..... | 13 |
| Permit Conditions Review..... | 15 |
| PUBLIC REVIEW..... | 17 |
| Public Comment Opportunity..... | 17 |
| APPENDIX A – EMISSIONS INVENTORIES..... | 18 |
| APPENDIX B – FACILITY DRAFT COMMENTS..... | 19 |
| APPENDIX C – PROCESSING FEE..... | 21 |

ACRONYMS, UNITS, AND CHEMICAL NOMENCLATURE

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| AAC | acceptable ambient concentrations |
| AACC | acceptable ambient concentrations for carcinogens |
| acfm | actual cubic feet per minute |
| ASTM | American Society for Testing and Materials |
| BACT | Best Available Control Technology |
| BMP | best management practices |
| BRC | below regulatory concern |
| Btu | British thermal units |
| CAA | Clean Air Act |
| CAM | Compliance Assurance Monitoring |
| CAS No. | Chemical Abstracts Service registry number |
| CBP | concrete batch plant |
| CE | control efficiency |
| CEMS | continuous emission monitoring systems |
| cfm | cubic feet per minute |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| CI | compression ignition |
| CMS | continuous monitoring systems |
| CO | carbon monoxide |
| CO ₂ | carbon dioxide |
| CO ₂ e | CO ₂ equivalent emissions |
| COMS | continuous opacity monitoring systems |
| DEQ | Department of Environmental Quality |
| dscf | dry standard cubic feet |
| EL | screening emission levels |
| EP | emissions point |
| EPA | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency |
| FEC | Facility Emissions Cap |
| Gal/wk | gallons per week |
| GHG | greenhouse gases |
| gph | gallons per hour |
| gpm | gallons per minute |
| gr | grains (1 lb = 7,000 grains) |
| HAP | hazardous air pollutants |
| HHV | higher heating value |
| HMA | hot mix asphalt |
| hp | horsepower |
| hr/day | hours per day |
| hr/wk | hours per week |
| hr/yr | hours per consecutive 12 calendar month period |
| HVLP | high volume, low pressure |
| ICE | internal combustion engines |
| IDAPA | a numbering designation for all administrative rules in Idaho promulgated in accordance with the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act |
| iwg | inches of water gauge |
| km | kilometers |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| lb/hr | pounds per hour |
| lb/day | pounds per day |
| lb/qtr | pound per quarter |
| m | meters |
| MACT | Maximum Achievable Control Technology |
| mg/dscm | milligrams per dry standard cubic meter |
| MMBtu | million British thermal units |
| MMscf | million standard cubic feet |
| NAAQS | National Ambient Air Quality Standard |
| NESHAP | National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants |
| NO ₂ | nitrogen dioxide |
| NO _x | nitrogen oxides |
| NSPS | New Source Performance Standards |
| O&M | operation and maintenance |
| O ₂ | oxygen |
| PAH | polyaromatic hydrocarbons |
| PC | permit condition |
| PCB | polychlorinated biphenyl |
| PERF | Portable Equipment Relocation Form |
| PM | particulate matter |
| PM _{2.5} | particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 2.5 micrometers |
| PM ₁₀ | particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 10 micrometers |
| POM | polycyclic organic matter |
| ppm | parts per million |
| ppmw | parts per million by weight |
| PSD | Prevention of Significant Deterioration |
| psig | pounds per square inch gauge |
| PTC | permit to construct |
| PTC/T2 | permit to construct and Tier II operating permit |
| PTE | potential to emit |
| PW | process weight rate |
| RAP | recycled asphalt pavement |
| RFO | reprocessed fuel oil |
| RICE | reciprocating internal combustion engines |
| <i>Rules</i> | <i>Rules for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho</i> |
| scf | standard cubic feet |
| SCL | significant contribution limits |
| SDS | Safety Data Sheets |
| SIP | State Implementation Plan |
| SM | synthetic minor |
| SM80 | synthetic minor facility with emissions greater than or equal to 80% of a major source threshold |
| SO ₂ | sulfur dioxide |
| SO _x | sulfur oxides |
| T/day | tons per calendar day |
| T/hr | tons per hour |
| T/yr | tons per consecutive 12 calendar month period |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| T2 | Tier II operating permit |
| TAP | toxic air pollutants |
| TEQ | toxicity equivalent |
| T-RACT | Toxic Air Pollutant Reasonably Available Control Technology |
| ULSD | ultra-low sulfur diesel |
| U.S.C. | United States Code |
| VOC | volatile organic compounds |
| wk | week |
| yd ³ | cubic yards |
| µg/m ³ | micrograms per cubic meter |

FACILITY INFORMATION

Description

The facility refurbishes propane tanks and truck trailers or frames.

Historically, the facility has been blasting the tanks outside and only blasting them inside the horse arena when the weather dictates. The facility has been preparing and airless spraying paints 20 to 40 500-gallon propane tanks each week. There have been no emissions controls on the existing blasting and painting operations.

To meet the air quality standards, through this permitting action, the facility has proposed the following changes to the facility:

For surface preparation (blasting):

- Install a fully enclosed blasting cabinet for surface preparation of 500-gallon or smaller propane tanks, which consists of most of the total surface preparations. The proposed four nanofiber media cartridges have total control efficiency of 99.999%, down to one micron. The emissions are assumed to be zero in the EI calculation.
- Install air filtration equipment for the existing blast room for equipment larger than a 500-gallon propane tank. The overall PM/PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} control efficiency of $(1-(1-99.8\%)(1-0\%)) = 99.8\%$ is used in the emissions calculations. Therefore, the proposed air filtration equipment should have an overall control efficiency of 99.8% or better. The blasting media (i.e., crushed glass) do not contain any hazardous air pollutants (HAP). The proposed usages in the existing blast room are 132.5 lb/hr x 8 hr/day x 1.2 buffer factor = 1,272 lb/day and 1,272 lb/day x 5 day/wk x 52 wk/yr = 330,720 lb/yr.

For painting operation (paint spray booth):

- Install a paint booth with filter systems to remove particulate matter in the overspray. Two filter systems in series, each with a 98% or better control efficiency for PM/PM₁₀/PM_{2.5}, are proposed. The calculated overall control efficiency of $(1-(1-98\%)(1-98\%)) = 99.96\%$ is used in the emissions calculation.
- Continue to use spray guns with a 65% or higher material transfer efficiency.
- Use paint materials: Lacquer Thinner SW R7K115, 2025 Acrylic Mod Clear Base EN, V 2153 Mid Coat Epoxy Primer, Carbothane 134 HG, and Carbozinc 859, or their equivalents.
- Limit the usage of all painting materials combined to 58 gal/wk.

For propane flare:

- No changes are made to the propane flare. The propane flare has been used to burn residual propane in the propane tanks and is estimated at the rate of 887,716 Btu/hr. According to the applicant, it actually operates 4.5 hr/day, 5 day/wk, and 52 wk/year or 1,170 hr/yr. However, for PTE calculation, 1,170 hr/yr is replaced with 8,760 hr/yr so that an operating hour monitoring will not be required.

Pollutants of concern identified are from painting operation, blasting operation and the propane flare.

Permitting History

This is the initial PTC for an existing facility that was constructed in August 2007 thus there is no permitting history.

Application Scope

This permit is the initial PTC for the existing minor facility.

The facility has proposed the changes to the existing facility to meet air quality standards as described above under Description Section.

Application Chronology

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| June 25, 2015 | The consent order was signed, which included a notification that a PTC was required (Enforcement Case No. E-2015.0001). |
| August 17, 2015 | DEQ received an application. |
| August 21, 2015 | DEQ received an application fee. |
| September, 1 – September 16, 2015 | DEQ provided an opportunity to request a public comment period on the application and proposed permitting action. |
| September 15, 2015 | DEQ determined that the application was incomplete. |
| October 15 and November 12, 2015 | DEQ received supplemental information from the applicant. |
| November 13, 2015 | DEQ determined that the application was complete. |
| January 4, 2016 | DEQ made available the draft permit and statement of basis for peer and regional office review. |
| January 8, 2016 | DEQ made available the draft permit and statement of basis for applicant review. |
| January 28, 2016 | DEQ received the revised emissions inventory for painting and blasting operations and the comments on the draft permit and statement of basis. |
| February 2, 2016 | DEQ received the permit processing fee. |
| February 8, 2016 | DEQ issued the final permit and statement of basis. |

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

Emissions Units and Control Equipment

Table 1 EMISSIONS UNIT AND CONTROL EQUIPMENT INFORMATION

| Source ID No. | Sources | Control Equipment |
|---------------|---|---|
| EP1 | <p><u>Paint Spray Booth(s) and/or Preparation Station:</u> Manufacturer: Col-Met Engineered Finishing Model: EIB 12-08-26-PT</p> <p>Note: the number of booths installed at the facility is not limited by this permit.</p> <p><u>Spray Material</u></p> <p>Spray Material Used: Epoxy Coatings Material Coated: steel Total Materials Usage Permit Limit: 58 gal/week,</p> <p><u>Coating spray gun(s):</u> Manufacturer(s): Grace Model(s): Magnum ports 19/Pro LTS 19 Type: airless Rated Capacity: 0.38 gal/min Transfer Efficiency: 65% or greater</p> | <p><u>Paint Spray Booth(s) and/or Preparation Station Filter System:</u></p> <p>Booth Type(s): special floor style, non-pressurized, industrial dry filter cross flow paint spray booth</p> <p>Particulate Filtration Method: dry filter Paint Booth Dimensions: 26' X 12' X 8' Exhaust System: 30" tube axial in-line exhaust fan (9,600 CFM @ 1/2 static pressure). Exhaust Chamber: industrial style exhaust chamber with two 20"x20"x2" filter cells</p> <p>Filter Manufacturer(s): Exhaust filters are a fiberglass 'paint arrestor pad' made specifically for the collection of paint overspray. Filters are UL rated Class 2, with CE of 98%.</p> <p>PM/PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} CE:</p> <p>Booth particulate filters CE #1: 98% or greater Booth particulate filters CE #2: 98% or greater OR Overall PM/PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} CE: 99.96% or greater</p> |
| NA | <p><u>Fully enclosed blasting cabinet for surface preparation of 500-gallon or smaller propane tanks, which consists most of the total surface preparations</u></p> | <p><u>Four nanofiber media cartridges have total control efficiency of 99.999%, down to one micron.</u></p> |
| EP2 | <p><u>Existing blasting room for surface preparation of equipment larger than a 500-gallon propane tank.</u></p> <p><u>Sand Blaster</u></p> <p>Manufacturer(s): Pirate Brand Model(s): 6.5 cu ft SPR Series Rated Capacity: 3,000 lb/hr</p> <p><u>Blasting Media</u></p> <p>Blasting media used: crushed glass Crushed glass usage permit limits: 1,272 lbs/day 330,720 lb/yr</p> | <p><u>Dry Abrasive Blast Room Filter System:</u></p> <p>Cartridge Style Dust Collection System Manufacturer: AM -14983 Model: # FFBW</p> <p>Each of the three (3) units contains 6 High efficiency cartridge filters, with CE 99.8% Cartridge Dimension: 26" x 12.75" OD x 8.375" ID (1). Blasting Room Dimensions: 20' X 80' X 10' scfm rating 4500 X (3) = 13,500 scfm for blast room.</p> <p>PM/PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} Control Efficiency:</p> <p>PM/PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} CE: 99.8% or greater down to 0.5 micron</p> |
| EP3 | <p><u>Propane Flare:</u></p> <p>Manufacturer: owner constructed Manufacture Date: August 2007 Heat Input Rating: 877,716 Btu/hr Fuel: propane</p> | <p>None</p> |

Emissions Inventories

Potential to Emit

IDAPA 58.01.01 defines Potential to Emit as the maximum capacity of a facility or stationary source to emit an air pollutant under its physical and operational design. Any physical or operational limitation on the capacity of the facility or source to emit an air pollutant, including air pollution control equipment and restrictions on hours of operation or on the type or amount of material combusted, stored or processed, shall be treated as part of its design if the limitation or the effect it would have on emissions is state or federally enforceable. Secondary emissions do not count in determining the potential to emit of a facility or stationary source.

Using this definition of Potential to Emit an emission inventory was developed by the applicant and reviewed by DEQ staff. Detailed calculations and assumptions can be found in Appendix A.

Uncontrolled Potential to Emit

Using the definition of Potential to Emit, uncontrolled Potential to Emit is then defined as the maximum capacity of a facility or stationary source to emit an air pollutant under its physical and operational design. Any physical or operational limitation on the capacity of the facility or source to emit an air pollutant, including air pollution control equipment and restrictions on hours of operation or on the type or amount of material combusted, stored or processed, shall **not** be treated as part of its design **since** the limitation or the effect it would have on emissions **is not** state or federally enforceable.

The uncontrolled Potential to Emit is used to determine if a facility is a “Synthetic Minor” source of emissions. Synthetic Minor sources are facilities that have an uncontrolled Potential to Emit for regulated air pollutants or HAP above the applicable Major Source threshold without permit limits.

The following table presents the uncontrolled Potential to Emit for regulated air pollutants as submitted by the Applicant and verified by DEQ staff. See Appendix A for a detailed presentation of the calculations and the assumptions used to determine emissions for each emissions unit.

No information is available to determine what would be the maximum production rate for this facility. The applicant assumed that 110% of the 2014 production rate would be facility’s maximum capacity. That is 58 gallons per week (gal/wk). The facility’s uncontrolled Potential to Emit for coating operating is based on 11.6 gal/day of all coating materials combined, calculated as $(58 \text{ gal/wk}) / (5 \text{ day/wk})$, and 365 days per year. According to the applicant, there are logistical operations, such as unloading one tank at a time from blast cabinet and loading the paint booth with one 500-gallon tank, dry time in the booth, and unloading the booth. Eight hours per day would be the maximum daily operation hours for coating operation.

For surface preparation (blasting operating), if it is based on nozzle design capacity of 3,000 lb/hr, the uncontrolled PTE will be very high and unrealistic. The uncontrolled PTE of the blasting operation is inherently limited by the painting operation as it prepares surface for substances being painted in the coating operation.

The uncontrolled PTE of the propane flare is inherently limited by how many propane tanks are refurbished. Though the uncontrolled PTE is based on 8,760 hr/yr for easy calculation, it makes no significant difference if operating hours inherently limited by the operation (i.e., 1170 hr/yr) were used.

Table 2 UNCONTROLLED POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR REGULATED AIR POLLUTANTS¹

| Emissions Unit | PM ₁₀ | PM _{2.5} | SO ₂ | NO _x | CO | VOC |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|--------|
| | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr |
| EP 1 Paint Spray Booth, Prep Station | 16.25 | 15.03 | | | | 52.31 |

| Emissions Unit | PM ₁₀ | PM _{2.5} | SO ₂ | NO _x | CO | VOC |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|--------|
| | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr |
| EP 2 Abrasive Blasting Room Exhaust | 3.01 | 0.30 | | | | |
| EP 3 Propane Flare | 0.030 | 0.030 | 6.33E-04 | 0.55 | 0.32 | 0.042 |
| Totals | 19.29 | 15.36 | 6.33E-04 | 0.55 | 0.32 | 52.35 |

No information is available to determine what would be the maximum production rate for this facility. The applicant has assumed that 110% of the 2014 production rate (i.e., 58 gal/wk) would be the facility's maximum capacity.

The following table presents the uncontrolled Potential to Emit for HAP pollutants as submitted by the Applicant and verified by DEQ staff. See Appendix A for a detailed presentation of the calculations and assumptions used to determine emissions for each emissions unit. All the HAP emissions come from coating operation.

