

Statement of Basis

for the DRAFT CAAPP Permit for:

Source Name:

Signode - Bridgeview

Statement of Basis No.: 95090018-1411
I.D. No.: 031027AAG
Permit No.: 95090018
Date Prepared: November 6, 2014

Permitting Authority:

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
Bureau of Air, Permit Section
217/785-1705

This Statement of Basis is being provided to USEPA and any interested parties as required by Section 39.5(8)(b) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act.

Table of Contents

PREFACE

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I - LEGAL BASIS FOR THE PERMIT AND PERMIT CONDITIONS

- 1.1 Legal Basis for Program
- 1.2 Legal Basis for Issuance of CAAPP Permit
 - a. Application Status
 - b. Compliance Status
 - c. Payment of Fees
 - d. Additional Information Status
- 1.3 Legal Basis for Conditions in the CAAPP Permit
 - a. Applicable Federal Regulations
 - b. Applicable SIP Regulations
 - c. Other Applicable Requirements

CHAPTER II - FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE PERMIT AND PERMIT CONDITIONS

- 2.1 Source History
- 2.2 Source Description
- 2.3 Single Source Status
- 2.4 Ambient Air Quality Status
- 2.5 Source Status
- 2.6 Annual Emissions
- 2.7 Fee Schedule
- 2.8 SIP Permit Facts

CHAPTER III - SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE PERMIT AND CONDITIONS

- 3.1 Environmental Justice
- 3.2 Emission Testing Results
- 3.3 Compliance Reports
- 3.4 Field Inspection Results
- 3.5 Historical Non-Compliance
- 3.6 Source Wide Justifications and Rationale
- 3.7 Emission Unit Justifications and Rationale
 - a. Cold Rolling Mill
 - b. Contact & Quench Pots (Magnus Lines)
 - c. Strapping Coating Lines and Wax Applicators (Subject to TT)
 - d. Strapping Coating Lines and Wax Applicators
 - e. Punch Press Department
 - f. Grit Seal Lines
 - g. Boilers
 - h. Space Heaters
 - i. Fugitive PM Emissions
 - j. Iron Phosphate Cleaning Tank
- 3.8 Insignificant Activities Discussion

- 3.9 Prompt Reporting Discussion
- 3.10 Emissions Reduction Market System (ERMS)
- 3.11 Incorporation by Reference Discussion
- 3.12 Periodic Monitoring General Discussions

CHAPTER IV - DESCRIPTION OF THE CHANGES FROM PREVIOUSLY ISSUED CAAPP PERMITS

- 4.1 Major Changes Summary

ENDNOTES

PREFACE

Reason For This Document

This document is a requirement of the permitting authority in accordance with 502(a) of the Clean Air Act, 40 CFR 70.7(a)(5), and Section 39.5(8)(b) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act. Section 39.5(8)(b) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act states the following:

“The Agency shall prepare a statement that sets forth the legal and factual basis for the Draft CAAPP permit conditions, including references to the applicable statutory or regulatory provisions.”

Purpose Of This Document

The purpose of this Statement of Basis is to provide discussion regarding the development of this Draft CAAPP Permit. This document would also provide the permitting authority, the public, the source, and the USEPA with the applicability and technical matters that form the basis of the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Summary Of Historical Actions Leading Up To Today's Permitting Action

Since the last Renewal CAAPP Permit issued on January 13, 2006, the source has not been issued any modifications or amendments.

Limitations

This Statement of Basis is not enforceable and only sets forth the legal and factual basis for the Draft CAAPP Permit Conditions (Chapters I and II). Chapter III contains supplemental material that would assist in educating interested parties about this source and the Draft CAAPP Permit. The Statement of Basis does not shield the source from enforcement actions or its responsibility to comply with existing or future applicable regulations. Nor does the Statement of Basis constitute a defense to a violation of the Federal Clean Air Act or the Illinois Environmental Protection Act including implementing regulations.

This document does not purport to establish policy or guidance.

INTRODUCTION

The Clean Air Act Permit Program (CAAPP) is the operating permit program established in Illinois for major stationary sources as required by Title V of the federal Clean Air Act and Section 39.5 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act. The Title V Permit Program (CAAPP) is the primary mechanism to apply the various air pollution control requirements established by the Clean Air Act to major sources, defined in accordance with Title V of the Clean Air Act. The Draft CAAPP Permit contains conditions identifying the state and federal applicable requirements that apply to the source. The Draft CAAPP Permit also establishes the necessary monitoring and compliance demonstrations. The source must implement this monitoring to demonstrate that the source is operating in accordance with the applicable requirements of the permit. The Draft CAAPP Permit identifies all applicable requirements for the various emission units as well as establishes detailed provisions for testing, monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting to demonstrate compliance with the Clean Air Act. Further explanations of the specific provisions of the Draft CAAPP Permit are contained in the following Chapters of this Statement of Basis.

In addition, the Illinois EPA has committed substantial resources and effort in the development of an acceptable Statement of Basis (this document) that would meet the expectations of USEPA, Region 5. As a result, this document contains discussions that address applicability determinations, periodic monitoring, streamlining, prompt reporting, and SSM authorizations (as necessary). These discussions involve, where necessary, a brief description and justification for the resulting conditions and terms in this Draft CAAPP Permit. This document begins by discussing the legal basis for the contents of the Draft CAAPP Permit, moves into the factual description of the permit, and ends with supplemental information that has been provided to further assist with the understanding of the background and genesis of the permit content.

It is Illinois EPA's preliminary determination that this source's Permit Application meets the standards for issuance of a "Final" CAAPP Permit as stipulated in Section 39.5(10)(a) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act (see Chapter I - Section 1.2 of this document). The Illinois EPA is therefore initiating the necessary procedural requirements to issue a Final CAAPP Permit. The Illinois EPA has posted the Draft CAAPP permit and this Statement of Basis on USEPA website:

<http://www.epa.gov/reg5oair/permits/ilonline.html>

CHAPTER I – LEGAL BASIS FOR THE PERMIT AND PERMIT CONDITIONS

1.1 Legal Basis for Program

The Illinois EPA's state operating permit program for major sources established to meet the requirements of 40 CFR Part 70 are found at Section 39.5 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act [415 ILCS 5/39.5]. The program is called the Clean Air Act Permitting Program (CAAPP). The underlying statutory authority is found in the Illinois Environmental Protection Act at 415 ILCS 5/39.5. The CAAPP was given final full approval by USEPA on December 4, 2001 (see 66 FR 62946).

1.2 Legal Basis for Issuance of CAAPP Permit

In accordance with Section 39.5(10)(a) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, the Illinois EPA may only issue a CAAPP Permit if all of the following standards for issuance have been met:

- The applicant has submitted a complete and certified application for a permit, permit modification, or permit renewal consistent with Sections 39.5(5) and (14) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, as applicable, and applicable regulations (Section a. below);
- The applicant has submitted with its complete application an approvable compliance plan, including a schedule for achieving compliance, consistent with Section 39.5(5) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act and applicable regulations (Section b. below);
- The applicant has timely paid the fees required pursuant to Section 39.5(18) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act and applicable regulations (Section c. below); and
- The applicant has provided any additional information as requested by the Illinois EPA (Section d. below).

a. Application Status

The source submitted an application for a Renewal CAAPP Permit on April 8, 2010. The source is currently operating under an application shield resultant from a timely and complete renewal application submittal. This Draft CAAPP Permit addresses application content and necessary revisions to meet the requirements for issuance of the permit.

b. Present Compliance Status

At the time of this Draft CAAPP Permit, there were no pending State or Federal enforcement actions against the source; therefore, a Compliance Schedule is not required for this source. The source submitted an approvable Compliance Plan as part of its Certified Permit Application. The source has certified compliance with all applicable rules and regulations. In addition, the draft permit requires the source to certify its compliance status on an annual basis.

c. Payment of Fees

The source is current on payment of all fees associated with operation of the emission units.

d. Additional Information

The source provided all the necessary additional application material as requested by the Illinois EPA.

1.3 Legal Basis for Conditions in the CAAPP Permit

This industrial source is subject to a variety of Federal and SIP regulations, which are the legal basis for the conditions in this permit (see Sections a. and b. below). Also, the CAAPP provides the legal basis for additional requirements such as periodic monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping. The following list summarizes those regulations that form the legal basis for the conditions in this Draft CAAPP Permit and are provided in the permit itself as the origin and authority.

a. Applicable Federal Regulations

This source operates emission units that are subject to the following Federal regulations.

- 40 CFR Part 60 - Subpart A, NSPS General Provisions
- 40 CFR Part 60 - Subpart TT, Standards of Performance for Metal Coil Surface Coating
- 40 CFR Part 63 - Subpart A, NESHAP General Provisions
- 40 CFR Part 63 - Subpart SSSS, National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Surface Coating of Metal Coil
- 40 CFR Part 63 - Subpart ZZZZ, National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines
- 40 CFR Part 63 - Subpart DDDDD, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters
- 40 CFR Part 82 - Subpart F, Ozone Depleting Substances

b. Applicable SIP Regulations

This source operates emission units that are subject to the following SIP regulations:

- 35 IAC Part 201 - Permits And General Provisions
- 35 IAC Part 205 - Emissions Reduction Market System
- 35 IAC Part 212 - Visible And Particulate Matter Emissions
- 35 IAC Part 214 - Sulfur Limitations
- 35 IAC Part 218 - Organic Material Emis Stnds And Lmtns For The Chicago Area
- 35 IAC Part 254 - Annual Emissions Report

c. Other Applicable Requirements

There are no other applicable requirements for this source.