Table 3 UNCONTROLLED POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS

| Hazardous Air Pollutants | PTE (T/yr) |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| Xylene | 9.6 |
| Toluene | 4.4 |
| Methanol | 5.5 |
| Ethyl Benzene | 1.002 |
| Methyl Ethyl Keytone | 0.49 |
| Hexamethylene Disocyanate | 0.004 |
| Total | 20.94 |

Pre-Project Potential to Emit

Pre-project Potential to Emit is used to establish the change in emissions at a facility as a result of this project.

This is an existing facility. However, since this is the first time the facility is receiving a permit, pre-project emissions are set to zero for all criteria pollutants.

Post Project Potential to Emit

Post project Potential to Emit is used to establish the change in emissions at a facility and to determine the facility's classification as a result of this project. Post project Potential to Emit includes all permit limits resulting from this project.

The following table presents the post project Potential to Emit for criteria pollutants from all emissions units at the facility as submitted by the applicant and reviewed by DEQ staff. See Appendix A for a detailed presentation of the calculations of these emissions for each emissions unit.

Table 4 POST PROJECT POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR REGULATED AIR POLLUTANTS

| Emissions Unit | PM ₁₀ | PM _{2.5} | SO ₂ | NO _x | CO | VOC |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr |
| EP 1 Paint Booth | 4.64E-03 | 6.01E-03 | | | | 37.3 |
| EP 2 Blast Room | 4.30E-03 | 4.30E-04 | | | | |
| EP3 Propane Flare | 2.98E-02 | 2.98E-02 | 6.33E-04 | 5.53E-01 | 3.19E-01 | 4.25E-02 |
| Totals | 0.039 | 0.036 | 6.33E-04 | 0.55 | 0.32 | 37.31 |

Change in Potential to Emit

The change in facility-wide potential to emit is used to determine if a public comment period may be required and to determine the processing fee per IDAPA 58.01.01.225. Because the pre-project emissions are set to zero, the facility-wide change in the potential to emit for criteria pollutants is the same as post-project PTE.

Non-Carcinogenic TAP Emissions

A summary of the estimated PTE for emissions increase of non-carcinogenic toxic air pollutants (TAP) is provided in the following table. No non-carcinogenic TAP are from the flare operation. Because the pre-project emissions are set to zero, the facility-wide change for TAP is the same as post-project PTE for TAP.

Table 5 POST PROJECT POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR NON-CARCINOGENIC TOXIC AIR POLLUTANTS

| Listed TAP (HAP) | PM | CAS # | Maximum Daily HAP & TAP Calculated Emission Rates, Averaged Over 24 Hrs (lb/hr) | 585 Screening Emission Levels (EL) (lb/hr) | Exceeds EL? |
|--|-------|------------|---|--|-------------|
| Facility Wide TAPs - Painting | | | | | |
| Xylene (HAP) | | 1330-20-7 | 0.79 | 29 | No |
| N-Butyl Acetate | | 123-86-4 | 0.02 | 47.3 | No |
| Toluene (HAP) | | 108-88-3 | 0.51 | 25 | No |
| Methanol (HAP) | | 67-56-1 | 0.10 | 17.3 | No |
| Acetone | | 67-64-1 | 0.04 | 119 | No |
| 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | | 108-65-6 | 0.10 | 24 | No |
| Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | | 100-41-4 | 0.08 | 29 | No |
| Stoddard Solvent | | 8052-41-3 | 0.08 | 35 | No |
| Isopropanol | | 67-63-0 | 0.05 | 65.3 | No |
| Methyl Amyl Ketone | | 110-43-0 | 0.00070 | 15.7 | No |
| Methyl Ethyl Keytone (HAP) | | 78-93-3 | 0.03 | 39.3 | No |
| N-Butanol | | 71-36-3 | 0.03 | 10 | No |
| Ethyl Acetate | | 141-78-6 | 0.00032 | 93.3 | No |
| Zinc (dust or fume) | PM | 7440-66-6 | 0.00028 | 0.667 | No |
| Carbon Black | PM | 1333-86-4 | 2.2606E-05 | 0.23 | No |
| Zinc Oxide | PM | 1314-13-2 | 2.8372E-06 | 0.677 | No |
| Microcrystalline Silica Coating | PM | 14808-60-7 | 0.001136 | 0.0067 | No |
| Microcrystalline Silica Blasting * | | | | | |
| Facility Wide TAPs Continued - Blasting | | | | | |
| Calcium Oxide (TAP) | 15.0% | 1305-78-8 | 1.59E-02 | 0.133 | No |
| Aluminum Oxide (TAP) | 2.0% | 7429-90-5 | 2.12E-03 | 0.667 | No |
| Magnesium Oxide (TAP) | 1.0% | 1309-48-4 | 1.06E-03 | 0.667 | No |
| Iron Oxide (TAP) | 1.0% | 1309-37-1 | 1.06E-03 | 0.333 | No |
| * Silicon Dioxide (TAP) This amount has been accounted for above | 1.0% | 14808-60-7 | NA | 0.0067 | na |
| Facility Wide TAPs Continued - Propane Flare | | | | | |

| Listed TAP (HAP) | PM | CAS # | Maximum Daily HAP & TAP Calculated Emission Rates, Averaged Over 24 Hrs (lb/hr) | 585 Screening Emission Levels (EL) (lb/hr) | Exceeds EL? |
|-----------------------|----|------------|---|--|-------------|
| Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) | | 10024-97-2 | 0.024 | 6 | No |

Carcinogenic TAP Emissions

No carcinogenic TAP are in the coatings and abrasive media, and No carcinogenic TAP are from the flare operation.

Post Project HAP Emissions

The following table presents the post project potential to emit for HAP pollutants from all emissions units at the facility as submitted by the applicant and verified by DEQ staff. See Appendix A for a detailed presentation of the calculations of these emissions for each emissions unit.

Table 6 HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS EMISSIONS POTENTIAL TO EMIT SUMMARY

| HAP | PTE Ton/Yr |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| Xylene | 6.84 |
| Toluene | 3.13 |
| Ethyl Benzene | 0.72 |
| Methyl Ethyl Keytone | 0.35 |
| Methanol | 3.92 |
| Hexamethylene Disocyanate | 0.0028 |
| Total HAP | 14.95 |

Ambient Air Quality Impact Analyses

As presented in Table 4 of the SOB, the facility's PTE is below regulatory concern (BRC) for PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, SO₂, NO_x, and CO as the PTE is below 10% of the respective significant level as defined in IDAPA 58.01.01.006. According to the State of Idaho Air Quality Modeling Guideline¹, modeling is not required for these air pollutants.

REGULATORY ANALYSIS

Attainment Designation (40 CFR 81.313)

The facility is located in Twin Falls County, which is designated as attainment or unclassifiable for PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, SO₂, NO₂, CO, and Ozone. Refer to 40 CFR 81.313 for additional information.

Facility Classification

The AIRS/AFS facility classification codes are as follows:

For THAP (Total Hazardous Air Pollutants) Only:

A = Use when any one HAP has actual or potential emissions ≥ 10 T/yr or if the aggregate of all HAPS (Total HAPs) has actual or potential emissions ≥ 25 T/yr.

¹ Criteria pollutant thresholds in Table 2, State of Idaho Guideline for Performing Air Quality Impact Analyses, Doc ID AQ-011, September 2013.

- SM80 = Use if a synthetic minor (potential emissions fall below applicable major source thresholds if and only if the source complies with federally enforceable limitations) and the permit sets limits ≥ 8 T/yr of a single HAP or ≥ 20 T/yr of THAP.
- SM = Use if a synthetic minor (potential emissions fall below applicable major source thresholds if and only if the source complies with federally enforceable limitations) and the potential HAP emissions are limited to < 8 T/yr of a single HAP and/or < 20 T/yr of THAP.
- B = Use when the potential to emit without permit restrictions is below the 10 and 25 T/yr major source threshold
- UNK = Class is unknown

For All Other Pollutants:

- A = Actual or potential emissions of a pollutant are ≥ 100 T/yr.
- SM80 = Use if a synthetic minor for the applicable pollutant (potential emissions fall below 100 T/yr if and only if the source complies with federally enforceable limitations) and potential emissions of the pollutant are ≥ 80 T/yr.
- SM = Use if a synthetic minor for the applicable pollutant (potential emissions fall below 100 T/yr if and only if the source complies with federally enforceable limitations) and potential emissions of the pollutant are < 80 T/yr.
- B = Actual and potential emissions are < 100 T/yr without permit restrictions.
- UNK = Class is unknown.

Table 7 REGULATED AIR POLLUTANT FACILITY CLASSIFICATION

| Pollutant | Uncontrolled PTE (T/yr) | Permitted PTE (T/yr) | Major Source Thresholds (T/yr) | AIRS/AFS Classification |
|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| PM/PM ₁₀ | 19.29 | 0.039 | 100 | B |
| PM _{2.5} | 15.36 | 0.036 | 100 | B |
| SO ₂ | 6.33E-04 | 6.33E-04 | 100 | B |
| NO _x | 0.55 | 0.55 | 100 | B |
| CO | 0.32 | 0.32 | 100 | B |
| VOC | 52.35 | 37.31 | 100 | B |
| Max. HAP (single) | 9.6 | 6.84 | 10 | B |
| HAP (Total) | 20.94 | 14.95 | 25 | |

Permit to Construct (IDAPA 58.01.01.201)

IDAPA 58.01.01.201Permit to Construct Required

This is an existing facility constructed without first obtaining a PTC. The facility and DEQ entered into a consent order that required the facility to apply for a PTC for the existing unpermitted facility. Therefore, a permit to construct is required to be issued in accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.220. This permitting action was processed in accordance with the procedures of IDAPA 58.01.01.200-228.

Visible Emissions (IDAPA 58.01.01.625)

IDAPA 58.01.01.625.....Visible Emissions

The sources of PM emissions at this facility are subject to the State of Idaho visible emissions standard of 20% opacity. This requirement is assured by Permit Condition 2.3.

IDAPA 58.01.01.775-776.....Rules for the Control of Odors

The permittee shall not allow, suffer, cause, or permit the emission of odorous gases, liquids, or solids to

the atmosphere in such quantities as to cause air pollution. This requirement is assured by Permit Conditions 2.2.

Title V Classification (IDAPA 58.01.01.300, 40 CFR Part 70)

IDAPA 58.01.01.301Requirement to Obtain Tier I Operating Permit

Post project facility-wide emissions from this facility do not have a potential to emit greater than 100 tons per year for criteria pollutants or 10 tons per year for any one HAP or 25 tons per year for all HAP combined as demonstrated previously in the Emissions Inventories Section of this analysis. Therefore, the facility is not a Tier I source in accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.006, and the requirements of IDAPA 58.01.01.301 do not apply.

PSD Classification (40 CFR 52.21)

40 CFR 52.21Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality

The facility is not a major stationary source as defined in 40 CFR 52.21(b)(1), nor is it undergoing any physical change at a stationary source not otherwise qualifying under paragraph 40 CFR 52.21(b)(1) as a major stationary source, that would constitute a major stationary source by itself as defined in 40 CFR 52. Therefore in accordance with 40 CFR 52.21(a)(2), PSD requirements are not applicable to this permitting action. The facility is not a designated facility as defined in 40 CFR 52.21(b)(1)(i)(a), and does not have facility-wide emissions of any criteria pollutant that exceed 250 T/yr.

NSPS Applicability (40 CFR 60)

The facility is not subject to any NSPS requirements.

NESHAP Applicability (40 CFR 61)

The facility is not subject to any NESHAP requirements in 40 CFR 61.

MACT Applicability (40 CFR 63)

Applicable

40 CFR 63 Subpart HHHHHHH NESHAP for Paint Stripping and Misc Surface Coating Operations at Area Sources

§63.11170 Am I subject to this subpart?

(a) You are subject to this subpart if you operate an area source of HAP as defined in paragraph (b) of this section, including sources that are part of a tribal, local, State, or Federal facility and you perform one or more of the activities in paragraphs (a)(1) through (3) of this section:

(1) Perform paint stripping using MeCl for the removal of dried paint (including, but not limited to, paint, enamel, varnish, shellac, and lacquer) from wood, metal, plastic, and other substrates.

(2) Perform spray application of coatings, as defined in §63.11180, to motor vehicles and mobile equipment including operations that are located in stationary structures at fixed locations, and mobile repair and refinishing operations that travel to the customer's location, except spray coating applications that meet the definition of facility maintenance in §63.11180. However, if you are the owner or operator of a motor vehicle or mobile equipment surface coating operation, you may petition the Administrator for an exemption from this subpart if you can demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Administrator, that you spray apply no coatings that contain the target HAP, as defined in §63.11180. Petitions must include a description of the coatings that you spray apply and your certification that you do not spray apply any coatings containing the target HAP. If circumstances

change such that you intend to spray apply coatings containing the target HAP, you must submit the initial notification required by 63.11175 and comply with the requirements of this subpart.

(3) Perform spray application of coatings that contain the target HAP, as defined in §63.11180, to a plastic and/or metal substrate on a part or product, except spray coating applications that meet the definition of facility maintenance or space vehicle in §63.11180.

(b) An area source of HAP is a source of HAP that is not a major source of HAP, is not located at a major source, and is not part of a major source of HAP emissions. A major source of HAP emissions is any stationary source or group of stationary sources located within a contiguous area and under common control that emits or has the potential to emit any single HAP at a rate of 9.07 megagrams (Mg) (10 tons) or more per year, or emit any combination of HAP at a rate of 22.68 Mg (25 tons) or more per year.

Analysis: The facility is subject to 40 CFR 63 Subpart HHHHHH because it is an area source for HAP and perform spray application of coatings to mobile equipment as defined in 40 CFR 63.11180, such as trailers. Currently the painting materials do not contain targeted HAP, the permittee may petition the Administrator for an exemption from this subpart

EPA is the administrator for this subpart at the time of this permit issuance.

Non-applicability

40 CFR 63 Subpart MMMM - NESHAP for Surface Coating of Misc. Metal Parts and Products

§63.3881 Am I subject to this subpart?

...
(b) You are subject to this subpart if you own or operate a new, reconstructed, or existing affected source, as defined in §63.3882, that uses 946 liters (250 gallons (gal)) per year, or more, of coatings that contain hazardous air pollutants (HAP) in the surface coating of miscellaneous metal parts and products defined in paragraph (a) of this section; and that is a major source, is located at a major source, or is part of a major source of emissions of HAP. A major source of HAP emissions is any stationary source or group of stationary sources located within a contiguous area and under common control that emits or has the potential to emit any single HAP at a rate of 9.07 megagrams (Mg) (10 tons) or more per year or any combination of HAP at a rate of 22.68 Mg (25 tons) or more per year. You do not need to include coatings that meet the definition of non-HAP coating contained in §63.3981 in determining whether you use 946 liters (250 gal) per year, or more, of coatings in the surface coating of miscellaneous metal parts and products.

Analysis: the facility does not emit or have the potential to emit 10 tons or more per year of any single HAP or 25 tons or more per year of all HAP combined. Therefore it is not a major source of HAP. Therefore, 40 CFR 63 Subpart MMMM does not apply.

Subpart XXXXXX—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Area Source Standards for Nine Metal Fabrication and Finishing Source Categories

§63.11514 Am I subject to this subpart?

(a) You are subject to this subpart if you own or operate an area source that is primarily engaged in the operations in one of the nine source categories listed in paragraphs (a)(1) through (9) of this section. Descriptions of these source categories are shown in Table 1 of this subpart. “Primarily engaged” is defined in §63.11522, “What definitions apply to this subpart?”

(1) Electrical and Electronic Equipment Finishing Operations;

- (2) Fabricated Metal Products;*
- (3) Fabricated Plate Work (Boiler Shops);*
- (4) Fabricated Structural Metal Manufacturing;*
- (5) Heating Equipment, except Electric;*
- (6) Industrial Machinery and Equipment Finishing Operations;*
- (7) Iron and Steel Forging;*
- (8) Primary Metal Products Manufacturing; and*
- (9) Valves and Pipe Fittings.*

Analysis: the facility is not subject to this subpart because it is not primarily engaged in the operations in one of the nine source categories listed above.