CHAPTER II - FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE PERMIT AND PERMIT CONDITIONS

2.1 Source History

There is no significant source history warranting discussion for this source.

2.2 Description of Source

SIC Code: 3499

County: Cook

The source manufactures steel strapping.

The source contains the following processes:

<i>Emission Units</i>	<i>Description</i>
Cold Rolling Mill	The Cold Rolling Mill is used to reduce the thickness of the steel coils when they arrive at the source. Emissions from the cold rolling operation are collected by four exhaust hoods and ducted to Mist Eliminator #1 and #2.
Contact & Quench Pots (Magnus Lines)	At all Magnus lines, the slit steel is cleaned and heat treated as it passes through two lead pots in series. The first pot is the Contact Pot and the second pot is the Quench Pot. The pots are heated via natural gas combustion.
Strapping Coating Lines and Wax Applicators (Subject to 40 CFR 60 Subpart TT)	The strap is painted at the dip tanks (M4 3) and dried at the ovens (M4-4). Finally, wax is applied and dried at M4-5. Wax is also applied and dried at R-1, PRINT-1 and SLIT-2. This operation is considered surface coating of metal coils and is subject to the requirements of NSPS TT and NESHAP SSSS.
Strapping Coating Lines and Wax Applicators	The strap is painted at the dip tanks (A-2, M2-3, and M3-3) and dried at the ovens (A-3, M2-4, and M3-4). Finally, wax is applied and dried at A-4, M2-5, and M3-5. This operation is considered surface coating of metal coils and is subject to the requirements of NESHAP SSSS.
Punch Press Department	Emissions of volatile organic material (VOM) result from the vanishing oil used to lubricate the steel during punching. The Permittee operates punch presses to produce steel seals used to clamp the ends of steel strapping together.
Grit Seal Lines	Grit Seal Lines #1 and #2 are comprised of two presses each controlled by a cyclone. Steel straps of different widths are purchased with an adhesive coating applied to one side. The steel strap is passed through an electric heater to melt the adhesive. After a crimping operation, aluminum oxide grit is applied to the adhesive side of the strap to form the final product.
Boilers	Two natural gas-fired boilers are used for production of hot water for the source needs.

<i>Emission Units</i>	<i>Description</i>
Space Heaters	The natural gas-fired space heaters are used to retain a comfortable working temperature in the facility.
Fugitive PM Emissions	Emissions caused by moving vehicles that creates particulate matter (road dust) emissions on paved and/or unpaved roadways. Particulate Matter also may be emitted from loading/unloading operations at the source.
Iron Phosphate Cleaning Tank	Cleans metal prior to being processed by the Apex Strapping Line.

2.3 Single Source Status

This source does not have any collocated facilities that would be considered a single source with this facility based on information found in the certified application.

2.4 Ambient Air Quality Status for the Area

The source is located in an area that is currently designated nonattainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and attainment or unclassifiable for all other criteria pollutants. (See 40 CFR Part 81 - Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes)

2.5 Source Status

The source requires a CAAPP permit because this source is considered major (based on its PTE) for the following regulated pollutants: volatile organic material (VOM) and hazardous air pollutant (HAP).

This source is considered a natural minor for the following regulated pollutants: PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂).

Based on available data, this source is not a major source of emissions for GHG. Signode - Bridgeview voluntarily submitted data on its emissions of GHG in its 2013 AER, reporting actual annual emissions of GHG of less than 100,000 tons per year. The emissions consist of 11,408 tons of CO₂, 0.21 tons of N₂O, and 0.22 tons of methane.

This source is not currently subject to any "applicable requirements", as defined by Section 39.5(1) of the Act, for emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) as defined by 40 CFR 86.1818-12(a), as referenced by 40 CFR 52.21(b)(49)(i). There are no GHG-related requirements under the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, Illinois' State Implementation Plan, or the Clean Air Act that apply to this facility, including terms or conditions in a Construction Permit addressing emissions of GHG or BACT for emissions of GHG from a major project at this facility under the PSD rules. In particular, the USEPA's Mandatory Reporting Rule for GHG emissions, 40 CFR Part 98, does not constitute an "applicable requirement" because it was adopted under the authority of Sections 114(a)(1) and 208 of the Clean Air Act. This permit also does not relieve the Permittee from the legal obligation to comply with the relevant provisions of the Mandatory Reporting Rule for this facility.

2.6 Annual Emissions

The following table lists annual emissions (tons) of criteria pollutants for this source, as reported in the Annual Emission Reports (AER) sent to the Illinois EPA:

<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>2013</i>	<i>2012</i>	<i>2011</i>
CO	7.99	8.15	8.25
NO _x	9.51	9.71	9.83
PM	52.99	56.15	52.23
SO ₂	0.06	0.06	0.06
VOM	65.35	58.82	57.73
CO ₂ e	11,477.00	11,717.00	11,865.00
HAP (Glyet)	3.32	2.77	2.24

2.7 Fee Schedule

The following table lists the approved annual fee schedule (tons) submitted in the Source's permit application:

<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>Tons/Year</i>
Volatile Organic Material (VOM)	166.87
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	0.23
Particulate Matter (PM)	49.93
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	39.46
HAP, not included in VOM or PM (HAP)	----
Total	256.49

2.8 SIP Permit Facts (T1 Limits)

CAAPP Permits must address all "applicable requirements", which includes the terms and conditions of preconstruction permits issued under regulations approved by USEPA in accordance with Title I of the CAA (See definition of applicable requirements in Section 39.5(1) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act). Preconstruction permits, commonly referred to in Illinois as Construction Permits, derive from the New Source Review ("NSR") permit programs required by Title I of the CAA. These programs include the two major NSR permit programs: (1) the Prevention of Significant Deterioration ("PSD") program¹ and (2) the nonattainment NSR program.² These programs also encompass state construction permit programs for projects that are not major.

In the CAAPP or Illinois's Title V permit program, the Illinois EPA's practice is to identify requirements that are carried over from an earlier Title I permit into a New or Renewed CAAPP Permit as "TI" conditions (i.e., Title I conditions). Title I Conditions that are revised as part of their incorporation into a CAAPP Permit are further designated as "TIR". Title I Conditions that are newly established through a CAAPP Permit are designated as "TIN". It is important that Title I Conditions be identified in a CAAPP Permit because these conditions will not expire when the CAAPP Permit expires. Because the underlying authority for Title I Conditions comes from Title I of the CAA and their initial establishment in Title I Permits, the effectiveness of T1 Conditions derives from Title I of the CAA rather than being linked to Title V of the A. For "changes" to be made to Title I Conditions, they must either cease to be applicable based on obvious circumstances, e.g., the subject

emission unit is permanently shut down, or appropriate Title I procedures must be followed to change the conditions.

- Previously Incorporated Construction Permits:

<i>Permit No.</i>	<i>Date Issued</i>	<i>Subject</i>
03010025	3/3/03	Special Products Second Slitting Line
01080036	9/10/01	Heated Pilot Line Cleaning Tank
01020025	4/13/01	Punch Press Department #2
98030006	6/5/00	Annealing Ovens

- Newly Issued Construction Permits:

<i>Permit No.</i>	<i>Date Issued</i>	<i>Subject</i>
12070036	10/3/12	Mag 4 WESP Installation
08050047	8/12/08	Plasma Treat System
04100019	12/19/07	Pilot Line Coating
99030098	4/8/08	Magnus 4 Strapping Line
95040106	1/9/13	Iron Phosphate Cleaning Tank

- The Illinois EPA has not established any T1R or T1N Limits in this Draft CAAPP permit.

- Extraneous or Obsolete T1 Conditions:³

<i>Construction Permit No.</i>	<i>Condition Number(s)</i>	<i>Subject</i>
04100019	1.1.5(a-c), 1.1.6(a)(i), and 2(a)(i & ii)*	Coating operations for pilot line

- * Note: These limits are obsolete because the Pilot Line was never constructed. All of these limits were only to become effective upon the startup of coating operations on the Pilot Line, which never occurred.

CHAPTER III - SUPPLEMENTAL DISCUSSIONS REGARDING THE PERMIT

The information provided in this Chapter of the Statement of Basis is being provided to assist interested parties in understanding what additional information may have been relied on to support this draft CAAPP permit.

3.1 Environmental Justice Discussions

While the Illinois EPA is sensitive to the location of this facility in a potential EJ community, Title V does not provide for substantive emission control requirements beyond those arising under currently applicable regulations. Thus, when issuing a CAAPP Permit for this facility, the Illinois EPA does not have the authority to impose additional emission control requirements to reduce emissions beyond the levels provided for by applicable state and federal regulations. At the same time, CAAPP Permits do not allow for additional emissions.