Permit Conditions Review

This section describes the permit conditions for this initial permit.

SECTION 1 PERMIT SCOPE

Permit Condition 1.1 states the purpose of this permitting action.

Table 1.1 lists the emissions sources regulated in this permit.

SECTION 2 FACILITY-WIDE CONDITIONS

Permit Condition 2.1 requires the facility to reasonably control fugitive emissions.

Permit Condition 2.2 requires the facility to reasonably control odors.

Permit Condition 2.3 requires the facility to comply with the 20% opacity limit.

Permit Condition 2.4 requires the facility to comply with open burning requirements.

Permit Condition 2.5 requires the facility to comply with reporting requirements.

Permit Condition 2.6 is a standard permit condition if the facility is affected by federal regulations.

SECTION 3 SURFACE PREPARATION (BLASTING)

Permit Conditions 3.1, 3.2 and Table 3.1 describe the blasting operation process and its control.

Permit Condition 3.3 establishes the daily and annual throughput limits that used in the EI. Together with other permit requirements, they keep particulate emissions below regulatory concern (BRC) to avoid PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} modeling requirement and to keep particulate TAP emissions below ELs.

Permit Condition 3.4 specifies that the blasting media shall not have HAP as defined in Clear Air Act. That is consistent with the EI calculations.

Permit Conditions 3.5 and 3.6 specify controls that are used in the EI to keep particulate emissions BRC to avoid PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} modeling requirement and to keep particulate TAP emissions below ELs.

Permit Conditions 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9 are corresponding monitoring requirements to ensure compliance with Permit Conditions 3.3 to 3.6.

Permit Condition 3.10 is a standard permit condition for filter systems taken from DEQ's internal guidance.

SECTION 4 COATING OPERATION/PAINT SPRAY BOOTH

The applicant has proposed the following:

- Install a paint booth with filter system to remove particulate matters in the overspray. Two filter systems in series, each with 98% control, are proposed. The calculated overall control efficiency of $(1-(1-98\%)(1-98\%)) = 99.96\%$ is used in the EI calculation.
- The spray guns continue to have 65% or higher material transfer efficiency.
- The proposed total paint throughput of $(58 \text{ gal/wk}) / (5 \text{ days/wk}) = 11.6 \text{ gal/day}$ is used in EI calculation. The maximum operating hours 8 hr/day (due to logistical operations, such as loading and unloading tanks), 5 days/week, 52 wk/yr or 2,080 paint hours per year are used for post project PTE calculation.

PM

The applicant used the maximum solid mass percentage, 89 wt%, of all six paints and the maximum density, 24.71 pounds per gallon, lb/gal, of all six paints to estimate the particulate emissions. For particulate emissions, the facility can use any paint as long as the PM content in paint does not exceed $89\% \times 24.71 \text{ lb/gal} = 22 \text{ lb/gal}$.

VOC

The EI spreadsheet used the maximum VOC wt%, 100%, of all six paints and maximum density, 24.71 lb/gal, of all six paints to estimate the VOC emissions. For VOC emissions, the facility can use any paint as long as the VOC content in the paint does not exceed $100\% \times 24.71 \text{ lb/gal} = 24.71 \text{ lb/gal}$.

HAP

The applicant originally multiplied the maximum xylene wt%, 56%, of the four paints containing xylene and the maximum density, 10.80 lb/gal, of the four paints to estimate xylene emissions. This over conservative emission estimation method showed that the uncontrolled xylene emissions are greater than 10 T/yr. Therefore, a more realistic emission calculation method is used in the revised EI submitted on 1/28/2016. That is using the maximum xylene content of the four paint materials containing xylene, in lb/gal, calculated as $\max(\text{the xylene wt\% multiplying the corresponding paint density})_{i=1 \text{ to } 4}$, to estimate xylene emissions. The uncontrolled xylene emissions are below 10 T/yr and the controlled xylene emissions are below 8 T/yr.

TAP

For TAP that are not HAP, the applicant estimated their emissions using the actual data of the six paints, such as their daily usage, TAP wt%, paint density, to demonstrate compliance with the standards. When assuming weekly throughput of 58 gal/week used up in one day, all TAP emissions are still way below their respective ELs. Therefore, weekly throughput monitoring is used in the permit rather than daily monitoring, and TAP content is not specifically limited in the permit.

The following permit conditions reflect the assumptions and throughput limits used in the EI calculations.

Permit Conditions 4.1, 4.2 and Table 4.1 describe the coating operation and its control.

Permit Condition 4.3 establishes the daily throughput limit that used in the emissions estimations by the applicant. Together with other permit requirements, the throughput limit keeps particulate emissions BRC to avoid PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} modeling, TAP emissions below ELs, HAP emissions below major source thresholds, and VOC emissions below major source threshold. The annual throughput limit is not necessary as it is inherently limited by the weekly throughput limit.

It is assumed in the EI that the weekly limit of 58 gallons of all paint materials combined is consumed in a day. The calculated TAP emissions based on that assumption are well below the respective ELs. Therefore, only weekly throughput limit is required.

Permit Condition 4.4 specifies the coating materials. The specifications reflect the assumptions and emissions calculations used in the EI. Together with other permit requirements, the permit condition keeps particulate emissions BRC to avoid PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} modeling, TAP emissions below ELs, HAP emissions below major source thresholds, and VOC emissions below major source threshold. The components of the listed paint materials can be found in the “VOC PM HAP & TAP Layout” worksheet of Appendix A.

Permit Condition 4.5 specifies controls that are used in the EI to keep particulate emissions BRC to avoid PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} modeling and to keep particulate TAP emissions below ELs.

Permit Conditions 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 are corresponding monitoring requirements to ensure compliance with Permit Conditions 4.3 to 4.5.

Permit Condition 4.9 is a standard permit condition for filter systems taken from DEQ’s internal guidance.

Permit Condition 4.10 states that the permittee is subject to 40 CFR 63 Subpart HHHHHH because it is an area source for HAP and perform spray application of coatings to mobile equipment as defined in 40 CFR 63.11180, such as trailers. However, currently the paints do not contain targeted HAP, the permittee may petition the Administrator for an exemption from this subpart. EPA is the Administrator for the subpart at the time of the permit issuance.

SECTION 5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

The general provisions are taken from the current PTC template.

PUBLIC REVIEW

Public Comment Opportunity

An opportunity for public comment period on the application was provided in accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.209.01.c. During this time, there were no comments on the application and there was not a request for a public comment period on DEQ’s proposed action. Refer to the chronology for public comment opportunity dates.

APPENDIX A – EMISSIONS INVENTORIES

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N |
|----|---|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| 12 | Days/Yr | | Avg Period in Hr's | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | 365 | | 24 | | | | | = linked cell | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Blasting Hrs/Yr | Blasting Days/Yr | | Blasting, Control #1 Efficiency Factor | Blasting, Control #2 Efficiency Factor | TAP overall blasting CE: | | | | | | | |
| 16 | 2080 | 260 | | 99.80% | 0% | 99.80% | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Coating Operations - EI Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | POST PROJECT HOURLY & ANNUAL PM10 & PM2.5 POTENTIAL TO EMIT - COATING OPERATION | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | Coating Material | | Daily Coating Use Gal/Day | Annual Coating Use Ton/Yr | Max. paint Density Lbs/Gal | Paint Spray Gun TE (%) | Booth Particulate Filters CE #1 % | Booth Particulate Filters CE #2 % | PM10 | | PM2.5 | | |
| 24 | Pre-Treatment wash primer, primer, topcoat clear, reducer, and hardener combined | | 11.60 | 20.4 | 24.71 | 65.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | Hourly PM10 Emissions Lbs PM10 / Hr | Annual PM 10 Emissions Ton PM10 / Yr | Hourly Pm2.5 Emissions Lbs PM2.5 / Hr | Annual PM2.5 Emissions Ton PM2.5 / Yr | |
| 25 | | | | | | | | | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.004 | 0.004 | |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | Daily coating use was determined by using the worksheets in this workbook - see adjacent TABs below. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | Annual coating use is assumed to be daily coating use multiplied by 365 days per year. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | The density of the paint was assumed to be the highest available for VOC estimation. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | 65% TE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | 98% CE Control #1 & 98% CE Control #2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | PM10 X 92.5% = PM2.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | (source: the available worksheets and supporting documentation in this workbook) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | POST PROJECT HOURLY AND ANNUAL VOC Potential To Emit For Coating Operations | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | Coating Material | | Daily Coating Use Gal/Day | Annual Coating Use Gal/IYr | VOC Content Lbs VOC/Gal | Hourly Voc Emissions Lbs Voc/Hr | Annual VOC Emissions Ton VOC/Yr | | | | | | |
| 39 | topcoat clear, reducer, and hardener combined | | 11.60 | 3,017 | 24.71 | 35.8 | 37.3 | | | | | | |
| 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | Daily coating use was determined by using the worksheets in this workbook - see TABs adjacent to this TAB below. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | Annual coating use is assumed to be daily coating use multiplied by 365 days per year. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | The VOC Content of the paint is assumed to be 100% VOC (DEQ Assumption for worst case where thinner is used in the spray ready Mix. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | Uncontrolled emissions are based on 8 Hr x 7 Days x 52 weeks = 2,912 . | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | All coating operations occur during this time. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | There are logistical operations: unloading 1 tank at a time from blast cabinet, & loading the paint booth, | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | dry time in the booth & unloading the booth; and repeat the process for each individual tank. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | Given this non painting time spent during normal business hours, the figure of 2912 hours was considered to be the worst-case | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | maximum hours during which emissions could occur. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

These two description lines have been revised to reflect new design.

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N |
|-----|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 53 | Therefore uncontrolled PM10 Emissions from the coating operations are calculated using the annual PTE as calculated using 2912 hours and | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | backing out the control efficiency of the filter system. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | Uncontrolled Annual PM10 Emissions | | | | 16.3 | Ton / Yr | 16.3 | | | | | | |
| 57 | Uncontrolled Annual PM2.5 Emissions | | | | 15.0 | Ton / Yr | 15.0 | | | | | | |
| 58 | Uncontrolled Annual VOC Emissions | | | | 52.2 | Ton / Yr | | | | | | | |
| 59 | Note: | VOC PTE = UnCtrl Annual VOC's | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | Propane Flare - EI Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 82 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 83 | PROPANE FLARE: POST PROJECT HOURLY AND ANNUAL POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR CRITEIA POLLUTANTS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 84 | WHEN COMBUSTING PROPANE GAS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 86 | Emission Unit | Rated Heat Input MMBtu/Hr | Annual Hours Of Operation | Criteria Pollutant | Emission Factors Lb/MMBtu | Hourly Emissions Lb /Hr | Annual Emissions Ton / Yr | | | | | | |
| 87 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 88 | Propane Flare | 8.8772E-01 | 8760 | PM10, PM2.5 | 7.66E-03 | 6.80E-03 | 2.98E-02 | | | | | | |
| 89 | | | | SO2 | 1.63E-04 | 1.45E-04 | 6.33E-04 | | | | | | |
| 90 | | | | NOx (TAP) | 1.42E-01 | 1.26E-01 | 5.53E-01 | | | | | | |
| 91 | | | | CO | 8.20E-02 | 7.28E-02 | 3.19E-01 | | | | | | |
| 92 | | | | VOC | 1.09E-02 | 9.70E-03 | 4.25E-02 | | | | | | |
| 93 | | | | Pb | | | na | na | | | | | |
| 94 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 97 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 98 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 99 | Abrasive Blasting - EI Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 101 | POST PROJECT HOURLY & ANNUAL PM10 & PM2.5 POTENTIAL TO EMIT - ABRASIVE BLASTING OPERATION | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 102 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 103 | Dry Abrasive Blasting | Abrasive Media Consumed Lbs/Day | Annual Media Use Ton/Yr | PM10 Emission Factor in Lbs of PM10 for Every 1000 Lbs of Media | PM2.5 Emission Factor in Lbs of PM2.5 for Every 1000 Lbs of Media | Hourly PM10 Emissions Lbs PM10 / Hr | Annual PM10 Emissions Ton PM10 / Yr | Hourly Pm2.5 Emissions Lbs PM2.5 / Hr | Annual PM2.5 Emissions Ton PM2.5 / Yr | | | | |
| 104 | | 1272 | 165.4 | 13.00 | 1.30 | 0.00413 | 0.00430 | 0.000413 | 0.000430 | | | | |
| 105 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 106 | Daily media use was taken from worksheets in the Blasting Emissions Workbook. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 107 | Emissions calculated using emission factors from AP 42. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 108 | Annual Media use is assumed to be Hourly Media Use X Annual Blasting Hours. Can use annual media throughput limit in the permit if need to. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 109 | 99.80% | CE Control #1 | 0% | CE Control #2 | The CE cells in this row have been linked to the Blasting Workbook, 'Post PTC Blast EI' | | | | | | | | |
| 110 | PM10 X 92.5% = PM2.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 111 | (source: the available worksheets and supporting documentation in this workbook) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 112 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 113 | Abrasive Blasting HAPS Emissions | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 114 | NO HAPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N |
|-----|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 115 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 116 | END of EI Summary Section | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 139 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 140 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 141 | Statement of Basis Tables | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 142 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 143 | Emissions Units and Control Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 144 | Table 1. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 145 | Source ID | Sources | | Control Equipment | | | | | | | | | |
| 146 | No. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 147 | | <u>January 2016 - Paint Spray Booth(s) and/or</u> | | <u>January 2016 - Paint Spray Booth(s) and/or Preparation</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| 148 | | <u>Preparation Station:</u> | | <u>Station Filter System:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| 149 | | Manufacturer: Col-Met Engineered Finishing | | Booth Type(s): special floor style, non-pressurized, | | | | | | | | | |
| 150 | | Solutions | | industrial dry filter cross flow paint spray | | | | | | | | | |
| 151 | | Model: Model EIB 12-08-26-PT | | booth. | | | | | | | | | |
| 152 | | Note: the number of booths installed at the facility | | Particulate Filtration Method: dry filter. | | | | | | | | | |
| 153 | | is not limited by this permit. | | Paint Booth Dimensions: 26' X 12' X 8'. | | | | | | | | | |
| 154 | | <u>Spray Material</u> | | Exhaust System: 30" tube axial in-line exhaust fan (9,600 | | | | | | | | | |
| 155 | | Spray material used: Epoxy Coatings | | CFM @ ½ static pressure). | | | | | | | | | |
| 156 | EP1 | Material coated: Steel | | Exhaust Chamber: industrial style exhaust chamber with | | | | | | | | | |
| 157 | | Total materials usage permit limit: 58 gal/week, | | two (2), 20" x 20" x 2" filter cells. | | | | | | | | | |
| 158 | | <u>Coating spray gun(s):</u> | | Filter Manufacturer(s): Exhaust filters are a fiberglass | | | | | | | | | |
| 159 | | Manufacturer(s): Grace | | "paint arrester pad" made | | | | | | | | | |
| 160 | | Model(s): Magnum ports 19/Pro LTS 19 | | specifically for the collection of | | | | | | | | | |
| 161 | | Type: Airless | | paint overspray. Filters are UL | | | | | | | | | |
| 162 | | Rated Capacity: 0.38 gal/min | | rated Class 2, with a CE of 98%. | | | | | | | | | |
| 163 | | Transfer Efficiency: 65% or greater | | PM/PM ₁₀ /PM _{2.5} Control Efficiency (CE): | | | | | | | | | |
| 164 | | | | Booth particulate filters CE #1 %: 98% or greater | | | | | | | | | |
| 165 | | | | Booth particulate filters CE #2 %: 98% or greater | | | | | | | | | |
| 166 | | | | OR | | | | | | | | | |
| 167 | NA | <u>Fully enclosed blasting cabinet for surface</u> | | Overall PM/PM ₁₀ /PM _{2.5} Control Efficiency: 99.96% or | | | | | | | | | |
| 168 | | <u>preparation of 500-gallon or smaller propane tanks.</u> | | greater | | | | | | | | | |
| 169 | | | | <u>Four nanofiber media cartridges have total control</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| 170 | | | | <u>efficiency of 99.999%, down to one micron.</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| 171 | | <u>Existing blasting room for surface preparation of</u> | | <u>Jan 2016 - Dry Abrasive Blast Room Filter System:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| 172 | | <u>equipment larger than a 500-gallon propane tank.</u> | | Cartridge Style Dust Collection System | | | | | | | | | |
| 173 | | <u>Sand Blaster</u> | | Manufacturer: AM -14983 | | | | | | | | | |
| 174 | EP2 | Manufacturer(s): Pirate Brand | | Model: # FFBW | | | | | | | | | |
| 175 | | Model(s): 6.5 cu ft SPR Series | | Each of the three (3) units contains 6 High efficiency | | | | | | | | | |
| 176 | | Rated Capacity: 3,000 lb/hr | | cartridge filters, with CE 99.8%. | | | | | | | | | |
| 177 | | <u>Blasting Media</u> | | Cartridge Dimension: 26" x 12.75" OD x 8.375" ID (1). | | | | | | | | | |
| 178 | | Blasting media used: crushed glass | | Blasting Room Dimensions: 20' X 80' X 10' | | | | | | | | | |
| 179 | | Crushed glass usage permit limits: 1,272 lbs/day | | scfm rating 4500 X (3) = 13,500 scfm for blast room. | | | | | | | | | |
| 180 | | 330,720 lb/yr | | PM/PM ₁₀ /PM _{2.5} - Particulate filter Control Efficiency | | | | | | | | | |
| 181 | EP3 | <u>Propane Flare:</u> | | <u>(CE): 99.8% down to .5 micron.</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| 182 | | Manufacturer: owner constructed | | None | | | | | | | | | |
| 183 | | Manufacture Date: August 2007 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 184 | | Heat Input Rating: 877,716 Btu/hr | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 185 | | Fuel: propane | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 186 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 187 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 188 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 189 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N |
|-----|--|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|--------|---|--|------|---|
| 190 | UNCONTROLLED POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR CRITERIA POLLUTANTS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 191 | Table 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 192 | UNCONTROLLED POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR CRITERIA POLLUTANTS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 193 | These two cells below for Uncontrolled PM10 & 2.5 are replacement for E136 and F136 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 194 | Emissions Unit | | | PM10 | PM2.5 | SO2 | NOx | CO | VOC | | | | |
| 195 | | | | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | | | | |
| 196 | EP 1 Paint Spray Booth, Prep Station | | | 16.25 | 15.03 | | | | 52.17 | | Pm10 & Pm2.5 Ton/Yr Blasting: Calculated as, Lb/Hr X 2912 Hr. See Blast Workbook Post PTC Crtr Polut & HAPs' - K10 & K11 | | |
| 197 | EP 2 Abrasive Blasting Room Exhaust | | | 3.01 | 0.30 | | | | | | 3.01 | 0.30 | |
| 198 | EP 3 Propane Flare | | | 0.030 | 0.030 | 6.33E-04 | 0.55 | 0.32 | 0.042 | | | | |
| 199 | Totals | | | 19.29 | 15.36 | 6.33E-04 | 0.55 | 0.32 | 52.21 | | | | |
| 200 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 201 | Uncontrolled Potential To Emit is based on a worst-case for operation of the facility and STD Annual Hours of operation x (7 day/wk) / (5 day/wk). | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 202 | Coating: Worst case Hrs of operation: 8 Hours per day X 260 Days /Yr, in the case of Painting Operations = 2080 Hrs/Yr X 7 Days /5 days or 2912 hours. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 203 | Blasting: Worst case Hrs of operation: 2912 Hrs. | | | Actual Hrs Operation | Hrs/Day | 8 | Days/Yr | 260 | | | | | |
| 204 | Flare: Worst case Hrs of operation: Per SC: 8,760 hr/yr is used for propane. It makes no significant difference in emissions. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 205 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 206 | Then the worst case maximum Potential to Emit was determined for the operation. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 207 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 208 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 209 | UNCONNTROLLED POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR HAPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 210 | Table 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 211 | UNCONNTROLLED POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR HAPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 212 | See Note 1a: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 213 | HAP's | | UnControlled PTE for HAP's | UnControlled PTE for HAP's | | | | | | | | | |
| 214 | Xylene | | 9.6 | 9.6 | | | | | | | | | |
| 215 | Toluene | | 4.4 | 4.4 | | | | | | | | | |
| 216 | Methanol | | 5.5 | 5.5 | | | | | | | | | |
| 217 | Ethyl Benzene | | 1.0 | 1.002 | | | | | | | | | |
| 218 | Methyl Ethyl Keytone | | 0.49 | 0.49 | | | | | | | | | |
| 219 | Hexamethylene Disocyanate | | 0.004 | 0.004 | | | | | | | | | |
| 220 | Worst Case HAPS SUM Tons/Yr | | 20.99 | 20.94 | | | | | | | | | |
| 221 | Note 1: For uncontrolled PTE calculation in the above uncontrolled PTE HAP table, 260 days/yr is corrected to be 365 days/yr as it needs to be based worst-case maximum. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 222 | Note 1a: For uncontrolled PTE calculation in the above uncontrolled PTE HAP table, is taken from 'Coating Criteria Polut HAP's Sum' U39..U44 and is based on worst-case maximum. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 223 | Pre-Project Potential to Emit | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N |
|-----|--|----------|-----------|--|-------------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 224 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 225 | The Pre-project Potential to Emit is used to establish the change in emission at a facility as a result of this project. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 226 | This is an existing facility. However, since this is the first time the facility is receiving a permit, pre-project emissions are set to zero for all criteria pollutants. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 227 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 228 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 229 | Post Project Potential to Emit | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 230 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 231 | Post project Potential to Emit is used to establish the change in emissions at the facility and to determine the facility's classification as a result of this project. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 232 | The following table presents the post project Potential to Emit for Criteria Pollutants from all emissions units at the facility. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 233 | Table 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 234 | POST PROJECT POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR CRITERIA POLLUTANTS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 235 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 236 | | PM10 | | PM2.5 | | SO2 | | NOx | | CO | | VOC | |
| 237 | Emissions Unit | Lb/Hr | Ton/Yr | Lb/Hr | Ton/Yr | Lb/Hr | Ton/Yr | Lb/Hr | Ton/Yr | Lb/Hr | Ton/Yr | Lb/Hr | Ton/Yr |
| 239 | EP 1 Paint Booth | 4.46E-03 | 4.64E-03 | 4.13E-03 | 6.01E-03 | | | | | | | 35.8 | 37.3 |
| 240 | EP 2 Blast Room | 4.13E-03 | 4.30E-03 | 4.13E-04 | 4.30E-04 | | | | | | | | |
| 241 | EP3 Propane Flare | 6.80E-03 | 2.98E-02 | 6.80E-03 | 2.98E-02 | 1.45E-04 | 6.33E-04 | 1.26E-01 | 5.53E-01 | 7.28E-02 | 3.19E-01 | 9.70E-03 | 4.25E-02 |
| 242 | Totals | 1.54E-02 | 0.039 | 1.13E-02 | 0.036 | 1.45E-04 | 6.33E-04 | 0.13 | 0.55 | 0.07 | 0.32 | 35.84 | 37.31 |
| 243 | | <BRC | | <BRC | | <BRC | | <BRC | | <BRC | | >BRC | |
| 244 | BRC (10% of significant) | | 1.5 | | 1 | | 4 | | 4 | | 10 | | 4 |
| 256 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 257 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 258 | Facility Wide TAP Emissions for Coating, Abrasive Blasting, and Propane Flare | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 259 | Table 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 260 | TAP Emissions for Coating, Abrasive Blasting, and Propane Flare | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 261 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 262 | Listed TAP (HAP) | PM | CAS # | Maximum Daily HAP & TAP Calculated Emission Rates, Averaged over 24 Hrs Lbs/Hr | 585 EL's - Lbs/Hr | Exceeds EL? | | | | | | | % of EL |
| 263 | Facility Wide TAPs - Painting | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 264 | Xylene (HAP) | | 1330-20-7 | 0.79 | 29 | No | 2.71% | | | | | | |
| 265 | N-Butyl Acetate | | 123-86-4 | 0.02 | 47.3 | No | 0.04% | | | | | | |
| 266 | Toluene (HAP) | | 108-88-3 | 0.51 | 25 | No | 2.04% | | | | | | |
| 267 | Methanol (HAP) | | 67-56-1 | 0.10 | 17.3 | No | 0.58% | | | | | | |
| 268 | Acetone | | 67-64-1 | 0.04 | 119 | No | 0.03% | | | | | | |
| 269 | 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | | 108-65-6 | 0.10 | 24 | No | 0.43% | | | | | | |
| 270 | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | | 100-41-4 | 0.08 | 29 | No | 0.29% | | | | | | |
| 271 | Stoddard Solvent | | 8052-41-3 | 0.08 | 35 | No | 0.22% | | | | | | |
| 272 | Isoproponal | | 67-63-0 | 0.05 | 65.3 | No | 0.08% | | | | | | |
| 273 | Methyl Amyl Ketone | | 110-43-0 | 0.00070 | 15.7 | No | 0.00% | | | | | | |
| 274 | Methyl Ethyl Keytone (HAP) | | 78-93-3 | 0.03 | 39.3 | No | 0.07% | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N |
|-----|--|------------|------------|------------|--------|----|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 275 | N-Butanol | | 71-36-3 | 0.03 | 10 | No | 0.26% | | | | | | |
| 276 | Ethyl Acetate | | 141-78-6 | 0.00032 | 93.3 | No | 0.00% | | | | | | |
| 277 | Zinc (dust or fume) | PM | 7440-66-6 | 0.00028 | 0.667 | No | 0.04% | | | | | | |
| 278 | Carbon Black | PM | 1333-86-4 | 2.2606E-05 | 0.23 | No | 0.01% | | | | | | |
| 279 | Zinc Oxide | PM | 1314-13-2 | 2.8372E-06 | 0.677 | No | 0.00% | | | | | | |
| 280 | Microcrystalline Silica Coating | PM | 14808-60-7 | 0.001136 | 0.0067 | No | 16.96% | | | | | | |
| 281 | Microcrystalline Silica Blasting * | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 282 | Facility Wide TAPs Continued - Blasting | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 283 | Calcium Oxide (TAP) | 1305-78-8 | 15.0% | 1.59E-02 | 0.133 | No | 11.95% | | | | | | |
| 284 | Aluminum Oxide (TAP) | 7429-90-5 | 2.0% | 2.12E-03 | 0.667 | No | 0.32% | | | | | | |
| 285 | Magnesium Oxide (TAP) | 1309-48-4 | 1.0% | 1.06E-03 | 0.667 | No | 0.16% | | | | | | |
| 286 | Iron Oxide (TAP) | 1309-37-1 | 1.0% | 1.06E-03 | 0.333 | No | 0.32% | | | | | | |
| 287 | * Silicon Dioxide (TAP) This amount has been accounted for above | 14808-60-7 | 1.0% | na | 0.0067 | na | | | | | | | |
| 288 | Facility Wide TAPs Continued - Propane Flare | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 289 | NITROGEN OXIDES (NOx) | 10024-97-2 | | 0.024 | 6 | No | 0.39% | | | | | | |
| 290 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 291 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 303 | Post Project HAP Emissions | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 304 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 305 | CONTROLLED POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR HAPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 306 | The following table presents the post project potential to emit for HAP pollutants from all emissions units at the facility. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 307 | Table 6. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 308 | CONTROLLED POTENTIAL TO EMIT FOR HAPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 309 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 310 | HAP's | | | PTE Ton/Yr | | | | | | | | | |
| 311 | Xylene | | | 6.84 | | | | | | | | | |
| 312 | Toluene | | | 3.13 | | | | | | | | | |
| 313 | Ethyl Benzene | | | 0.72 | | | | | | | | | |
| 314 | Methyl Ethyl Keytone | | | 0.35 | | | | | | | | | |
| 315 | Methanol | | | 3.92 | | | | | | | | | |
| 316 | Hexamethylene Disocyanate | | | 0.0028 | | | | | | | | | |
| 317 | Worst Case Std Hours | | Total Hap | 14.95 | | | | | | | | | |
| 318 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M |
|-----|---|-------|--------|--------|----------|-----------------|--------|---|-----------------|--------|--------|---|
| 359 | From your letter of September 15th, 2015 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 360 | Subject: Reply for Facility ID # 053-00034 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 361 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 362 | Question # 3. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 363 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 364 | Updated - January 2016, Summary of Key Elements | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 365 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 366 | Throughputs | | | | Controls | | | | Operating Hours | | | |
| 367 | Gallons, Lbs & mmBTU's | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 368 | | Daily | Weekly | Annual | | Type | CE | | Daily | Weekly | Annual | |
| 369 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 370 | | Ep1 | | | | Fiber Filter #1 | 98% | | | | | |
| 371 | | Gal | 11.60 | 58 | 3017 | Fiber Filter #2 | 98% | | 8 | 40 | 2,080 | |
| 372 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 373 | | Ep2 | | | | Fiber Filter #1 | 99.80% | | | | | |
| 374 | | Lbs | 1272 | 6360 | 330,720 | Fiber Filter #2 | 0 | | 8 | 40 | 2,080 | |
| 375 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 376 | | Ep3 | 4.27 | 21.36 | 1,110 | na | na | | 4.7 | 23.5 | 1,222 | |
| 377 | | mmBTU | | | | | | | | | | |
| 378 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M |
|----|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|----------------------|
| 2 | 2014-2015 - Actual Product Usage For 1 Work Day (Friday) Pre-PTC | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Post PTC - Painting Operations Will Occur Throughout The Week | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Labels Reflect Post PTC Operations | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Coating Product | Weekly Product Usage % | Weekly Product Usage Mixed Gal | Mix Ratio | Density Of Each Part For Unmixed Products Lbs/Gal | Density Of Each Part Contained In Mixed Product Lbs/Gal | | Density For Mixed And 1 Part Products Lbs/Gal | | Usage Of Each Product Or Mixed Part Lbs/Week | | Weekly Gallons Total |
| 7 | | (Note 1) | (Note 1) | | | (Notes 2,3,4) | | | | (Note 5) | | (Note 1) |
| 8 | Lacquer Thinner SW R7K115 | 8% | 4.64 | na | | | | 6.84 | | 31.74 | | 58 |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2025 Acrylic Mod Clear Base EN | 12% | 6.73 | na | | | | 7.79 | | 52.41 | | Hours Per Day |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 |
| 12 | V 2153 Mid Coat Epoxy Primer | 23% | 13.40 | na | | | | 10.80 | | 144.70 | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | Gal/Week |
| 14 | Carbothane 134 HG | 34% | 19.72 | | | | | 11.37 | | 224.22 | | 58 |
| 15 | Part A | | 15.78 | 4 | 11.87 | 9.50 | | | | 187.26 | | |
| 16 | Part B | | 3.94 | 1 | 9.35 | 1.87 | | | | 36.88 | | Annual Gal |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3,017 |
| 18 | Carbozinc 859 | 23% | 13.34 | | | | | 24.71 | | 329.63 | | |
| 19 | Part A | | 5.89 | na | 10.53 | 4.65 | | | | 62.03 | | |
| 20 | Part B | | 3.34 | na | 7.28 | 1.82 | | | | 24.28 | | |
| 21 | Part C | | 4.11 | na | 59.2 | 18.23 | | | | 243.19 | | Lbs/Week |
| 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | 784 |
| 23 | Imron 3.5 + Poly RF | 0.33% | 0.19 | | | | | 8.64 | | 1.64 | | |
| 24 | Part A | | 0.15 | 4 | 8.34 | 6.63 | | | | 1.26 | | Ton / Yr |
| 25 | Part B | | 0.04 | 1 | 9.82 | 1.96 | | | | 0.37 | | 20.4 |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M |
|----|---|------|-----|---|---|---|--------------------|-------|-------|--------|-----|---|
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | MAX Column I | 24.71 | | | | |
| 29 | 1 Week Totals | 58 | Gal | | | | | | Total | 784.3 | Lbs | |
| 30 | Annual Totals | 3017 | Gal | | | | | | | 40,785 | Lbs | |
| 31 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Notes Data from Manufacturer's SDS, MSDS, TDS, Air Quality Data Sheets, Tech Support Emails, & Owner Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | Note 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | A. Owner supplied information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | The owner supplied paint usage by % figures. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | Owner supplied total gallons used based on experience and review of paint purchase records. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | Owner supplied clean up operations information: Type of solvent, number of gallons used for clean up and for thinning. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | Solvent Product - SW RK115, Amount used for clean up - all, Amount used for thinning - none. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | Owner supplied usage figures are expressed in 'spray ready' mixed product. Spray ready product is referred to as | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | mixed product' throughout the workbook. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | B. Work Hours, typical production levels, product usage | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | Work hours at the facility are 8 Hr/Day, 5 Days/Week, 52 Weeks/Yr. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | An example operational week will result in 30, 500 gallon propane tanks being prepared and coated. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | Pre Construction - Typical surface coating usage is 40 gallons/week; single highest production day --> 53 gallons. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | C. Operational, Physical design limits for the facility | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | 30 Tanks require 40 gallons to coat; 40 tanks would require 53 gallons. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | The current operational limits for the facility = 40 tanks per week. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | The figure of 53 Gal/Week is the pre-permit maximum design capacity of the facility. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | Post permit, with an array of new equipment installed, operators may be able to perform surface coating operations on | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | some limited additional large equipment. Examples: assorted metal tanks, truck, trailer, equipment frames, large metal items. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | A figure of 58 Gallons per week will be used throughout the proposal to allow the operator a safety factor (10%) in the | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | event the economy improves. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 | D. Painting Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | Manufacturer: Graco Magnum proLTS 19 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M |