Having a facility subject to a CAAPP Permit provides benefits for air quality, the public and the environment generally. CAAPP Permits require more reporting on a facility's compliance status than is required by underlying state operating permits. For example, the requirements for semi-annual reports for all monitoring and annual compliance certifications only become applicable upon the effectiveness of a CAAPP Permit. In addition, CAAPP Permits generally provide clarity and awareness of applicable regulations and the mechanisms by which sources must comply with these regulations. CAAPP Permits add to the compliance checks put on facilities. Where a facility has outstanding compliance deficiencies, CAAPP Permits may establish compliance schedules and other additional conditions for monitoring and reporting.

With this Statement of Basis, the Illinois EPA has made very clear the applicable emission limitations, standards, and other enforceable terms and conditions, as well as attendant monitoring, reporting, recordkeeping, and certifications to assure compliance. The Illinois EPA has provided an explanation of same, as well as a justification for why the conditions that assure compliance are appropriate. The level of detail in the Statement of Basis is atypically involved and is in recognition of the public interest in the permitting of this complex facility in a potential EJ community. The Statement of Basis has been provided to the USEPA for its review. The extremely detailed explanation of the requirements, particularly Periodic Monitoring, applicable to this source is intended to further meaningful public participation.

3.2 Emission Testing Results

The source has performed the following emission testing:

<i>Emission Unit</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>Results of Run #1</i>	<i>Results of Run #2</i>	<i>Results of Run #3</i>	<i>3-Run Average</i>	<i>Compliance Margin %</i>
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/22/13-10/23/13	Lead	0.0041 lb/hr	0.0048 lb/hr	0.0047 lb/hr	0.0045 lb/hr	99.5 % *

<i>Emission Unit</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>Results of Run #1</i>	<i>Results of Run #2</i>	<i>Results of Run #3</i>	<i>3-Run Average</i>	<i>Compliance Margin %</i>
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/22/13-10/23/13	Lead	0.00002 gr/dscf	0.00002 gr/dscf	0.00002 gr/dscf	0.00002 gr/dscf	-
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/23/13-10/24/13	Lead	0.0051 lb/hr	0.0045 lb/hr	0.0045 lb/hr	0.0047 lb/hr	99.5 % *
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/23/13-10/24/13	Lead	0.00002 gr/dscf	0.00002 gr/dscf	0.00002 gr/dscf	0.00002 gr/dscf	-
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/28/13-10/29/13	Lead	0.0070 lb/hr	0.0030 lb/hr	0.0023 lb/hr	0.0041 lb/hr	99.6 % *
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/28/13-10/29/13	Lead	0.00003 gr/dscf	0.00001 gr/dscf	0.00001 gr/dscf	0.00002 gr/dscf	-
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/22/13-10/23/13	PM	0.0467 lb/hr	0.0404 lb/hr	0.0868 lb/hr	0.0580 lb/hr	97.8 % *
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/22/13-10/23/13	PM	0.00023 gr/dscf	0.00019 gr/dscf	0.00042 gr/dscf	0.00028 gr/dscf	99.1 %
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/23/13-10/24/13	PM	0.0836 lb/hr	0.0819 lb/hr	0.0899 lb/hr	0.0851 lb/hr	96.8 % *
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/23/13-10/24/13	PM	0.00040 gr/dscf	0.00040 gr/dscf	0.00043 gr/dscf	0.00041 gr/dscf	98.6 %
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/28/13-10/29/13	PM	0.1532 lb/hr	0.1613 lb/hr	0.2080 lb/hr	0.1742 lb/hr	93.4 % *

<i>Emission Unit</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>Results of Run #1</i>	<i>Results of Run #2</i>	<i>Results of Run #3</i>	<i>3-Run Average</i>	<i>Compliance Margin %</i>
Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Line - Lead Pots	10/28/13-10/29/13	PM	0.00074 gr/dscf	0.00077 gr/dscf	0.00103 gr/dscf	0.00085 gr/dscf	97.1 %

* These values are calculated using the combined allowable lb/hr limitations of Magnus 4 Steel Strapping Lines Contact and Quench Pots, as both were simultaneously being controlled by the WESP.

3.3 Compliance Reports (Annual Certifications, Semiannual Monitoring, NESHAP, etc.)

A review of the source's compliance reports demonstrates the sources ability to comply with all applicable requirements.

3.4 Field Inspection Results

A review of the source's latest field inspection report dated 4/19/13 demonstrates the source's ability to comply with all applicable requirements.

3.5 Historical Non-Compliance

There is no historical non-compliance for this source.

3.6 Source Wide Justifications and Rationale

Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Fugitive Particulate Matter (35 IAC 212.301 and 35 IAC 212.314)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 3.1(a)

Particulate Matter Emission

- ✓ Monitoring as follows (Condition 3.1(a))
 - o Daily visible observations shall be performed for a week at such time as requested by the IEPA.
- ✓ Recordkeeping as follows (Condition 3.1(a)):
 - o Records of these observations.
- ✓ Reporting as follows (Condition 3.5(a)(i)):
 - o Report to IEPA any deviation within 30 days.

Rationale and Justification for Periodic Monitoring

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for the source because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance with respect to the applicable standard.

- Further, the source is required to comply with a Fugitive PM Operating Program, as required by Condition 3.2(a), and a PM₁₀ contingency plan, as required by Condition 3.2(b). Both of these plans will act to minimize the fugitive PM emissions from the source.

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex source-wide non-applicability determinations were not made for this source.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations for source wide emission units has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

3.7 Emission Unit Justifications and Rationale

a. Cold Rolling Mill		
Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.123)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.1.2(a) (i) (A)
PM Requirement (35 IAC 212.322)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.1.2(b) (i) (A)
PM Requirement (35 IAC 212.324(b))	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.1.2(b) (i) (B)
VOM Requirement (35 IAC 218.301)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.1.2(c) (i) (A)
Work Practice Requirement (Section 39.5(7) (a) of the Act)	Applicable Work Practice	See the Permit, Condition 4.1.2(d) (i) (A)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Visible Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable opacity standard. If the Permittee does not detect opacity during the Method 22, compliance with the 30% opacity standard can easily be determined, as 0% opacity is less than 30% opacity. If opacity is visible during the Method 22 and continues to be visible after any corrective action, a Method 9 will provide an exact measurement of any opacity. This direct measurement will be used to determine if the source is in compliance with the 30% opacity standard.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Particulate Matter Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- For compliance with 35 IAC 212.324, the Permittee must comply with the applicable monitoring and recordkeeping established under 35 IAC 212.324.
- The records that are required (i.e., the hours of operation for emission units (hours/mo and hours/yr) and the emissions of PM from the emission units (tons/mo and tons/yr) are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the process weight rate (PWR) standards for the equipment. The emissions do not vary significantly from the emission units. Therefore, the emission limit of lb/hr can be determined from the monthly records of the hours of operation and the emissions of PM over that given timeframe.

To determine compliance, emissions from the rolling mill may be calculated based on the following:

PM₁₀ emissions from the rolling mill may be calculated based on the following emission factors derived from the most recent stack test:

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/ton)
PM ₁₀	0.431

Emissions (lb) = (Wt. of Steel Strap Processed, Ton) x (The Appropriate Emission Factor, lb/Ton)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Organic Material Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- For example, the source could use the following compliance method. For compliance with 35 IAC 215.301, with the required records, a calculation can be made to ensure compliance with the applicable VOM limit for the presses. Knowing the usage of each material used combined with the VOM content of each material used, VOM emissions can be found. Usage x VOM content = VOM emissions; with a conservative approach, it can be assumed that all VOM applied is directly emitted therefore ensuring the source is in compliance with the limits. Then, knowing the hours of operation of the emission unit, the VOM emissions can be divided by hours of operation to give VOM emissions (lb or ton) per hour of operation --giving (lb/hr).

To determine compliance, emissions from the rolling mill may be calculated based on the following:

VOM emissions from the rolling mill may be calculated based on the following emission factors derived from the most recent stack test:

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/ton)
VOM	0.044

Emissions (lb) = (Wt. of Steel Strap Processed, Ton) x (The Appropriate Emission Factor, lb/Ton)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Work Practice Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- The monthly inspections and records of these inspections will verify that the emission unit is being operated and maintained in a manner which minimizes emissions.

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex non-applicability determinations were not made for this emission unit. All non-applicability discussions can be found in the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

b. Contact & Quench Pots (Magnus Lines)		
Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.123)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.2.2(a) (i) (A)
PM Requirement (35 IAC 212.321/322)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Conditions 4.2.2(b) (i) (A & B)
PM Requirement (T1's)	Applicable Limits	See the Permit, Conditions 4.2.2(b) (i) (C & D)
PM Requirement (35 IAC 212.324)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.2.2(b) (i) (E)
SO ₂ Requirement (35 IAC 214.301)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.2.2(c) (i) (A)
SO ₂ Requirement (T1)	Applicable Limit	See the Permit, Condition 4.2.2(c) (i) (B)
VOM Requirement (T1)	Applicable Limit	See the Permit, Condition 4.2.2(d) (i) (A)
VOM Requirement (35 IAC 218.301)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.2.2(d) (i) (B)
CO Requirement (T1)	Applicable Limit	See the Permit, Condition 4.2.2(e) (i) (A)
NO _x Requirement (T1)	Applicable Limit	See the Permit, Condition 4.2.2(f) (i) (A)
HAP Requirement (T1)	Applicable Limit	See the Permit, Condition 4.2.2(g) (i) (A)
Operational and Production Requirements (T1's)	Applicable Limits	See the Permit, Conditions 4.2.2(h) (i) (A-C)
Work Practice Requirements (39.5(7) (a) of the Act & T1's)	Applicable Work Practices	See the Permit, Conditions 4.2.2(i) (i) (A-J)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Visible Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable opacity standard. If the Permittee does not detect opacity during the Method 22, compliance with the 30% opacity standard can easily be determined, as 0% opacity is less than 30% opacity. If opacity is visible during the Method 22 and continues to be visible after any corrective action, a Method 9 will provide an exact measurement of any opacity. This direct measurement will be used to determine if the source is in compliance with the 30% opacity standard.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Particulate Matter Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- The records that are required (i.e., the hours of operation for emission units (hours/mo and hours/yr) and the emissions of PM from the emission units (tons/mo and tons/yr) are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the process weight rate (PWR) standards for the equipment. The emissions do not vary significantly from the emission units. Therefore, the emission limit of lb/hr can be determined from the monthly records of the hours of operation and the emissions of PM over that given timeframe.
- For compliance with 35 IAC 212.324, the Permittee must comply with the applicable monitoring and recordkeeping established under 35 IAC 212.324.