|-----|---|---|---|------|---|------|---|--------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 62 | Transfer Efficiency: 65% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 63 | Rated Capacity: 0.38 Gal/Min | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 64 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65 | E. Work flow requirements, actual process at the facility - Pre Permit - 2014, 2015 Data | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | Work flow requirements, crew complement and production levels at the facility dictate preparations are made throughout | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 67 | the week, and all coating operations are accomplished on the same day each week - Friday. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 68 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | F. Historically, 2014 & 2015, Actual Emissions for 1 (one) work day are coincidentally equal to actual emissions for 1 (one) week | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71 | Pre Construction | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 72 | All painting at the Aslett Ranch is done on Friday each week - All painting for the week is done in 1 (one) 8 hour work day. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | The actual facility painting emissions for a typical week are coincidentally equal to the actual painting emissions | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 74 | for the 1 (one) 8 hour production day. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | For this proposal in calculating emissions, a normal work schedule was used. 8 Hrs X 5 days X 52 Weeks = 2080 Hrs/ Yr | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | Post Construction | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | The new paint booth will accommodate seven (7), 500 gallon tanks at one time. The work crew will be preparing tanks, | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 80 | painting, and drying, while moving in and out of the booth, throughout the week. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 82 | Note 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 83 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 84 | Carbothane 134 HG (manufacturer supplied mixed density information see AQD sheets) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 85 | The Mix Ratio In This 2 Component Product Is: 4 parts A to 1 part B. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 86 | The Density of Part A is 11.87 Lbs/Gal, the Density of Part B is 9.35 Lbs/Gal. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 87 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 88 | 5 Gallons of Mixed Product Has (4 Gal of Part A x Density of Part A 11.87 Lb/Gal)/5 = 9.49 Lbs of Part A in 1 Gallon of Mixed Product. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 89 | 5 Gallons of Mixed Product Has (1 Gal of Part B x Density of Part B 9.35 Lb/Gal)/5 = 1.87 Lbs of Part B in 1 Gallon of Mixed Product. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 91 | Ethyl Benzene content, mixed product: 9.49 Lbs of Part A / Gal, Wt % of Ethel Benzene in Part A = 5% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 92 | | | | 9.49 | x | 5% | = | 0.47 | Lbs of Ethel Benzene/Gal | | | |
| 93 | Hexamethylene Disocyanate content, mixed product: 1.87 Lbs of Part B /Gal, Wt % of Hexamethylene Disocyanate in Part B = .1% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 94 | | | | 1.87 | x | 0.1% | = | 0.0019 | Lbs of Hexamethylene Disocyanate/Gal | | | |
| 95 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 96 | Note 3 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 97 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 98 | Carbozinc 859 (manufacturer supplied mixed density information) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 99 | 4 Gallon Kit Contains --> Part A-1.770 Gal of CZ 859 (Color 0700) , Part B-1.0 Gal CZ 859 Primer, Part C-1.233 Gal Zinc Dust Type II. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100 | The Density of Part A is 10.53 Lb/Gal, the Density of Part B is 7.28 Lb/Gal, the Density of Part C is 59.20 Lb/Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 101 | The Mixed Product Density is 24.71 lb/Gal. | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M |
|-----|---|---|---|------|---|-----|---|------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 102 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 103 | 4 Gallons of Mixed Carbozinc Has (1.77 Gal of Part A x Density of Part A 10.53 Lb/Gal)/4 = 4.65 Lbs of Part A in 1 Gallon of Mixed Product | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 104 | 4 Gallons of Mixed Carbozinc Has (1 Gal of Part B x Density of Part B 7.28)/4 = 1.82 Lbs of Part B in 1 Gallon of Mixed Product | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 105 | 4 Gallons of Mixed Carbozinc Has (1.233 Gal of Part C x Density of Part C)/4 = 18.24 Lbs of Part C in 1 Gallon of Mixed Product. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 106 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 107 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 108 | Toluene content, mixed product: 4.65 Lbs Part A/Gal, Toluene Wt % of Part A = 25% --> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 109 | | | | 4.65 | x | 25% | = | 1.16 | Lbs of Toluene/Mixed Gal, Part A | | | |
| 110 | Toluene content, mixed product: 1.82 Lbs of Part B/Gal, Toluene Wt % of Part B = 50% --> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 111 | | | | 1.82 | x | 50% | = | 0.91 | Lbs of Toluene/Mixed Gal, Part B | | | |
| 112 | | | | | | | | 2.07 | Lbs of Toluene/Mixed Gal - SUM | | | |
| 113 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 114 | Methyl Ethyl Keytone content, mixed product: 4.65 Lbs Part A/Gal, Methyl Ethyl Keytone Wt % of Part A = 5% --> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 115 | | | | 4.65 | x | 5% | = | 0.23 | Lbs of Methyl Ethyl Keytone/Mixed Gal | | | |
| 116 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 117 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 118 | Note 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 119 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 120 | A. Imron 3.5 + Poly RF (from SDS) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 121 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 122 | The Mix ratio in this 2 component product is 4 parts A to 1 part B. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 123 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 124 | Part A | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 125 | The unmixed density: Part A is 8.34 Lbs/Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 126 | Wt % Solids = 50.95 % | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 127 | Lbs of Solids = (50.95% of 8.34 Lbs/Gal) = 4.24 Lbs/Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 128 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 129 | Wt % Volatiles = 100 - Wt% Solids (50.95) = 49.95 % | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 130 | Lbs of Volatiles = (49.95% of 8.34 Lbs/Gal) = 4.16 Lbs/Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 131 | VOC ap = 3.9 Lbs/Gal from the SDS for Part A | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 132 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 133 | Part B | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 134 | The unmixed density: Part B is 9.82 Lbs/Gal. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 135 | Wt % Solids = 95% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 136 | Lbs of Solids = (95% of 9.82 Lbs/Gal) = 9.33 Lbs/Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 137 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 138 | Wt % Volatiles = 100 - Wt% Solids (95%) = 5% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 139 | Lbs of Volatiles = (95% of 9.82 Lbs/Gal) = .49 Lbs/Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 140 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 141 | B. Mixed density of Parts A, B, calculations | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 142 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 143 | A 5 Gallon Kit Contains --> (Part A 8.34 Lbs/Gal x 4) = 33.36 lb & (Part B 9.82 Lbs/Gal x 1) = 9.82 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 144 | A 5 Gallon Kit contains --> 33.36 lb for 4 gal + 9.82 Lbs for 1 Gal = 43.18 Lbs of Mixed Material/5 Gal Kit | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 145 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 146 | 1 Gallon of Mixed Product Has: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 147 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 148 | Part A (33.36) Lbs/Gal / 5 = 6.63 Lbs of Part A / Mixed Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 149 | Part B (9.82) Lbs/Gal / 5 = 1.96 Lbs of Part B / Mixed Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 150 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 151 | SUM Part A & Part B = 8.64 Lbs/Mixed Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 152 | Check answer - the density for 1 gallon of mixed material (from above) is = 43.18 / 5 = 8.64 Lbs/Gal. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 153 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 154 | C. Mixed Product Solids & VOC Calculations | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 155 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 156 | The Mixed Density: 8.64 Lbs/Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 157 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 158 | Wt % Solids = 60.5% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 159 | Lbs of Solids = 5.23 Lbs/Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 160 | (Part A 6.63 Lbs / 1 Mixed Gal) x (Part A Wt % Solids 50.95%) + (Part B 1.96 Lbs / 1 Mixed Gal) x Part B Wt % Solids 95%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 161 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 162 | Wt % Volatiles = 100 - Wt% Solids (60.5%) = 39.5 % | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 163 | Lbs of Volatiles = (Wt % Volatiles 39.5% x Mixed Density 8.64 Lbs/Gal) = 3.41 Lbs/Gal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 164 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 165 | Note 5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 166 | Day Usage of each Product or mixed Part in Lbs/Day | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 167 | This column shows the actual pounds of spray ready product 'out of the tip' of a typical spray gun at the | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 168 | facility - in 1 (one) work day. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 169 | This column is referenced in the next spread sheet - 'Coating VOC PM HAP & TAP' Emissions Calculations. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 170 | The figures in this column are BEFORE transfer efficiency (TE), and controls (CE) are applied to the figures. | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W |
|----|---|------------|---|-----------------|-------------|------------|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|-----|---|
| 2 | Coating Products: Actual Emissions For 1 (One), Week - Post PTC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Usage | | | VOC's | | | | | Particulate Emissions | | | | | | | Control | | | | | | |
| 5 | 'Spray Ready' Mixed Material | | | | Total VOC's | | | Individual TAP/HAP & VOC's | | Individual TAP/HAP Particulate | | | | Transfer Efficiency | 65.00% | | | | | Control #1 Efficiency | 98% | |
| 6 | Product & Listed TAP/HAP | CAS Number | Usage Of Each Product Or Mixed Part In Lbs/Wk | % VOC By Weight | VOC Lbs/Gal | VOC Lbs/Wk | Individual TAP/HAP Density As A % Of The Part | TAP/HAP 'Out Of The Spray Tip' Lbs/Wk | % Solids By Weight | Solids Lbs/Gal | Total PM 'Out Of The Spray Tip' Lbs/Wk | Individual TAP/HAP Density As A % Of The Part | Individual TAP/HAP 'Out Of The Spray Tip' Lbs/Wk | TE Factor | PM Emissions W/O CONTROLS Lbs/Wk | CE Factor | Emissions AFTER CONTROL #1 Lbs/Wk | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Lacquer Thinner SW R7K115 | | 31.74 | 100% | 6.84 | 31.74 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Toulene | 108-88-3 | | | | | 47.0% | 14.92 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Methanol | 67-56-1 | | | | | 38.0% | 12.06 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Acetone | 67-64-1 | | | | | 15.0% | 4.76 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Toulene | 108-88-3 | | | | | 47.0% | 14.92 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Methanol | 67-56-1 | | | | | 38.0% | 12.06 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | 26.98 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | 2025 Acrylic Mod Clear Base EN | | 52.41 | 57% | 4.45 | 29.87 | | | 43% | 3.35 | 22.54 | | | 0.35 | 7.89 | 0.02 | 0.1578 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | Xylene | 1330-20-7 | | | | | 56.0% | 29.35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | Xylene | 1330-20-7 | | | | | 56.0% | 29.35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | V 2153 Mid Coat Epoxy Primer | | 144.70 | 32.27% | 3.49 | 46.69 | | | 67.73% | 7.31 | 98.00 | | | 0.35 | 34.30 | 0.02 | 0.6860 | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | Xylene | 1330-20-7 | | | | | 42.0% | 60.77 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | Xylene | 1330-20-7 | | | | | 42.0% | 60.77 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | Carbothane 134 HG | | 224.22 | 19.10% | 2.17 | 42.83 | | | 80.09% | 9.20 | 179.57 | | | 0.35 | 62.85 | 0.02 | 1.2570 | | | | | |
| 36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | Part A | | 187.26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W |
|----|------------------------------|------------|--------|---|--------|------|-------|---|-------|-------|---|-----|-------|--------|-----|-------|---|------|--------|---|------|--------|
| 39 | Microcrystalline Silica | 14808-60-7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 35% | 65.54 | | 0.35 | 22.94 | | 0.02 | 0.4588 |
| 40 | Toluene | 108-88-3 | | | | | | | 10.0% | 18.73 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | Carbon Black | 1333-86-4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 10% | 18.73 | | 0.35 | 6.55 | | 0.02 | 0.1311 |
| 42 | Ethyl Benzene | 100-41-4 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 9.36 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | 108-65-6 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 9.36 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | Stoddard Solvent | 8052-41-3 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 9.36 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | Toluene | 108-88-3 | | | | | | | 10.0% | 18.73 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | Meta-Xylene | 1330-20-7 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 9.36 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | Ethyl Benzene | 100-41-4 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 9.36 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | Para-Xylene | 106-42-3 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 9.36 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | Ortho-Xylene | 95-47-6 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 9.36 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | | | | | | | | | | 56.18 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | Part B | | 36.88 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | N-Butyl Acetate | 123-86-4 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 1.84 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | Hexamethylene Diisocyanate | 822-06-0 | | | | | | | 0.1% | 0.04 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | Carbozinc 859 | | 329.63 | | 11.00% | 2.72 | 36.26 | | | | | 89% | 22.00 | 293.37 | | | | 0.35 | 102.68 | | 0.02 | 2.0536 |
| 62 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 63 | Part A | | 62.03 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 64 | TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65 | Toluene | 108-88-3 | | | | | | | 25.0% | 15.51 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | Methyl Ethyl Ketone | 78-93-3 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 3.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 67 | N-Butanol | 71-36-3 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 3.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 68 | 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | 108-65-6 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 3.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | Meta-Xylene | 1330-20-7 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 3.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | Carbon Black | 1333-86-4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1% | 0.62 | | 0.35 | 0.22 | | 0.02 | 0.0043 |
| 71 | Ethyl Benzene | 100-41-4 | | | | | | | 0.7% | 0.43 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 72 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 74 | Toluene | 108-88-3 | | | | | | | 25.0% | 15.51 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | Methyl Ethyl Ketone | 78-93-3 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 3.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | Meta-Xylene | 1330-20-7 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 3.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | Ethyl Benzene | 100-41-4 | | | | | | | 0.7% | 0.43 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | | | | | | | | | | 22.15 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | Part B | | 24.28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 80 | TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | Toluene | 108-88-3 | | | | | | | 50.0% | 12.14 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 82 | Isopropanol | 67-63-0 | | | | | | | 25.0% | 6.07 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 83 | Meta-Xylene | 1330-20-7 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 1.21 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 84 | Ethyl Benzene | 100-41-4 | | | | | | | 1.0% | 0.24 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 86 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | |
|-----|--------------------------|-----------|--------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|----------------|-------|---------|-----------|--------|------|------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|------|-------|-----------------|------|--------|--|
| 87 | HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 88 | Toulene | 108-88-3 | | | | | | | 50.0% | 12.14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 89 | Meta-Xylene | 1330-20-7 | | | | | | | 5.0% | 1.21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90 | Ethyl Benzene | 100-41-4 | | | | | | | 1.0% | 0.24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 91 | | | | | | | | | | 13.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 92 | Part C | | 243.19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 93 | TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 94 | Zinc (dust or fume) | 7440-66-6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% | 243.19 | | 0.35 | 85.12 | | 0.02 | 1.7023 | |
| 95 | Zinc Oxide | 1314-13-2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1% | 2.43 | | 0.35 | 0.85 | | 0.02 | 0.0170 | |
| 96 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 97 | HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 98 | no HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 99 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100 | Imron 3.5 + Poly RF | | 1.64 | | 39.50% | 3.41 | 0.65 | | | | | 60.50% | 5.23 | 0.99 | | | | 0.35 | 0.35 | | 0.02 | 0.0069 | |
| 101 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 102 | Part A | | 1.26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 103 | TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 104 | N-Butyl Acetate | 123-86-4 | | | | | | | 28.1% | 0.35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 105 | Carbon Black | 1333-86-4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2.40% | 0.03 | | 0.35 | 0.01 | | 0.02 | 0.0002 | |
| 106 | Ethyl Acetate | 141-78-6 | | | | | | | 3.1% | 0.04 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 107 | Methyl Amyl Ketone | 110-43-0 | | | | | | | 6.7% | 0.08 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 108 | | | | | | | | | | 0.48 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 109 | HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 110 | no HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 111 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 112 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 113 | Part B | | 0.37 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 114 | TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 115 | no TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 116 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 117 | HAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 118 | no TAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 119 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 120 | Relevant Totals | | | | | | 188.04 | | | | | | | | | | | | 208 | | | 4.2 | |
| 121 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 122 | | | | | Max VOC % | Lbs/Gal For The Highest Density Paint | Gal/Wk | MAX VOC Lbs/Hr | | Hrs/Day | Days/Week | | | | Max PM % | Lbs / Gal For That Paint | Gal / Week | | | Max PM Lbs / Hr | | | |
| 123 | Worst Case, MAX VOC & PM | | | | 100% | 24.71 | 58.00 | 35.8 | | 8 | 5 | | | | 89% | 24.71 | 58 | | | 11 | | | |
| 124 | | | | | MAX VOC Lacquer Thinner SW R7K115 | | | | | | | | | | MAX PM Carbozinc 859 | | | | | | | | |
| 125 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | max [(wt%) * (lb/gal of the paint)] = | | | | | | | | |
| 126 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | |
|-----|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|---|--------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---|---|--------|--------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| 127 | | | Max Xylene % | | max Lbs/Gal of 4 Paints containing Xylene | Gal/Wk | MAX Xylene Lbs/Hr | | | Max Toluene Lbs/Mixed Gal | | | Gal/Wk | MAX Toluene Lbs/Hr | | Max Ethyl Benzene Lbs/Mixed Gal | | Gal/Wk | MAX Ethyl Benzene Lbs/Hr | | | | |
| 128 | | | 56% | | 10.80 | 58.00 | 6.6 | | | 2.07 | | | 58.00 | 3.0 | | 0.47 | | 58.00 | 0.69 | | | | |
| 129 | | | MAX Xylene 2025 Acrylic Mod Clear Base EN | | | | | | | MAX Toluene Carbozinc 859 | | | | | | MAX Ethyl Benzene Carbothane 134 HG | | | | | | | |
| 130 | Worst Case, MAX HAPS | | max lb/gal xylene: 4.536 56%*10.80 = 6.048 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 131 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 132 | | | Max Methyl Ethyl Keytone Lbs/Mixed Gal | | Gal/Wk | MAX Methyl Ethyl Keytone Lbs/Hr | | | | Max Hexamethylene Disocyanate Lbs/Mixed Gal | | Gal/Wk | MAX Hexamethylene Disocyanate Lbs/Hr | | Max Methanol % | Lbs/Gal For That Paint | | Gal/Wk | MAX Methanol Lbs/Hr | | | | |
| 133 | | | 0.23 | | 58.00 | 0.34 | | | | 0.0019 | | 58.00 | 0.0027 | | 38% | 6.84 | | 58.00 | 3.8 | | | | |
| 134 | | | MAX Methyl Ethyl Keytone Carbozinc 859 | | | | | | | MAX Hexamethylene Disocyanate Carbothane 134 HG | | | | | | MAX Methanol Lacquer Thinner SW R7K115 | | | | | | | |

| | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z | AA | AB | AC | AD | AE | AF | AG | AH | AI | AJ | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|---|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|-------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 2 | Modified Automotive Coatings XLS from Idaho DEQ Air Website | | The 5 Coating (+Thinner) Products Used - Aslett Ranch | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Weight Percentage Content Data | | 2025 Acrylic Mod Clear Base EN | Lacquer Thinner SW R7K115 | | | V 2153 Mid Coat Epoxy Primer | Carbothane 134 HG | | | | | | | Carbothane 134 HG | Carbozinc 859 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Coating Material | Density (lb/gal) | Wt. % Solids | Xylene (HAP) | Toluene (HAP) | Methanol (HAP) | Acetone | Xylene (HAP) | Micro crystalline Silica | Toluene (HAP) | Carbon Black | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | Stoddard Solvent | N-Butyl Acetate | Hexamethylene Diisocyanate (HAP) | Toluene (HAP) | Methyl Ethyl Ketone (HAP) | N-Butanol | 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | Meta Xylene (Xylenes) (HAP) | Carbon Black | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | Toluene (HAP) | Isopropanol | Meta Xylene (Xylenes) (HAP) | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | Zinc (dust or fume) | Zinc Oxide | N-Butyl Acetate | Carbon Black | Ethyl Acetate | Methyl Amyl Ketone | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | PM | | PM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | PM | | PM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | PM | | PM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | PM | | PM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Lacquer Thinner SW R7K115 | 6.84 | 0.00 | | 47% | 38% | 15% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2025 Acrylic Mod Clear Base EN | 7.79 | 43.00% | 56% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | V 2153 Mid Coat Epoxy Primer | 10.80 | 67.73% | | | | | 42.00% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Carbothane 134 HG | 11.37 | 89.00% | | | | | | 35.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 0.10% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Carbozinc 859 | 24.71 | 89.00% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 25.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 1.00% | 0.70% | 50.00% | 25.00% | 5.00% | 1.00% | 100.00% | 1.00% | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Intron 3.5 + Poly RF | 8.64 | 60.50% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 20.10% | 2.40% | 3.10% | 6.70% | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Weight Content Data & Calculated Hourly Emissions Rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Coating Material | Density (lb/gal) | Wt. Solids Lbs/Gal | Xylene (HAP) | Toluene (HAP) | Methanol (HAP) | Acetone | Xylene (HAP) | Micro crystalline Silica | Toluene (HAP) | Carbon Black | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | Stoddard Solvent | N-Butyl Acetate | Hexamethylene Diisocyanate (HAP) | Toluene (HAP) | Methyl Ethyl Ketone (HAP) | N-Butanol | 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | Meta Xylene (Xylenes) (HAP) | Carbon Black | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | Toluene (HAP) | Isopropanol | Meta Xylene (Xylenes) (HAP) | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | Zinc (dust or fume) | Zinc Oxide | N-Butyl Acetate | Carbon Black | Ethyl Acetate | Methyl Amyl Ketone | HAP | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Lacquer Thinner SW R7K115 | 6.84 | 0.00 | | 0.37 | 0.30 | 0.12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.67 | | | |
| 22 | 2025 Acrylic Mod Clear Base EN | 7.79 | 3.35 | 0.73 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.73 | | | |
| 23 | V 2153 Mid Coat Epoxy Primer | 10.80 | 7.31 | | | | | 1.52 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.52 | | | |
| 24 | Carbothane 134 HG | 11.37 | 9.11 | | | | | | 1.64 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.05 | 0.001 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.70 | | | |
| 25 | Carbozinc 859 | 24.71 | 21.99 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.39 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 6.08 | 0.06 | | | | | 0.89 | | | | |
| 26 | Intron 3.5 + Poly RF | 8.64 | 5.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.61 | 0.0008 | 0.001 | 0.00 | 0.01 | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | Hourly Emissions Rate | 24.71 | 21.99 | 0.73 | 0.37 | 0.30 | 0.12 | 1.52 | 1.64 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.05 | 0.001 | 0.39 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 6.08 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 1.52 | | | |
| 29 | Weighted Avg wt % | | 1.38 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | | | |
| 30 | Minimum Density (lb/gal) | 6.84 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | Daily/Hourly Use Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | 1.450 | Gal/Hr | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | 8 | Hr/Day | | | | | | | | | 5 | Number of actual work days facility Sprays coatings each week | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | 11.60 | Gal/Day | | | | | | | | | 365 | Days/Yr | 52 | Weeks/Yr | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | 2.4 | Hr/Day (averaging period) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | Aslett Ranch buffer factor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | 1.00 | Though the 'buffer cell' is incorporated in formulas below - it is not used -> therefore set @ 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | | Proposal 'coating usage figures', set @ 53 gallons + a 10% safety = 58 gallons/week | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | Paint Gun Transfer Efficiency | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | 65.00% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | Particulate Filter #1 Control Efficiency (control for particulates) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | 98% | input cell for CE#1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | Particulate Filter #2 Control Efficiency (control for particulates) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | 98% | input cell for CE#2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | | | | 2025 Acrylic Mod Clear Base EN | Lacquer Thinner SW R7K115 | | | V 2153 Mid Coat Epoxy Primer | Carbothane 134 HG | | | | | | Carbothane 134 HG | Carbozinc 859 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Intron 3.5 + Poly RF | | | |

| | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z | AA | AB | AC | AD | AE | AF | AG | AH | AI | AJ | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---------------|----------------|--|---|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | Xylene (HAP) | Toluene (HAP) | Methanol (HAP) | Acetone | Xylene (HAP) | Micro crystalline Silica | Toluene (HAP) | Carbon Black | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | Stoddard Solvent | N-Butyl Acetate | Hexamethelene Diisocyanate (HAP) | Toluene (HAP) | Methyl Ethyl Keytone (HAP) | N-Butanol | 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | M-Xylene (Xylenes) | Carbon Black | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | Toluene (HAP) | Isopropanol | Meth Xylene (Xylenes) (HAP) | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | Zinc (dust or fume) | Zinc Oxide | N-Butyl Acetate | Carbon Black | Ethyl Acetate | Methyl Amyl Ketone | | | |
| 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | | | | 1330-20-7 | 100-85-3 | 67-56-1 | 67-64-1 | 1330-20-7 | 14008-60-7 | 108-88-3 | 1333-86-4 | 100-41-4 | 105-85-0 | 8022-41-3 | 123-86-4 | 872-86-0 | 100-88-3 | 75-83-3 | 71-36-3 | 100-65-6 | 1330-20-7 | 1333-86-4 | 100-41-4 | 100-88-3 | 87-63-0 | 87-63-0 | 1330-20-7 | 100-41-4 | 7449-66-4 | 1314-13-2 | 123-86-4 | 1333-86-4 | 141-78-6 | 110-45-0 | | |
| 53 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | | | | Maximum Daily HAP & TAP 24 Hr Calculated Emission Rates = (C3B Buffer Factor) x (hourly emissions rate from row 28) X (8 hours/Day) spread over a 24 Hour Averaging Period | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | | | | 0.2446 | 0.1243 | 0.1005 | 0.0397 | 0.5064 | 7.6465E-05 | 0.1561 | 2.1847E-05 | 0.0780 | 0.0780 | 0.0780 | 0.0154 | 0.0003 | 0.1292 | 0.0258 | 0.0258 | 0.0258 | 0.0258 | 7.237E-07 | 0.0036 | 0.1012 | 0.0506 | 0.0101 | 0.0020 | 0.00028372 | 2.8372E-06 | 0.0029 | 3.52885E-08 | 0.0003 | 0.0007 | | | |
| 56 | | | | 0.7870 | x | na | na | x | x | 0.511 | 2.2606E-05 | 0.084 | 0.104 | na | 0.018 | na | x | na | na | x | x | x | x | x | na | x | x | na | na | na | x | na | na | | | |
| 57 | | | | 0.7870 | x | 0.1005 | 0.0397 | x | 7.6465E-05 | 0.511 | 2.2606E-05 | 0.084 | 0.104 | 0.0780 | 0.018 | 0.0003 | x | 0.0258 | 0.0258 | 0.0258 | x | x | x | x | 0.0506 | x | x | 0.00028372 | 2.8372E-06 | x | x | 0.0003 | 0.0007 | | | |
| 58 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 | | | | Maximized Annual Use Rate | 4,234.0 | Gal/Yr | This Annual Use Rate figure is ---- (C34) Gal/Day X (M35) 365 Days/Yr. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | | | | Maximized HAP Emissions | 7.22 | Ton/Yr | This HAPs figure is ---- (AJ28) or maximum density of HAPs/Gal X (C33) Annual Use Rate Gal/Yr / 2000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 64 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | | | | Maximum Hourly Calculated Emission Rates In Lbs/Hr = Cell C3B Buffer Factor x lbs of the Part Used in 1 hour from Row 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 67 | | | | 0.73 | 0.3729163 | 0.302 | 0.119016 | 1.519 | 0.0002 | 0.468 | 6.5541E-05 | 0.234 | 0.234 | 0.234 | 0.046 | 0.001 | 0.388 | 0.078 | 0.078 | 0.078 | 0.078 | 2.1711E-06 | 0.011 | 0.303 | 0.152 | 0.030 | 0.006 | 0.00085116 | 8.5110E-06 | 0.009 | 1.05625E-07 | 0.0009745 | 0.0021062 | | | |
| 68 | | | | 2.361 | x | na | na | x | na | 1.532 | 6.7818E-05 | 0.251 | 0.312 | na | 0.055 | na | x | na | na | x | x | x | x | x | na | x | x | na | na | na | x | na | na | | | |
| 69 | | | | 2.361 | x | 0.3 | 0.119016 | x | 0.0002 | 1.532 | 6.7818E-05 | 0.251 | 0.312 | 0.234 | 0.055 | 0.001 | x | 0.078 | 0.078 | 0.078 | x | x | x | x | 0.152 | x | x | 0.0009 | 8.5E-06 | 0.009 | x | 0.0009745 | 0.0021062 | | | |
| 70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 72 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | | | | 2.361 | x | 0.302 | 0.119 | x | 0.0002 | 1.532 | 6.7818E-05 | 0.251 | 0.312 | 0.234 | 0.055 | 0.001 | x | 0.078 | 0.078 | x | x | x | x | x | 0.152 | x | x | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.009 | x | 0.001 | 0.002 | | | |
| 74 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | | | | Actual Hourly Emissions SUM Individual like Items | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | | | | Actual HAPS Calc All Paints | | | | Sum of individual like pollutants in Lb/Hr & Lb/Day | | | | Annual Figures | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | | | | Lb/Hr | Lb/Day | Lbs/Yr | Ton / Yr | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | | | | 2.36 | 18.9 | 4911 | 2.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | | | | 1.53 | 12.3 | 3187 | 1.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 80 | | | | 0.30 | 2.4 | 627 | 0.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | | | | 0.25 | 2.0 | 522 | 0.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 82 | | | | 0.001 | 0.007 | 2 | 0.001 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 83 | | | | 0.08 | 0.62 | 161 | 0.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 84 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 85 | | | | 4.52 | 36 | 9,410 | 4.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N |
|----|---|------------|--|--|---|--------|---|-------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 2 | Coating TAP's Emissions Summary - All Coatings | | | | | | | | | | The figures in this column come from 'Coating TAP & Hap Calc' where they are first used for input | |
| 3 | Listed TAP (HAP) | CAS # | Maximum Daily HAP & TAP Calculated Emission Rates, Averaged over 24 Hrs Lbs/Hr | 585 AACs for Non-Carcinogens mg/m ³ | Exceeds AAC? Note 1 | | Maximum Hourly HAP & TAP's Calculated Emission Rates Lbs/Hr | 585 EL's - Lbs/Hr | Exceeds EL? | Maximum Hrs/Day Spraying | 8 | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Xylene (HAP) | 1330-20-7 | 0.79 | 21.75 | No | | 2.36 | 29 | No | | | |
| 6 | N-Butyl Acetate | 123-86-4 | 0.02 | 35.5 | No | | 0.05 | 47.3 | No | | | |
| 7 | Toluene (HAP) | 108-88-3 | 0.51 | 18.75 | No | | 1.53 | 25 | No | Averaging period for EL's | 24 | |
| 8 | Methanol (HAP) | 67-56-1 | 0.10 | 13 | No | | 0.30 | 17.3 | No | | | |
| 9 | Acetone | 67-64-1 | 0.04 | 89 | No | | 0.12 | 119 | No | Total work hours in 1 year | 2080 | |
| 10 | 1-Methoxy-2-Propanol Acetate | 108-65-6 | 0.10 | 3.6 | No | | 0.31 | 24 | No | | | |
| 11 | Ethyl Benzene (HAP) | 100-41-4 | 0.08 | 21.75 | No | | 0.25 | 29 | No | Days /Week | 5 | |
| 12 | Stoddard Solvent | 8052-41-3 | 0.08 | 26.25 | No | | 0.23 | 35 | No | | | |
| 13 | Isoproponal | 67-63-0 | 0.05 | 49 | No | | 0.15 | 65.3 | No | | | |
| 14 | Methyl Amyl Ketone | 110-43-0 | 0.001 | 11.75 | No | | 0.002 | 15.7 | No | | | |
| 15 | Methyl Ethyl Keytone (HAP) | 78-93-3 | 0.03 | 29.5 | No | | 0.08 | 39.3 | No | | | |
| 16 | N-Butanol | 71-36-3 | 0.03 | 7.5 | No | | 0.08 | 10 | No | | | |
| 17 | Ethyl Acetate | 141-78-6 | 0.0003 | 70 | No | | 0.001 | 93.3 | No | | | |
| 18 | Zinc (dust or fume) | 7440-66-6 | 0.0003 | 0.5 | No | | 0.001 | 0.667 | No | | | |
| 19 | Microcrystalline Silica | 14808-60-7 | 7.65E-05 | 0.005 | No | | 0.0002 | 0.0067 | No | | | |
| 20 | Carbon Black | 1333-86-4 | 0.00002 | 0.175 | No | | 0.0001 | 0.23 | No | | | |
| 21 | Zinc Oxide | 1314-13-2 | 0.000003 | 0.5 | No | | 0.00001 | 0.677 | No | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | Note 1. From State of Idaho Guidelines for Performing an Air Quality Impact Analysis Section 3.34 part c. If Controlled Emissions are below EL's compliance with TAPs has been determined via Idaho Air Rules Section 210.08. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | TAP Emissions Totals | | 24 Hr HAP/TAP Calculated Emissions Rate in Lbs / Hr | Maximum Hourly Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr | Actual Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr For Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 29 | Total Lbs/Hr | | 1.825 | 5.48 | 5.48 | | | | | | | |
| 30 | Lbs/yr | | 3,797 | 11,391 | 11,391 | | | | | | | |
| 31 | Tons/Yr | | 1.898 | 5.695 | 5.695 | | | | | | | |
| 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | HAP Emissions Totals | | 24 Hr HAP/TAP Calculated Emissions Rate in Lbs / Hr | Maximum Hourly Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr | Actual Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr For Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Total Lbs/Hr | | 1.508 | 4.52 | 4.52 | | | | | | | |
| 35 | Lbs/yr | | 2,080 | 9,410 | 9,410 | | | | | | | |
| 36 | Tons/Yr | | 1.040 | 4.705 | 4.705 | | | | | | | |
| 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | Combined TAP & HAP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | TAPS that are not HAPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | Lbs/Hr | | 0.318 | 0.95 | 0.95 | | | | | | | |
| 43 | Lbs/yr | | 0.318 | 1983 | 1983 | | | | | | | |
| 44 | Tons/Yr | | 0.0002 | 1.0 | 1.0 | | | | | | | |
| 45 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | Compounds That are both HAP & TAP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | Lbs/Hr | | 1.51 | 4.52 | 4.45 | | | | | | | |
| 48 | Lbs/yr | | 3,136 | 9,408 | 9,247 | | | | | | | |
| 49 | Tons/Yr | | 1.6 | 4.7 | 4.6 | | | | | | | |
| 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | The One HAP that is not A TAP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | Lbs/Hr | | Hexamethylene Diisocyanate (HAP) | 0.0003 | 0.0009 | 0.0009 | | | | | | |
| 53 | Lbs/yr | | | 0.6 | 1.92 | 1.92 | | | | | | |
| 54 | Tons/Yr | | | 0.0003 | 0.001 | 0.0010 | | | | | | |
| 55 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | Total TAP & HAP: TAPS that are both + TAPS that are not HAPS + One (1) HAP that is not a TAP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | Lbs/Hr | | 1.826 | 5.477 | 5.400 | | | | | | | |
| 59 | Lbs/yr | | 3,798 | 11,393 | 11,232 | | | | | | | |
| 60 | Tons/Yr | | 1.899 | 5.696 | 5.616 | | | | | | | |
| 61 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 63 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----|----|-----------------|--|
| 2 Aslett Ranch - 2014 Coating | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | days /Yr | Painting Hrs/Day | Actual Hrs/Year | Weeks/Yr | Work Days / Week | | | 7 day x 8 hr x 52 week | Max Dsgn/Opp Hr/Day | | Max Dsgn/Opp Days/Week | | Hrs/Day X Days/Week X 52 | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 365 | 8 | 2080 | 52 | 5 | | | 2912 | 24 | | 7 | | 8760 | Uncontrolled Potential to Emit For Criteria Pollutants - Worst Case, Max Hrs | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | Actual Emissions W/O Controls Std Hrs (2080) All Paints | | | | Uncontrolled Potential To Emit | | | | | | Emissions Unit | PM10 | PM2.5 | SO2 | NOx | CO | VOC | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | | | | |
| 7 | | | Actual operating hours, production rates and types of materials processed during a defined period | | | | No Controls or Limits on operation. VOC, HAP, & PM Content is Maximized (8 Hrs/Day) X (7 day/Wk) X 52 Wk = 2912 Hrs | | | | | | Point Sources | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | CAS # | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Day | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr | Total Lbs/Yr | Total Ton/Yr | | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Day | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr | Total Lbs/Yr | Total Ton/Yr | | Painting Operations | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | | | |
| 9 | Criteria Pollutants | | | | | | | | | | | | Total, Point Sources | 16 | 15 | | | | | 52 | | |
| 10 | PM | | 42 | 5.2 | 10,820 | 5.4 | PM | 89 | 11 | 32,501 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | PM10 | Note 1 | 42 | 5.2 | 10,820 | 5.4 | PM10 | 89 | 11 | 32,501 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | About 56 Hrs/Wk | |
| 12 | PM2.5 | | 38 | 4.8 | 10,008 | 5.0 | PM2.5 | 83 | 10 | 30,063 | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | VOC | | 38 | 4.7 | 9,778 | 4.9 | VOC | 287 | 35.8 | 104,336 | 52 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | About 39 Hr/Wk | | | | Uncontrolled Potential To Emit For HAPs (about 56 hrs/Wk) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | HAP's | | Actual HAPS Emissions - All Paints, Std Hrs | | | | Maximized HAPS Emissions Rate/Lbs/Hr X (2912 Hrs) | | | | Coating w/highest Hap | | HAP's | PTE Ton/Yr | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Xylene | 1330-20-7 | | 2.4 | | 2.46 | | 53 | 6.58 | 19,153 | 9.6 | | V 2153 Mid Coat Epoxy Primer | Xylene | 9.6 | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Toluene | 108-88-3 | | 1.5 | | 1.59 | | 24 | 3.01 | 8,751 | 4.4 | | Carbozinc 859 | Toluene | 4.4 | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Methanol | 67-56-1 | | 0.3 | | 0.31 | | 30 | 3.77 | 10,975 | 5.5 | | Lacquer Thinner SW R7K115 | Methanol | 5.5 | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | Ethyl Benzene | 100-41-4 | | 0.3 | | 0.26 | | 5.5 | 0.69 | 2,004 | 1.0 | | Carbothane 134 HG | Ethyl Benzene | 1.0 | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | Methyl Ethyl Keytone | 78-93-3 | | 0.1 | | 0.08 | | 2.7 | 0.34 | 982 | 0.5 | | Carbozinc 859 | Methyl Ethyl Keytone | 0.5 | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | Hexamethylene Disocyanate | 822-06-0 | | 0.001 | | 0.0010 | | 0.02 | 0.003 | 8 | 0.004 | | Carbothane 134 HG | Hexamethylene Disocyanate | 0.004 | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | |
|----|---|--|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------|---------------------------|------|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------|--------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| 27 | Actual HAP Calculated Emissions Rates | | All Paints, STD Hours | | Actual HAPS Lbs/Hr | 4.52 | Actual HAPS Tons / Yr | 4.71 | | Sum Maximized Haps Lbs/Hr | 14.38 | Sum Maximized Haps Ton/Yr | 20.9 | | | | Total | 20.9 | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | PM10 & PM2.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | In order to determine PM2.5, emissions daily and annual PM10 emissions are multiplied by a speciation factor. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | The factor is from California Emissions Inventory and Reporting System (CEDARS) Particulate Matter Speciation Profiles (dated 7/28/2009). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Potential to Emit Criteria Pollutants - All Paints Post Construction (Proposed Emissions) | | | | | | |
| 32 | Specifically the "Paint Application - Oil Based" factor of 92.5% of PM10 is PM2.5 speciation factor -> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | W/Controls, Limits On Operation, Std Hrs - Worst Case | | | | | | |
| 33 | | | | | PM | | | | VOC | | 92.50% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | | PTE | Hourly PM10 in Lbs of Pm10/Hr | Annual PM10 in T-PM10 / Yr | Hourly PM2.5 in Lbs of PM2.5 / Hr | Annual PM2.5 in T-PM10/Yr | VOC Lb / Hr | VOC Ton / Yr | | | | | | | | Emissions Unit | PM10 Ton/Yr | PM2.5 Ton/Yr | SO2 Ton/Yr | NOx Ton/Yr | CO Ton/Yr | VOC Ton/Yr |
| 35 | 40 Hrs | Worst Case Emission Rates Std Hours | NO Controls | 11.2 | 11.6 | 10.3 | 10.7 | 35.8 | 37.3 | | | | | | | | Painting Operations | 0.005 | 0.004 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37.3 |
| 36 | | CE #1 & #2 Added | With Controls | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.004 | 0.004 | | | | | | | | | | Potential To Emit - All Paints W Controls, Limits, STD Hrs Showing Post Construction (Proposed) HAP Emissions | | | | | | |
| 37 | 40 Hrs | Std Paints Std Hours | NO Controls | 5.2 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 5.00 | 4.7 | 4.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | | CE #1 & #2 Added | With Controls | 0.00073 | 0.00076 | 0.00067 | 0.00070 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | Note 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | PTE is the maximum amount of air contaminants that this source could emit if: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Xylene | 6.84 | | | | | |
| 41 | Each process is operated at 100% of design capacity, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Toluene | 3.13 | | | | | |
| 42 | Each process is operated at the maximum number of hours possible each day, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ethyl Benzene | 0.72 | | | | | |
| 43 | Materials that emit the most air contaminants are used or processed 100 % of the time; and, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Methyl Ethyl Keytone | 0.351 | | | | | |
| 44 | air pollution control equipment is turned off. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Methanol | 3.92 | | | | | |
| 45 | Note 3 | In the 'Coating TAP & HAP Calc' sheet, HAPS are Maximized for worst case. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Hexamethylene Disocyanate | 0.0028 | | | | | | |
| 46 | where: | That worksheet is a modified version of 'Automotive Coatings XLS', from the Idaho DEQ Air Quality website. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Worst Case Std Hours | Total Hap | 14.95 | | | | | |
| 47 | And | Annual Maximized HAP Emissions (Ton/Yr) = Maximum Density of HAPs/Gal X Annual Use Rate Gal/Yr] / 2000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Actual HAP Ton/Yr All Paints Std Hrs | Actual HAP | 4.71 | | | | | |
| 48 | And | Maximum Density of HAP = Select coating product with the highest (MAX) HAP emissions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | And | Assume that product is being used 100% of the time. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | About 40 Hrs./Wk | | | | | |
| 50 | | Where Annual Use Rate (Gal/Yr) = Actual use rate (gal/day) x 365 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | |
|----|--|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------|------------------|---|---|---|--|
| 2 | Post PTC - Blasting Operations & Emissions Inventories | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Surface preparation operations for 500 gallon tanks (and below) at the facility post construction will be done | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | in a fully enclosed blasting cabinet. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Blast Cabinet Specifications: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Viking Blast and Wash Systems | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | GC-500 with 44" diameter capacity & a length capacity of 10 Ft. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Airless Blast cleaning is accomplished with six (6) 1,725 R.P.M., 10 HP centrifugal wheels | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | lined with 3/8 thick manganese work hardening steel wear plates. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Blast Cabinet Dust Collection: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Model VK4 Continuous duty pulse type, cartridge dust collector (dh). | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | 7.5 HP fan with 4 nanofiber media cartridges. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | To be 99.999% efficient down to 1 micron. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Drum Cover kit and 55 Gallon drum is included. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Deflagration Panels are included and are required as per NFPA 654. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | The Resulting Emissions From Blasting Cabinet = Zero | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | The remaining surface preparation activities, for equipment larger than a 500 gallon propane tank, will be done | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | in a prepared blast room with associated air filtration equipment installed. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | Retro Fit Blast Room Dust Collection Specifications: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | Jan 2016 Proposal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | Cartridge Style Dust Collection System | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | Three (3) Dust-Hog 4,500 cfm AM-14983 Model FFBW | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | Each unit contains (6) cartridge filters CE 99.8% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | scfm rating exceeds requirement for blast room | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | Post Construction - Abrasive Blasting Emissions Inventory | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | Assumptions: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | 1. Post Construction blast media usage can be found in Rows 46-50 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | 2. Controls efficiency is 99.9% or better. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | 3. Blast pressure & nozzle diameter are the same as 2014. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | 4. Lbs of blast media consumed per hour See- Cell C49 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | 5. Number of blasting days / week See C47 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | 6. Number of blasting hours per work day See Cell C48 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | 7. PM Emissions for Glass are no worse than those for Sand. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | 8. TAP & HAP emissions are considerably lower with glass than those with silica sand. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | Blasting Media Usage Rate - Actual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | 5300 | Lbs of Media Consumed/Week | | | | | 2080 | Blasting Hrs/Yr | | | | |
| 45 | 5 | Number of Blasting Days / Week | | | | | 260 | Blasting Days/Yr | | | | |
| 46 | 8 | Work hours / Day | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | 133 | Lbs of Media Consumed / Hr | | | | | 52 | # Weeks / Yr | | | | |
| 48 | 1,060 | Lbs of Media Consumed / Day | | | | | 365 | Days/Yr | | | | |
| 49 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | Material Balance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | For the purposes of the emissions inventory | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | * 'Actual media usage rate' information is taken from purchase order records, and, | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | * A buffer factor, is included in calculations. For this draft reply REV 3 - we elected to use the buffer cell | | | | | | | | | | | |