Compliance with the emission limits established in 4.2.2 of this permit may be based on the recordkeeping requirements in Condition 4.2.2 and the following emission factors:

PM₁₀ emissions from the strapping lines may be calculated based on the following emission factors derived from the most recent stack test:

Pollutant	Emission Factors (lb/ton)
PM ₁₀	0.510

Emissions (lb) = (Wt. of Steel Strap Processed, Ton) x (The Appropriate Emission Factor, lb/Ton)

Natural gas combustion emissions from the pots may be calculated based on the following emission factors:

Pollutant	Emission Factors (lb/Mft ³)
PM	7.6

These are the emission factors for uncontrolled natural gas combustion in small boilers (< 100 mmBtu/hr), Table 1.4-2, AP-42, Volume 1, Fifth Edition, Supplement D, March, 1998.

$$\text{Natural Gas Combustion Emissions (lb)} = (\text{Natural Gas Consumed, Mft}^3) \times (\text{The Appropriate Emission Factor, lb/Mft}^3)$$

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Sulfur Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- By definition in 40 CFR 72.2, "pipeline quality" natural gas contains a sulfur content of The sulfur content limitation would result in SO₂ emission less than the limit 2,000 ppm because the properties associated with this combustion process means the sulfur level discharged will not exceed sulfur level input to the dryers. It should also be noted that the source is also required to maintain the type of fuel used, maintain inspection records, and maintain maintenance and repair logs of the dryers. These records would help the Illinois EPA determine if the heaters are being operated properly and therefore would result in SO₂ being minimized.

Natural gas combustion emissions from the pots may be calculated based on the following emission factors:

Pollutant	Emission Factors (lb/Mft ³)
SO ₂	0.6

These are the emission factors for uncontrolled natural gas combustion in small boilers (< 100 mmBtu/hr), Table 1.4-2, AP-42, Volume 1, Fifth Edition, Supplement D March, 1998.

$$\text{Natural Gas Combustion Emissions (lb)} = (\text{Natural Gas Consumed, Mft}^3) \times (\text{The Appropriate Emission Factor, lb/Mft}^3)$$

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Organic Material Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- For compliance with 35 IAC 215.301, with the required records, a calculation can be made to ensure compliance with the applicable VOM limit for the presses. Knowing the usage of each material used combined with the VOM content of each material used, VOM emissions can be found. Usage x VOM content = VOM emissions; with a conservative approach, it can be assumed that all VOM applied is directly emitted therefore ensuring the source is in compliance with the limits. Then, knowing the hours of operation of the emission unit, the VOM emissions can be divided by hours of operation to give VOM emissions (lb or ton) per hour of operation -- giving (lb/hr).

Natural gas combustion emissions from the pots may be calculated based on the following emission factors:

Pollutant	Emission Factors (lb/Mft ³)
VOM	5.5

These are the emission factors for uncontrolled natural gas combustion in small boilers (< 100 mmBtu/hr), Table 1.4-2, AP-42, Volume 1, Fifth Edition, Supplement D March, 1998.

Natural Gas Combustion Emissions (lb) = (Natural Gas Consumed, Mft³) x (The Appropriate Emission Factor, lb/Mft³)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Carbon Monoxide Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.

Natural gas combustion emissions from the pots may be calculated based on the following emission factors:

Pollutant	Emission Factors (lb/Mft ³)
CO	84

These are the emission factors for uncontrolled natural gas combustion in small boilers (< 100 mmBtu/hr), Table 1.4-2, AP-42, Volume 1, Fifth Edition, Supplement D March, 1998.

Natural Gas Combustion Emissions (lb) = (Natural Gas Consumed, Mft³) x (The Appropriate Emission Factor, lb/Mft³)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Nitrogen Oxides Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.

Natural gas combustion emissions from the pots may be calculated based on the following emission factors:

Pollutant	Emission Factors (lb/Mft ³)
NO _x	100

These are the emission factors for uncontrolled natural gas combustion in small boilers (< 100 mmBtu/hr), Table 1.4-2, AP-42, Volume 1, Fifth Edition, Supplement D, March, 1998.

Natural Gas Combustion Emissions (lb) = (Natural Gas Consumed, Mft³) x (The Appropriate Emission Factor, lb/Mft³)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of HAP Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- To determine ongoing compliance with these limits, the source must perform testing at least once every 5 years.
- The source has also already performed emission testing for these units, which showed compliance margins of greater than 95% with the applicable limits. See Section 3.2 of this SOB.

Compliance with the emission limits established in 4.2.2 of this permit may be based on the recordkeeping requirements in Condition 4.2.2 and the following emission factors:

Lead emissions from the strapping lines may be calculated based on the following emission factors derived from the most recent stack test:

Pollutant	Emission Factors (lb/ton)
Lead	0.0067

Emissions (lb) = (Wt. of Steel Strap Processed, Ton) x (The Appropriate Emission Factor, lb/Ton)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Operational and Production Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- Emissions are considered negligible

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Work Practice Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex non-applicability determinations were not made for this emission unit. All non-applicability discussions can be found in the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

c. Strapping Coating Lines and Wax Applicators (Subject to NSPS TT)		
Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.123)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.3.2(a) (i) (A)
PM Requirement (35 IAC 212.321)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.3.2(b) (i) (A)
SO ₂ Requirement (35 IAC 214.301)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.3.2(c) (i) (A)
VOM Requirement (40 CFR 60.462(a) (1))	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.3.2(d) (i) (A)
VOM Requirement (35 IAC 218.204(d))	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.3.2(d) (i) (B)
VOM Requirements (T1's)	Applicable Limits	See the Permit, Conditions 4.3.2(d) (i) (C-E)
HAP Requirement (40 CFR 63.5120(a) (2))	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.3.2(e) (i) (A)
HAP Requirements (T1's)	Applicable Limits	See the Permit, Conditions 4.3.2(e) (i) (B-D)
Operational and Production Requirements (39.5(7) of the Act and T1's)	Applicable Limits and Operational Requirements	See the Permit, Conditions 4.3.2(f) (i) (A-E)
Work Practice Requirement (39.5(7) of the Act)	Applicable Work Practice	See the Permit, Condition 4.3.2(g) (i) (A)

Discussion:

Paint Dip Tank - Magnus 4 Strapping Line (M4-3) and Electric Paint Drying Oven - Magnus 4 Strapping Line (M4-4) have a Thermal Oxidizer as a control device. As explained by the underlying construction permit, this control device was installed only for PSD avoidance purposes. The thermal oxidizer is not required for compliance with the NSPS or the NESHAP, as the source uses the compliant coating options to comply with these standards. The Permittee has the option to idle the operation of the thermal oxidizer on the coating line M4 at any time, if compliance with all of the following is demonstrated:

- i. VOM content in applied coatings not exceeds the limits established in Conditions 4.3.2(d) (i) (A & B);
- ii. HAP emission limits established in Condition 4.3.2(e) (i) are not exceeded;
- iii. Material usage limits established in Conditions 4.3.2(f) (i) (B & C) are not exceeded; and
- iv. Annual VOM emissions from coating line M4 do not exceed the limits established in Condition 4.3.2(d) (i) (C & D).

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Visible Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.

- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable opacity standard. If the Permittee does not detect opacity during the Method 22, compliance with the 30% opacity standard can easily be determined, as 0% opacity is less than 30% opacity. If opacity is visible during the Method 22 and continues to be visible after any corrective action, a Method 9 will provide an exact measurement of any opacity. This direct measurement will be used to determine if the source is in compliance with the 30% opacity standard.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Particulate Matter Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- For compliance with 35 IAC 212.324, the Permittee must comply with the applicable monitoring and recordkeeping established under 35 IAC 212.324.
- The records that are required (i.e., the hours of operation for emission units (hours/mo and hours/yr) and the emissions of PM from the emission units (tons/mo and tons/yr) are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the process weight rate (PWR) standards for the equipment. The emissions do not vary significantly from the emission units. Therefore, the emission limit of lb/hr can be determined from the monthly records of the hours of operation and the emissions of PM over that given timeframe.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Sulfur Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for the oven/dryer because:

- The source has a substantial margin of compliance.
- There is a small likelihood of an exceedance.
- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- By definition in 40 CFR 72.2, "pipeline quality" natural gas contains a sulfur content of The sulfur content limitation would result in SO₂ emission less than the limit 2,000 ppm because the properties associated with this combustion process means the sulfur level discharged will not exceed sulfur level input to the dryers. It should also be noted that the source is also required to maintain the type of fuel used, maintain inspection records, and maintain maintenance and repair logs of the dryers. These records would help the Illinois EPA determine if the dryers are being operated properly and therefore would result in SO₂ being minimized.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Organic Material Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Presumed by rule as the source is subject to a standard promulgated after November 1990 (NSPS TT and 218.204). Both of these standards contain sufficient periodic monitoring.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- For the T1 limits, the source must keep records to demonstrate compliance. The VOC contents that must be determined/recorded to satisfy NSPS and/or 218 requirements can be relied upon to calculate the VOM emissions. The source must keep records and documentation of the calculations made to determine the VOM emissions.

To determine compliance with 4.3.2, VOM emissions from the coating lines may be calculated based on the following:

VOM (lb) = (Coating/Wax Usage, gal) x (Coating Density, lb/gal) x (VOM Content of Coating, % by Wt.)

Compliance of the coating line with VOM emission limitations in Condition 4.3.2 may be based on the recordkeeping requirements in Condition 4.3.2 and by the use of the formula listed below:

VOM Coating Content = $V \times D / [1 - W \times D]$

Where:

V = Percent VOM in the coating (%)

D = Overall coating density (lb/gal)

$W = \Sigma (w_i/d_i)$

Where:

w_i = Percent exempt compound i in the coating,

d_i = Overall density of exempt compound i, lb/gal and the summation Σ is applied over water

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of HAP Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Presumed by rule as the source is subject to a standard promulgated after November 1990 (NESHAP SSSS). This standard contains sufficient periodic monitoring.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- For the T1 limits, the source must keep records to demonstrate compliance. The HAP contents that must be determined/recorded to satisfy NESHAP requirements can be relied upon to calculate the HAP emissions. The source must keep records and documentation of the calculations made to determine the HAP emissions.

To determine compliance with 4.3.2, organic HAP emissions from the coating lines may be calculated based on the following:

HAP (lb) = (Coating/Wax Usage, gal) x (Coating Density, lb/gal) x (HAP Content of Coating, % by Wt.)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Operational and Production Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- The source must maintain records of material usage. The source must also maintain a record of the HAP content of the material used. Records are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the general operational requirements.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Work Practice Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- The monthly inspections and records of these inspections will verify that the emission unit is being operated and maintained in a manner which minimizes emissions.

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex non-applicability determinations were not made for this emission unit. All non-applicability discussions can be found in the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

d. Strapping Coating Lines and Wax Applicators		
Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.123)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.4.2(a) (i) (A)
PM Requirement (35 IAC 212.322)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.4.2(b) (i) (A)
SO ₂ Requirement (35 IAC 214.301)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.4.2(c) (i) (A)
VOM Requirement (35 IAC 218.204(d))	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.4.2(d) (i) (A)
HAP Requirement (40 CFR 63.5120(a) (2))	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.4.2(e) (i) (A)
Operational and Production Requirement (Section 39.5(7) of the Act)	Applicable Operational Requirement	See the Permit, Condition 4.4.2(f) (i) (A)
Work Practice Requirement (Section 39.5(7) of the Act)	Applicable Work Practice	See the Permit, Condition 4.4.2(g) (i) (A)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Visible Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable opacity standard. If the Permittee does not detect opacity during the Method 22, compliance with the 30% opacity standard can easily be determined, as 0% opacity is less than 30% opacity. If opacity is visible during the Method 22 and continues to be visible after any corrective action, a Method 9 will provide an exact measurement of any opacity. This direct measurement will be used to determine if the source is in compliance with the 30% opacity standard.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Particulate Matter Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- For compliance with 35 IAC 212.324, the Permittee must comply with the applicable monitoring and recordkeeping established under 35 IAC 212.324.
- The records that are required (i.e., the hours of operation for emission units (hours/mo and hours/yr) and the emissions of PM from the emission units (tons/mo and tons/yr) are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the process weight rate (PWR) standards for the equipment. The emissions do not vary significantly from the emission units. Therefore, the emission limit of lb/hr can be determined from the monthly records of the hours of operation and the emissions of PM over that given timeframe.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Sulfur Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for the oven/dryer because:

- The source has a substantial margin of compliance.
- There is a small likelihood of an exceedance.
- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- By definition in 40 CFR 72.2, "pipeline quality" natural gas contains a sulfur content of The sulfur content limitation would result in SO₂ emission less than the limit 2,000 ppm because the properties associated with this combustion process means the sulfur level discharged will not exceed sulfur level input to the dryers. It should also be noted that the source is also required to maintain the type of fuel used, maintain inspection records, and maintain maintenance and repair logs of the

dryers. These records would help the Illinois EPA determine if the dryers are being operated properly and therefore would result in SO₂ being minimized.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Organic Material Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Presumed by rule as the source is subject to a standard promulgated after November 1990 (218.204). This standard contain sufficient periodic monitoring.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.

To determine compliance with 4.3.2, VOM emissions from the coating lines may be calculated based on the following:

VOM (lb) = (Coating/Wax Usage, gal) x (Coating Density, lb/gal) x (VOM Content of Coating, % by Wt.)

Compliance of the coating line with VOM emission limitations in Condition 4.3.2 may be based on the recordkeeping requirements in Condition 4.3.2 and by the use of the formula listed below:

VOM Coating Content = $V \times D / [1 - W \times D]$

Where:

V = Percent VOM in the coating (%)

D = Overall coating density (lb/gal)

$W = \Sigma (w_i/d_i)$

Where:

w_i = Percent exempt compound i in the coating,

d_i = Overall density of exempt compound i, lb/gal and the summation Σ is applied over water

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of HAP Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Presumed by rule as the source is subject to a standard promulgated after November 1990 (NESHAP SSSS). This standard contain sufficient periodic monitoring.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category

To determine compliance with 4.3.2, organic HAP emissions from the coating lines may be calculated based on the following:

HAP (lb) = (Coating/Wax Usage, gal) x (Coating Density, lb/gal) x (HAP Content of Coating, % by Wt.)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Operational and Production Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- The requirement for the source to use pipeline quality natural gas can easily be verified by the requirement to the source to maintain records, such as a statement from the gas supplier.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Work Practice Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- The monthly inspections and records of these inspections will verify that the emission unit is being operated and maintained in a manner which minimizes emissions.

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex non-applicability determinations were not made for this emission unit. All non-applicability discussions can be found in the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

e. Punch Press Department		
Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.123)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.5.2(a)(i)(A)
VOM Requirement (35 IAC 218.301)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.5.2(b)(i)(A)
VOM Requirements (T1's)	Applicable Limits	See the Permit, Conditions 4.5.2(c)(i)(B & C)
Operational and Production Requirements (T1's)	Applicable Operational and Production Requirements	See the Permit, Condition 4.5.2(d)(i)(A-C)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Visible Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance

with the applicable opacity standard. If the Permittee does not detect opacity during the Method 22, compliance with the 30% opacity standard can easily be determined, as 0% opacity is less than 30% opacity. If opacity is visible during the Method 22 and continues to be visible after any corrective action, a Method 9 will provide an exact measurement of any opacity. This direct measurement will be used to determine if the source is in compliance with the 30% opacity standard.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Organic Material Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- The VOM emissions are based off of material usages. Therefore, the requirement for the source to maintain records of the material usages can be used to demonstrate compliance with these applicable VOM limits.
- For compliance with 35 IAC 215.301, with the required records, a calculation can be made to ensure compliance with the applicable VOM limit for the presses. Knowing the usage of each material used combined with the VOM content of each material used, VOM emissions can be found. Usage x VOM content = VOM emissions; with a conservative approach, it can be assumed that all VOM applied is directly emitted therefore ensuring the source is in compliance with the limits. Then, knowing the hours of operation of the emission unit, the VOM emissions can be divided by hours of operation to give VOM emissions (lb or ton) per hour of operation -- giving (lb/hr).

Compliance with emission limits in Condition 4.5.2 may be based on the recordkeeping requirements in Condition 4.5.2 and the formula listed below:

VOM emissions = Vanishing oil usage (gal) x VOM content (lbs/gal) x 1 ton/2,000 lbs.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Operational and Production Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- The requirement for the source to maintain records of the usage of material (vanishing oil) and the VOM content is sufficient to verify compliance with the usage limits. The source is required to have testing data for the VOM content of the vanishing oil(s).