simplify
adjust %
simplify

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | |
|----|----------------|--|---|----------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------|--|--------------|----------------|--------------|--|
| 54 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | | Media Usage - Buffer Factor | | | | | 1.2 | | | | | |
| 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | | Until recently the facility used Green Diamond sand for blasting media. Since March 2015 the facility has replaced the sand with | | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | | Crushed Glass. The PM, PM10 & PM2.5 emission factors used for glass are the same as used for sand from CARB and AP 42 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | | documents as referenced. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | | Abrasive Blasting - Actual Emission Rates (plus Buffer) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | | Quantity of Media Used / Yr | | | | | 330,720 | Lbs/Yr | | | | |
| 63 | | Quantity of Media Used / Hr | | | | | 159 | Lbs/Hr | | | | |
| 64 | | Quantity of Media Used / Day | | | | | 1,272 | Lbs/Day | | | | |
| 65 | | Quantity of Media Used /week | | | | | 6,360 | | | | | |
| 66 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 67 | | Table 27. AP 42, 13.2.6-1 | | | | | | | Aslett Ranch | Annual results | | |
| 68 | | | | | | | | | W/O Controls | | | |
| 69 | For Reference: | Silica Sand Emission Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | | 27 | Lbs of PM / 1000 Lbs of Media {AP 42, 13.2.6-1} | | | | | | 8,929 | Lbs PM/yr | | |
| 71 | | 13 | Lbs of PM10 / 1000 Lbs of Media {AP 42, 13.2.6-1} | | | | | | 4,299 | Lbs PM10/Yr | | |
| 72 | | 1.3 | Lbs of PM2.5 / 1000 Lbs of Media {AP 42.13.2.6-1} | | | | | | 430 | Lbs PM2.5/Yr | | |
| 73 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 74 | | | | | | | | Crushed Glass PM Emissions = Sand Emissions | | | | |
| 75 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | | Emission Factors | | | | | 27.00 | Lbs of PM / 1000 Lbs of Media | | | | |
| 77 | | | | | | | 13 | Lbs of PM10 / 1000 Lbs of Media | | | | |
| 78 | | | | | | | 1.3 | Lbs of PM2.5 / 1000 Lbs of Media | | | | |
| 79 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 80 | | Input Cell for Control #1 --> Efficiency Factor | | 99.80% | dwn to 1 micron | over all control eff. = | | 99.80% | | | | |
| 81 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 82 | | Input Cell for Control #2 --> Efficiency | | 0.0% | Control 2 set to 0, this system has 1 layer of control. | | | | | | | |
| 83 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 84 | | Particulate Control is ---> (1 - Efficiency Factor) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 86 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 87 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 88 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 89 | | PM Emissions | | 8,929.4 | Lbs/Yr PM | | 17.86 | Lbs/Yr PM | | 17.8589 | Lbs/Yr PM | |
| 90 | | | | 4.3 | Lbs/Hr PM | | 0.009 | Lbs/Hr PM | | 0.0086 | Lbs/Hr PM | |
| 91 | | | | 4.5 | Ton/Yr PM | | 0.0089 | Ton/Yr PM | | 0.0089 | Ton/Yr PM | |
| 92 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 93 | | PM10 | | 4,299 | Lbs/Yr PM10 | | 8.6 | Lbs/Yr PM10 | | 8.5987 | Lbs/Yr PM10 | |
| 94 | | | | 2.07 | Lbs/Hr PM10 | | 0.0041 | Lbs/Hr PM10 | | 0.0041 | Lbs/Hr PM10 | |
| 95 | | | | 2.15 | Ton/Yr PM10 | | 0.00430 | Ton/Yr PM10 | | 0.0043 | Ton/Yr PM10 | |
| 96 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 97 | | PM2.5 | | 429.9 | Lbs/Yr PM2.5 | | 0.9 | Lbs/Yr PM2.5 | | 0.8599 | Lbs/Yr PM2.5 | |
| 98 | | | | 0.21 | Lbs/Hr PM2.5 | | 0.0004 | Lbs/Hr PM2.5 | | 0.0004 | Lbs/Hr PM2.5 | |
| 99 | | | | 0.21 | Ton/Yr PM2.5 | | 0.00043 | Ton/Yr PM2.5 | | 0.00043 | Ton/Yr PM2.5 | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N |
|----|--|------------|-------------|--|--|--------------|--------------------------|---|--|-----|---|--|--|
| 2 | Post Construction HAP, TAP & PM Calc | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | # Actual Hrs / Yr | | 2080 | Hrs | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Averaging Period | | 24 | Hrs | | | | Work Hrs/Day | | 8 | these cells have been linked to the 'Post PTC Blast Ei' | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | Blasting Days/Week | | 5 | | | |
| 9 | Actual Usage Rate | | 159 | Lbs/Hr -----> | This figure includes buffer | | | Weeks/Yr | | 52 | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | Days/Yr | | 365 | | | |
| 11 | Transfer Efficiency | | | | 0% | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Control 1 --> Efficiency Factor | | | | 99.80% | linked cells | total eff= | 99.80% | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Control 2 --> Efficiency Factor | | | | 0 | linked cells | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | <i>Particulate Control is ---> (1 - Efficiency Factor) X (Lbs/Hr)</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Black Beauty Glass Beads TAPs Content | CAS # | % by weight | Actual Uncontrolled TAP Emitted Lbs/Hr | Actual Uncontrolled TAP Emitted Lbs/Yr | | Control 1 Results Lbs/Hr | Maximum Hourly HAP & TAP's Calculated Emission Rates After Control 1 Lbs/Hr | Maximum Daily HAP & TAP Calculated Emission Rates, Averaged over 24 Hrs Lbs/Hr | | Control 2 Results Lbs/Hr | Maximum Hourly HAP & TAP's Calculated Emission Rates After Controls 1 & 2 Lbs/Hr | Maximum Daily HAP & TAP Calculated Emission Rates, Averaged over 24 Hrs Lbs/Hr |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Calcium Oxide (TAP) | 1305-78-8 | 15.0% | 23.85 | 49,608 | | 0.048 | 0.048 | 0.016 | | 0.0477 | 0.0477 | 0.01590 |
| 22 | Aluminum Oxide (TAP) | 7429-90-5 | 2.0% | 3.18 | 6,614 | | 0.006 | 0.006 | 0.002 | | 0.0064 | 0.0064 | 0.00212 |
| 23 | Magnesium Oxide (TAP) | 1309-48-4 | 1.0% | 1.59 | 3,307 | | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.001 | | 0.0032 | 0.0032 | 0.00106 |
| 24 | Iron Oxide (TAP) | 1309-37-1 | 1.0% | 1.59 | 3,307 | | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.001 | | 0.0032 | 0.0032 | 0.00106 |
| 25 | Silicon Dioxide (TAP) | 14808-60-7 | 1.0% | 1.59 | 3,307 | | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.001 | | 0.0032 | 0.0032 | 0.00106 |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N |
|----|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | Post PTC Blasting HAPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | No HAPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | Actual Emissions W/O Controls | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | Actual operating hours, production rates and types of materials processed during a defined period | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Day | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr | Total Lbs/Yr | Total Ton/Yr | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | Criteria Pollutants | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | PM | 34.34 | 4.293 | 8,929 | 4.5 | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | PM10 | 16.54 | 2.067 | 4,299 | 2.1 | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | PM2.5 | 1.65 | 0.2067 | 430 | 0.21 | | | | | | | | |

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K |
|----|--|---|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| 2 | Post Construction Criteria Pollutants & HAPS Summary | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Actual Hrs/Day | 8 | Actual Hrs/Year | 2080 | Max Dsgn/Opp Hr/Day | 24 | Max Dsgn/Opp Days/Week | 7 | Hrs/Day X Days/Week X 52 | 8760 |
| 5 | 365 | Post Construction - Actual Emissions <i>With/Out</i> Controls | | | | Post PTC Uncontrolled Potential To Emit | | | | |
| 6 | Days/Yr | Actual operating hours, production rates and types of materials processed during a defined period | | | | <i>With/Out</i> Controls or limits on operation and, worst case maximum emissions Rate Per Day Hr X 2912 hrs | | | | |
| 7 | | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Day | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr | Total Lbs/Yr | Total Ton/Yr | | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Day | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr | Total Lbs/Yr | Total Ton/Yr |
| 8 | Criteria Pollutants | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | PM | 34 | 4.29 | 8,929 | 4.5 | PM | 34 | 4.29 | 12,501 | 6.3 |
| 10 | PM10 | 17 | 2.07 | 4,299 | 2.15 | PM10 | 17 | 2.07 | 6,019 | 3.01 |
| 11 | PM2.5 | 2 | 0.21 | 430 | 0.21 | PM2.5 | 2 | 0.21 | 602 | 0.30 |
| 13 | | Post Construction - Actual Emissions <i>With</i> Controls | | | | Post Construction - PTE, <i>With</i> Controls and Limits on Operations | | | | |
| 14 | | Actual operating hours, production rates and types of materials processed during a defined period | | | | Worst Case Maximum Emissions Rate Per Day X (Std Hrs) | | | | |
| 15 | | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Day | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr | Total Lbs/Yr | Total Ton/Yr | | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Day | Calculated Emissions Rate Lbs/Hr | Total Lbs/Yr | Total Ton/Yr |
| 16 | Criteria Pollutants | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | PM | 0.07 | 0.009 | 17.86 | 0.0089 | PM | 0.07 | 0.009 | 17.859 | 0.0089 |
| 18 | PM10 | 0.033 | 0.00413 | 8.60 | 0.0043 | PM10 | 0.033 | 0.00413 | 8.599 | 0.0043 |
| 19 | PM2.5 | 0.0033 | 0.00041 | 0.860 | 0.00043 | PM2.5 | 0.0033 | 0.000413 | 0.860 | 0.00043 |
| 22 | <u>Information from manufacturer, maximum design capacity of blaster</u> | | | | EF for Sand & Glass | | | | | |
| 23 | 5/8" Nozzle @ 90 PSI | = | 3,000 | Lbs/Hr | | 27.00 | Lbs of PM / 1000 Lbs of Media {AP 42, 13.2.6-1} | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | 13 | Lbs of PM10/1000 Lbs of Media {AP 42, 13.2.6-1} | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | 1.3 | Lbs of PM2.5/1000 Lbs of Media {AP 42.13.2.6-1} | | | |
| 27 | Uncontrolled Potential to Emit For Criteria Pollutants | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | Emissions | PM10 | PM2.5 | SO2 | NOx | CO | VOC | | | |
| 29 | Unit | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | Ton/Yr | | | |
| 30 | Point Sources | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | Blasting Operations | 3.01 | 0.30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 32 | Total Point Sources | 3.01 | 0.30 | | | | | | | |
| 33 | Uncontrolled Potential To Emit For HAPS | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | NO HAPS | | | | | | | | | |

Aslett Ranch Propane Flare - Operations, Engineering, and BTU Data

Nearly empty (primarily 500 gallon) are brought into the facility to be surface prepared and coated. As part of the refurbishing process the tanks are cleared of residual propane.

500 gallon tanks burn for an average of 20 min
 250 gallon tanks burn for an average of 15 min
 1000 gallon tank burns for an average of 40 min

Owner describes hours of operation as Hr/Day Days/Week
 Weeks/Yr
 Hr Avg Period Actual hours of actual operation
Owner supplied information

Vapor volume from 1 gallon of liquid propane @ 60 degrees F - 36.39 CuFt
 Vapor volume from 1 LB of liquid propane @ 60 degrees F - 8.57 CUft
Engineering handbook

"Vapor pressure" is the force exerted by a gas, LP gas in this case, attempting to escape from a container, (by pressing on the container's interior surfaces, or exiting at a gas valve if the gas valve is opened and not regulated).

BTU Content of Propane

21,591 BTU per pound
 91,690 BTU per Gal
 2,572 BTU per CuFt
Engineering handbook

Larger household tanks are more likely to contain a majority of propane, (typically 90 percent propane in North America).
source: the engineering toolbox

LPG-typical Vapor Pressure @ 70 degrees F, with 90% Propane to Butane ratio = 82 psig
source: the engineering toolbox

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Properties of Propane: | C3H8 |
| Chemical Formula | |
| BTU per Gallon (Vaporized) | 91,690 |
| BTU per Pound | 21,591 |
| Weight per Liquid Gallon | 4.23 |
| Vaporization Temperature | -44°F |
| Specific Gravity - Vapor (Air=1) | 1.53 |
| Specific Gravity - Liquid (Water=1) | 0.51 |
| Vaporization Rate (Liquid to Vapor) | 272:01:00 |
| Combustion Data : | |
| Limits of Flammability, %of gas in air | 2.3% to 9.5% |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Air required to burn 1 Cu Ft Vapor | 23.5 Cu Ft |
| Oxygen required to burn 1 Cu Ft Vapor | 4.9 Cu Ft |
| Ignition Temperature | 920-1029°F |
| Optimum Flame Temperature | 3500°F |
| Vapor Pressure at 0°F | 28 PSI |
| Vapor Pressure at 70° F | 122 PSI |
| Vapor Pressure at 100° F | 190 PS |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Estimation of Average Mass Flow Rate of a Propane Flare in Lbs/Hr of Propane | 35 |
| Estimation of Maximum Mass Flow Rate of a Propane Flare in Lbs/Hr of Propane (Avg mass flow rate x 25%) | 42 |
| 1 LB of Propane contains BTU's | 21,221 |
| Therefore the BTU input for the Aslett Ranch Flare is: | 887,716 |

Source Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Air permits Division
 New Source Review Emission Calculations
 Sample Calculations for Flares

Note: Load all three propane workbooks in Excel at the same time,
 the driver is the [Aslett Ranch Propane Flare - EI.xlsx] workbook.
 This workbook contains the other two, but all three must be loaded for everything to work.

APPENDIX B – FACILITY DRAFT COMMENTS

The following comments were received from the facility on January 28, 2016:

Facility Comment: the applicant submitted a revised EI and requested to change the blasting media daily and annual throughputs.

DEQ Response: changes are made in the permit and SOB.

Facility Comment: The applicant requested to change the control efficiency of the filtration system for the blasting room and submitted a revised EI to reflect the change.

DEQ Response: changes are made in the permit and SOB.

Facility Comment: The applicant requested a 90-day timeframe to install new equipment.

DEQ Response: the 90-day timeframe is granted and included in the permit.

APPENDIX C – PROCESSING FEE

| Emissions Inventory | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Pollutant | Annual Emissions Increase (T/yr) | Annual Emissions Reduction (T/yr) | Annual Emissions Change (T/yr) |
| NO _x | 0.6 | 0 | 0.6 |
| SO ₂ | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| CO | 0.3 | 0 | 0.3 |
| PM10 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| VOC | 37.3 | 0 | 37.3 |
| TAPS/HAPS ¹ | 14.7 | 0 | 14.7 |
| Total: | 0.0 | 0 | 38.2 |
| | | | |
| Fee Due | \$ 5,000.00 | | |

Comments: ¹ These HAP are VOC too. For fee purpose, they are not counted towards total emissions in this table.