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex non-applicability determinations were not made for this emission unit. All non-applicability discussions can be found in the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

f. Grit Seal Lines		
Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.123)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.6.2(a) (i) (A)
PM Requirement (35 IAC 212.322)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.6.2(b) (i) (A)
PM Requirement (35 IAC 212.324(b))	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.6.2(b) (i) (B)
PM Requirement (T1)	Applicable Limit	See the Permit, Condition 4.6.2(b) (i) (C)
Operational and Production Requirement (T1)	Applicable Limit	See the Permit, Condition 4.6.2(c) (i) (A)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Visible Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable opacity standard. If the Permittee does not detect opacity during the Method 22, compliance with the 30% opacity standard can easily be determined, as 0% opacity is less than 30% opacity. If opacity is visible during the Method 22 and continues to be visible after any corrective action, a Method 9 will provide an exact measurement of any opacity. This direct measurement will be used to determine if the source is in compliance with the 30% opacity standard.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Particulate Matter Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- For compliance with 35 IAC 212.324, the Permittee must comply with the applicable monitoring and recordkeeping established under 35 IAC 212.324.
- The records that are required (i.e., the hours of operation for emission units (hours/mo and hours/yr) and the emissions of PM from the emission units (tons/mo and tons/yr) are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the process weight rate (PWR) standards for the equipment. The emissions do not vary significantly from the emission units. Therefore, the

emission limit of lb/hr can be determined from the monthly records of the hours of operation and the emissions of PM over that given timeframe.

To determine compliance with 4.6.2, emissions of PM from the grit seal lines may be calculated based on the following emission factors:

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/Ton)
PM	15

This is the emission factor for Abrasive Manufacturing Rotary Dryer, Sand Blasting Grit, with Fabric Filter (SCC 30503505), Table 11.31-1, AP-42, Volume I, Fifth Edition, January, 1995. PM emission factor has been corrected to not include the 99.9% control efficiency for a baghouse.

Seal Line Emissions (lb) = (Grit Used, Ton) x (The Appropriate Emission Factor, lb/Ton) x [1 - (Cyclone Efficiency* (%) / 100)]

* As specified by manufacturer or vendor of the cyclones

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Operational and Production Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- The source must maintain records of material usage and hours of operation. Records are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the general operational requirements.

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex non-applicability determinations were not made for this emission unit. All non-applicability discussions can be found in the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

g. Boilers		
Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.123)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.7.2(a) (i) (A)
Operational and Production Requirement (39.5(7) (b) of the Act)	Applicable Operational Requirement	See the Permit, Condition 4.7.2(b) (i) (A)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Visible Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.

- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable opacity standard. If the Permittee does not detect opacity during the Method 22, compliance with the 30% opacity standard can easily be determined, as 0% opacity is less than 30% opacity. If opacity is visible during the Method 22 and continues to be visible after any corrective action, a Method 9 will provide an exact measurement of any opacity. This direct measurement will be used to determine if the source is in compliance with the 30% opacity standard.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Operational and Production Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- The requirement for the source to use pipeline quality natural gas can easily be verified by the requirement to the source to maintain records, such as a statement from the gas supplier.

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex non-applicability determinations were not made for this emission unit. All non-applicability discussions can be found in the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

h. Space Heaters		
Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.123)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.8.2(a)(i)(A)
Operational and Production Requirement (39.5(7)(b) of the Act)	Applicable Operational Requirement	See the Permit, Condition 4.8.2(b)(i)(A)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Visible Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable opacity standard. If the Permittee does not detect opacity during the Method 22, compliance with the 30% opacity standard can easily be determined, as 0% opacity is less than 30% opacity. If opacity is visible during the Method 22 and continues to be visible after

any corrective action, a Method 9 will provide an exact measurement of any opacity. This direct measurement will be used to determine if the source is in compliance with the 30% opacity standard.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Operational and Production Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- The requirement for the source to use pipeline quality natural gas can easily be verified by the requirement to the source to maintain records, such as a statement from the gas supplier.

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex non-applicability determinations were not made for this emission unit. All non-applicability discussions can be found in the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

i. Fugitive PM Emissions		
Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.123)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.9.2(a)(i)(A)
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.316(c))	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.9.2(a)(i)(B)
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.316(f))	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.9.2(a)(i)(C)
Operational and Production Requirement (35 IAC 212.306)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.9.2(c)(i)(A)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Visible Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for these emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable opacity standard. If the Permittee does not detect opacity during the Method 22, compliance with the 30% opacity standard can easily be determined, as 0% opacity is less than 30% opacity. If opacity is visible during the Method 22 and continues to be visible after any corrective action, a Method 9 will provide an exact measurement of any opacity. This direct measurement will be used to determine if the source is in compliance with the 30% opacity standard.

- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable opacity standard. The Permittee must perform observations for roadways in accordance with the specified procedures listed in the permit.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Particulate Matter Emission

See the source-wide justifications/rationale for Condition 3.1(a) of the permit.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Operational and Production Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for the source because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- The Permittee must operate in accordance with the Fugitive PM Operating Plan, which is incorporated by reference into the permit. This Plan is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with this applicable requirement.

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex non-applicability determinations were not made for this emission unit. All non-applicability discussions can be found in the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

j. Iron Phosphate Cleaning Tank		
Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
Opacity Requirement (35 IAC 212.123)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.10.2(a) (i) (A)
PM Requirement (35 IAC 212.321)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.10.2(b) (i) (A)
SO ₂ Requirement (35 IAC 214.301)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.10.2(c) (i) (A)
VOM Requirement (35 IAC 218.301)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 4.10.2(d) (i) (A)
VOM Requirement (T1)	Applicable Limit	See the Permit, Condition 4.10.2(d) (i) (B)
Operational and Production Requirement (39.5(7) (a) of the Act)	Applicable Work Practice	See the Permit, Condition 4.10.2(e) (i) (A)
Operational and Production Requirement (T1's)	Applicable Limits	See the Permit, Conditions 4.10.2(e) (i) (B & C)

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Visible Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- As specified in the permit, observations using Method 22 for the presence of visible emissions once per year, followed by Method 9 measurements if visible emissions are present, is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable opacity standard. If the Permittee does not detect opacity during the Method 22, compliance with the 30% opacity standard can easily be determined, as 0% opacity is less than 30% opacity. If opacity is visible during the Method 22 and continues to be visible after any corrective action, a Method 9 will provide an exact measurement of any opacity. This direct measurement will be used to determine if the source is in compliance with the 30% opacity standard.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Particulate Matter Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- The records that are required (i.e., the hours of operation for emission units (hr/mo and hr/yr) and the emissions of PM from the emission units (T/mo and T/yr) are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the process weight rate (PWR) standards for the equipment. The emissions do not vary significantly from the emission units. Therefore, the emission limit of lb/hr can be determined from the monthly records of the hours of operation and the emissions of PM over that given timeframe.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Sulfur Emissions

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for the natural gas-fired tank heater because:

- The source has a substantial margin of compliance.
- There is a small likelihood of an exceedance.
- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- By definition in 40 CFR 72.2, "pipeline quality" natural gas contains a sulfur content of The sulfur content limitation would result in SO₂ emission less than the limit 2,000 ppm because the properties associated with this combustion process means the sulfur level discharged will not exceed sulfur level input to the dryers. It should also be noted that the source is also required to maintain the type of fuel used, maintain inspection records, and maintain maintenance and repair logs of the dryers. These records would help the Illinois EPA determine if the dryers are being operated properly and therefore would result in SO₂ being minimized.

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Organic Material Emission

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission units because:

- Emissions do not vary significantly under normal operation and/or vary slowly with time.
- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.
- The VOM emissions are based off of material usages. Therefore, the requirement for the source to maintain records of the material usages can be used to demonstrate compliance with these applicable VOM limits.
- For compliance with 35 IAC 215.301, with the required records, a calculation can be made to ensure compliance with the applicable VOM limit for the presses. Knowing the usage of each material used combined with the VOM content of each material used, VOM emissions can be found. Usage x VOM content = VOM emissions; with a conservative approach, it can be assumed that all VOM applied is directly emitted therefore ensuring the source is in compliance with the limits. Then, knowing the hours of operation of the emission unit, the VOM emissions can be divided by hours of operation to give VOM emissions (lb or ton) per hour of operation -- giving (lb/hr).

To determine compliance with 4.10.2, emissions from the phosphate cleaning tank may be calculated based on the following equation and emission factors:

VOM emissions from cleaning operations:

$$\text{VOM (lb)} = (\text{Cleaning Material Usage, lb}) \times (\text{VOM Content of Cleaning Material, \% by Wt.})$$

Rationale/Justification for Periodic Monitoring of Operational and Production Requirements

Periodic Monitoring is sufficient for this emission unit because:

- Source has not exhibited a history of non-compliance.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.

Non-Applicability Discussion

Complex non-applicability determinations were not made for this emission unit. All non-applicability discussions can be found in the Draft CAAPP Permit.

Prompt Reporting Discussion

Prompt reporting of deviations has been established as 30 days. See rationale in Chapter III Section 3.9.

3.8 Insignificant Activities Discussion

Applicable Requirements Summary		
Applicable Requirement	Type	Location
NESHAP Requirement (40 CFR 63 Subpart ZZZZ)	Applicable Standard	See the Permit, Condition 6.1(a)(a)

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP)

- Presumed by rule as the source is subject to a standard promulgated after November 1990.
- Monitoring is consistent with other sources in this source category.

3.9 Prompt Reporting Discussion

Among other terms and conditions, CAAPP Permits contain reporting obligations to assure compliance with applicable requirements. These reporting obligations are generally four-fold. More specifically, each CAAPP Permit sets forth any reporting requirements specified by state or federal law or regulation, requires prompt reports of deviations from applicable requirements, requires reports of deviations from required monitoring and requires a report certifying the status of compliance with terms and conditions of the CAAPP Permit over the calendar year.

The number and frequency of reporting obligations in any CAAPP Permit is source-specific. That is, the reporting obligations are directly related to factors, including the number and type of emission units and applicable requirements, the complexity of the source and the compliance status. This four-fold approach to reporting is common to virtually all CAAPP Permits as described below. Moreover, this is the approach established in the Draft CAAPP Permit for this source.

Regulatory Reports

Many state and federal environmental regulations establish reporting obligations. These obligations vary from rule-to-rule and thus from CAAPP source to CAAPP source and from CAAPP Permit to CAAPP Permit. The variation is found in the report triggering events, reporting period, reporting frequency and reporting content. Regardless, the CAAPP makes clear that all reports established under applicable regulations shall be carried forward into the CAAPP Permit as stated in Section 39.5(7)(b) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act. Generally, where sufficiently detailed to meet the exacting standards of the CAAPP, the regulatory reporting requirements are simply restated in the CAAPP Permit. Depending on the regulatory obligations, these regulatory reports may also constitute a deviation report as described below.

The Draft CAAPP Permit for this source would embody all regulatory reporting as promulgated under federal and state regulations under the Clean Air Act and the Illinois Environmental Protection Act. Depending on the frequency of the report, the regulatory report may also satisfy the prompt reporting obligations discussed below. These reports must be certified by a responsible official.

These reports are generally found in the reporting sections for each emission unit group. The various regulatory reporting requirements are summarized in the table at the end of this Reporting Section.

Deviation Reports (Prompt Reporting)

Section 39.5(7)(f)(ii) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act mandates that each CAAPP Permit require prompt reporting of deviations from the permit requirements.

Neither the CAAPP nor the federal rules upon which the CAAPP is based and was approved by USEPA define the term "prompt". Rather, 40 CFR Part 70.6(a)(3)(iii)(B) intended that the term have flexibility in application. The USEPA has acknowledged for purposes of administrative efficiency and clarity that the permitting authority (in this case, Illinois EPA) has the discretion to define "prompt" in relation to the degree and type of deviation likely to occur at a particular source. The Illinois EPA follows this approach and defines prompt reporting on a permit-by-permit basis. In instances where the underlying applicable requirement contains "prompt" reporting, the Illinois EPA typically incorporates the pre-established timeframe in the CAAPP permit (e.g. a NESHAP or NSPS deviation report). Where the underlying applicable requirement fails to explicitly set forth the timeframe for reporting deviations, the Illinois EPA generally uses a timeframe of 30 days to define prompt reporting of deviations.

This approach to prompt reporting of deviations as discussed herein is consistent with the requirements of Section 39.5(7)(f)(ii) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act as well as 40 CFR Part 70 and the CAA. The reporting arrangement is designed so that the source will appropriately notify the Illinois EPA of those events that might warrant attention. The timing for these event-specific notifications is necessary and appropriate as it gives the source enough time to conduct a thorough investigation into the causes of an event, collecting any necessary data, and developing preventive measures, to reduce the likelihood of similar events, all of which must be addressed in the notification for the deviation, while at the same time affording regulatory authority and the public timely and relevant information. The approach also affords the Illinois EPA and USEPA an opportunity to direct investigation and follow-up activities, and to make compliance and enforcement decisions in a timely fashion.

The Draft CAAPP Permit for this source would require prompt reporting as required by the Illinois Environmental Protection Act in the fashion described in this subsection. In addition, pursuant to Section 39.5(7)(f)(i) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, this Draft CAAPP Permit would also require the source to provide a summary of all deviations with the Semi-Annual Monitoring Report. These reports must be certified by a responsible official, and are generally found in the reporting sections for each emission unit group.

Semi-Annual Monitoring Reports

Section 39.5(7)(f)(i) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act mandates that each CAAPP Permit require a report relative to monitoring obligations as set forth in the permit. Depending upon the monitoring obligation at issue, the semi-annual monitoring report may also constitute a deviation report as previously discussed. This monitoring at issue includes instrumental and non-instrumental emissions monitoring, emissions analyses, and emissions testing established by state or federal laws or regulations or as established in the CAAPP Permit. This monitoring also includes recordkeeping. Each deviation from each monitoring requirement must be identified in the relevant semi-annual report. These reports provide a timely opportunity to assess for compliance patterns of concern. The semi-annual reports shall be submitted regardless of any deviation events. Reporting periods for semi-annual monitoring reports are January 1 through June 30 and July 1 through December 31 of each calendar year. Each semi-annual report is due within 30 days after the close of reporting period. The reports shall be certified by a responsible official. The Draft CAAPP Permit for this source would require such reports at Condition 3.5(b).

Annual Compliance Certifications

Section 39.5(7)(p)(v) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act mandates that each CAAPP Permit require a source to submit a certification of its compliance status with each term and condition of its CAAPP Permit. The reports afford a broad assessment of a CAAPP sources compliance status. The CAAPP requires that this report be submitted, regardless of compliance status, on an annual basis. Each CAAPP Permit requires this annual certification be submitted by May 1 of the year immediately following the calendar year reporting period. The report shall be certified by a responsible official. The Draft CAAPP Permit for this source would require such a report at Condition 2.6(a).

Prompt reporting of deviations is critical in order to have timely notice of deviations and the opportunity to respond, if necessary. The effectiveness of the permit depends upon, among other important elements, timely and accurate reporting. The Illinois EPA, USEPA, and the public rely on timely and accurate reports submitted by the source to measure compliance and to direct investigation and follow-up activities. Prompt reporting is evidence of the source's good faith in disclosing deviations and describing the steps taken to return to compliance and prevent similar incidents.

Any occurrence that results in an excursion from any emission limitation, operating condition, or work practice standard as specified in this Draft CAAPP Permit is a deviation subject to prompt reporting. Additionally, any failure to comply with any permit term or condition is a deviation of that permit term or condition and must be reported to the Illinois EPA as a permit deviation. The deviation may or may not be a violation of an emission limitation or standard. A permit deviation can exist even though other indicators of compliance suggest that no emissions violation or exceedance has occurred. Reporting permit deviations does not necessarily result in enforcement action. The Illinois EPA has the discretion to take enforcement action for permit deviations that may or may not constitute a deviation from an emission limitation or standard or the like, as necessary and appropriate.

As a result, the Illinois EPA's approach to prompt reporting of deviations as discussed herein is consistent with the requirements of Section 39.5(7)(f)(ii) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act as well as 40 CFR Part 70 and the CAA. This reporting arrangement is designed so that the source will appropriately notify the Illinois EPA of those events that might warrant individual attention.

3.10 Emissions Reduction Market System (ERMS)

The Emissions Reduction Market System (ERMS) is a "cap and trade" market system for major stationary sources located in the Chicago ozone nonattainment area. It is designed to reduce VOM emissions from stationary sources to contribute to reasonable further progress toward attainment, as required by Section 182(c) of the CAA.

The ERMS addresses VOM emissions during a seasonal allotment period from May 1 through September 30. Participating sources must hold "allotment trading units" (ATUs) for their actual seasonal VOM emissions. Each year participating sources are issued ATUs based on allotments set in the sources' CAAPP permits. These allotments are established from historical VOM emissions or "baseline emissions" lowered to provide the emissions reductions from stationary sources required for reasonable further progress.

By December 31 of each year, the end of the reconciliation period following the seasonal allotment period, each source shall have sufficient ATUs in its transaction account to cover its actual VOM emissions during the preceding season. A transaction account's balance as of December 31 will include any valid ATU transfer agreements entered into as of December 31 of the given year, provided such agreements are promptly submitted to the Illinois EPA for entry into the transaction account database. The Illinois EPA will then retire ATUs in sources' transaction accounts in amounts equivalent to their seasonal emissions. When a source does not appear to have sufficient ATUs in its transaction account, the Illinois EPA will issue a notice to the source to begin the process for Emissions Excursion Compensation.

In addition to receiving ATUs pursuant to their allotments, participating sources may also obtain ATUs from the market, including ATUs bought from other participating sources and general participants in the ERMS that hold ATUs (35 IAC 205.630) and ATUs issued by the Illinois EPA as a consequence of VOM emissions reductions from an Emissions Reduction Generator or an Intersector Transaction (35 IAC 205.500 and 35 IAC 205.510). During the reconciliation period, sources may also buy ATUs from a secondary reserve of ATUs managed by the Illinois EPA, the "Alternative Compliance Market Account" (ACMA) (35 IAC 205.710). Sources may also transfer or sell the ATUs that they hold to other sources or participants (35 IAC 205.630).

3.11 Incorporation by Reference Discussion

Based on guidance found in White Paper 2 and past petition responses by the Administrator, it is recognized that Title V permit authorities may, within their discretion, incorporate plans by reference. As recognized in the *White Paper 2*, permit authorities can effectively streamline the contents of a Title V permit, avoiding the inevitable clutter of restated text and preventing unnecessary delays where, as here, permit issuance is subject to a decision deadline.⁴ However, it is also recognized that the benefits of incorporation of plans must be carefully balanced by a permit authority with its duty to issue permits in a way that is "clear and meaningful" to the Permittee and the public.⁵

The criteria that are mentioned in USEPA Administrator Petition Responses stress the importance of identifying, *with specificity*, the object of the incorporation.⁶ The Illinois EPA agrees that such emphasis is generally consistent with USEPA's pronouncements in previous guidance.

For each condition incorporating a plan, the Illinois EPA is also briefly describing the general manner in which the plan applies to the source. Identifying the nature of the source activity, the regulatory requirements or the nature of the equipment associated with the plan is a recommendation of the *White Paper 2*⁷. The Illinois EPA has stopped short of enumerating the actual contents of a plan, as restating them in the permit would plainly defeat the purpose of incorporating the document by reference and be contrary to USEPA guidance on the subject.⁸

Plans may need to be revised from time to time, as occasionally required by circumstance or by underlying rule or permit requirement. Except where expressly precluded by the relevant rules, this Draft CAAPP Permit allows the Permittee to make future changes to a plan without undergoing formal permit revision procedures. This approach will allow flexibility to make required changes to a plan without separately applying for a revised permit and,

similarly, will lessen the impacts that could result for the Illinois EPA if every change to a plan's contents required a permitting transaction.⁹ Changes to the incorporated plans during the permit term are automatically incorporated into the Draft CAAPP Permit unless the Illinois EPA expresses a written objection. The exception to this practice is the PM₁₀ Contingency Measure Plan, for which a permit revision is needed for any changes to the plan.¹⁰

The Draft CAAPP Permit incorporates by reference the following plans: Fugitive Particulate Matter Operating Program and PM₁₀ Contingency Plan.¹¹

3.12 Periodic Monitoring General Discussions

Pursuant to Section 504(c) of the Clean Air Act, a Title V permit must set forth monitoring requirements, commonly referred to as "Periodic Monitoring", to assure compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit. A general discussion of Periodic Monitoring is provided below. The Periodic Monitoring that is proposed for specific operations and emission units and at this source is discussed in Chapter III of this Statement of Basis. Chapter III provides a narrative discussion of and justification for the elements of Periodic Monitoring that would apply to the different emission units and types of emission units at the facility.

As a general matter, the required content of a CAAPP Permit with respect to such Periodic Monitoring is addressed in Section 39.5(7) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act.¹² Section 39.5(7)(b) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act¹³ provides that in a CAAPP Permit:

The Agency shall include among such conditions applicable monitoring, reporting, record keeping and compliance certification requirements, as authorized by paragraphs d, e, and f of this subsection, that the Agency deems necessary to assure compliance with the Clean Air Act, the regulations promulgated thereunder, this Act, and applicable Board regulations. When monitoring, reporting, record keeping and compliance certification requirements are specified within the Clean Air Act, regulations promulgated thereunder, this Act, or applicable regulations, such requirements shall be included within the CAAPP Permit.

Section 39.5(7)(d)(ii) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act further provides that a CAAPP Permit shall:

Where the applicable requirement does not require periodic testing or instrumental or noninstrumental monitoring (which may consist of recordkeeping designed to serve as monitoring), require Periodic Monitoring sufficient to yield reliable data from the relevant time period that is representative of the source's compliance with the permit
...

Accordingly, the scope of the Periodic Monitoring that must be included in a CAAPP Permit is not restricted to monitoring requirements that were adopted through rulemaking or imposed through permitting. When applicable regulatory emission standards and control requirements or limits and control requirement in relevant Title 1 permits are not accompanied by compliance procedures, it is necessary for Monitoring for these standards, requirements or limits to be established in a CAAPP Permit.^{14, 15} Monitoring requirements must also be established when standards and control requirement are accompanied by compliance procedures but those procedures are not adequate to assure compliance with the applicable standards or requirements.^{16, 17} For this

purpose, the requirements for Periodic Monitoring in a CAAPP Permit may include requirements for emission testing, emissions monitoring, operational monitoring, non-instrumental monitoring, and recordkeeping for each emission unit or group of similar units at a facility, as required by rule or permit, as appropriate or as needed to assure compliance with the applicable substantive requirements. Various combinations of monitoring measures will be appropriate for different emission units depending on their circumstances, including the substantive emission standards, limitations and control requirements to which they are subject.

What constitutes sufficient Periodic Monitoring for particular emission units, including the timing or frequency associated with such Monitoring requirements, must be determined by the permitting authority based on its knowledge, experience and judgment.¹⁸ For example, as Periodic Monitoring must collect representative data, the timing of Monitoring requirements need not match the averaging time or compliance period of the associated substantive requirements, as set by the relevant regulations and permit provisions. The timing of the various requirements making up the Periodic Monitoring for an emission unit is something that must be considered when those Monitoring requirements are being established. For this purpose, Periodic Monitoring often consists of requirements that apply on a regular basis, such as routine recordkeeping for the operation of control devices or the implementation of the control practices for an emission unit. For certain units, this regular monitoring may entail "continuous" monitoring of emissions, opacity or key operating parameters of a process or its associated control equipment, with direct measurement and automatic recording of the selected parameter(s). As it is infeasible or impractical to require emissions monitoring for most emission units, instrumental monitoring is more commonly conducted for the operating parameters of an emission unit or its associated control equipment. Monitoring for operating parameter(s) serves to confirm proper operation of equipment, consistent with operation to comply with applicable emission standards and limits. In certain cases, an applicable rule may directly specify that a particular level of an operating parameter be maintained, consistent with the manner in which a unit was being operated during emission testing. Periodic Monitoring may also consist of requirements that apply on a periodic basis, such as inspections to verify the proper functioning of an emission unit and its associated controls.

The Periodic Monitoring for an emission unit may also include measures, such as emission testing, that would only be required once or only upon specific request by the Illinois EPA. These requirements would always be accompanied by Monitoring requirements would apply on a regular basis. When emission testing or other measure is only required upon request by the Illinois EPA, it is included as part of the Periodic Monitoring for an emission unit to facilitate a response by the Illinois EPA to circumstances that were not contemplated when Monitoring was being established, such as the handling of a new material or a new mode of operation. Such Monitoring would also serve to provide further verification of compliance, along with other potentially useful information. As emission testing provides a quantitative determination of compliance, it would also provide a determination of the margin of compliance with the applicable limit(s) and serve to confirm that the Monitoring required for an emission unit on a regular basis is reliable and appropriate. Such testing might also identify specific values of operating parameters of a unit or its associated control equipment that accompany compliance and can be relied upon as part of regular Monitoring.

There are a number of considerations or factors that are or may be relevant when evaluating the need to establish new monitoring requirements as part of the Periodic Monitoring for an emission unit. These factors include: (1) The nature of the emission unit or process and its emissions; (2) The variability in the operation and the emissions of the unit or process over time; (3) The use of add-on air pollution control equipment or other practices to control emissions and comply with the applicable substantive requirement(s); (4) The nature of that control equipment or those control practices and the potential for variability in their effectiveness; (5) The nature of the applicable substantive requirement(s) for which Periodic Monitoring is needed; (6) The nature of the compliance procedures that specifically accompany the applicable requirements; (7) The type of data that would already be available for the unit; (8) The effort needed to comply with the applicable requirements and the expected margin of compliance; (9) The likelihood of a violation of applicable requirements; (10) The nature of the Periodic Monitoring that may be readily implemented for the emission unit; (11) The extent to which such Periodic Monitoring would directly address the applicable requirements; (12) The nature of Periodic Monitoring commonly required for similar emission units at other facilities and in similar circumstances; (13) The interaction or relationship between the different measures in the Periodic Monitoring for an emission unit; and (14) The feasibility and reasonableness of requiring additional measures in the Periodic Monitoring for an emission unit in light of other relevant considerations.¹⁹

CHAPTER IV – CHANGES FROM PREVIOUSLY ISSUED CAAPP PERMITS

4.1 Major Changes Summary

This renewal CAAPP draft is presented in a new format. The new format is the result of recommendations by the USEPA, comments made by sources, and interactions with the public.

	<i>Previous CAAPP Permit Layout</i>	<i>New CAAPP Permit Layout</i>
Section 1	Source Identification	Source Information
Section 2	List Of Abbreviations/Acronyms	General Permit Requirements
Section 3	Insignificant Activities	Source Requirements
Section 4	Significant Emission Units	Emission Unit Requirements
Section 5	Overall Source Conditions	Title I Requirements
Section 6	Emission Control Programs	Insignificant Activities
Section 7	Unit Specific Conditions	Other Requirements
Section 8	General Permit Conditions	State Only Requirements
Section 9	Standard Permit Conditions	---
Section 10	Attachments	Attachments

Endnotes

¹ The federal PSD program, 40 CFR 52.21, applies in Illinois. The Illinois EPA administers PSD permitting for major projects in Illinois pursuant to a delegation agreement with USEPA.

² Illinois has a state nonattainment NSR program, pursuant to state rules, Major Stationary Sources Construction and Modification ("MSSCM"), 35 IAC Part 203, which have been approved by USEPA as part of the State Implementation Plan for Illinois.

³ The incorporation, or carry-over, of terms or conditions from previous Title I permits into Title V permits typically does not occur on a wholesale basis. Recognizing that construction permits may frequently contain obsolete or extraneous terms and conditions, USEPA has emphasized that only "environmentally significant terms" from previous preconstruction permits must be carried over into Title V permits. See, White Paper for Streamlined Development of Part 70 Permit Applications, dated July 10, 1995. Therefore, certain T1 terms and conditions have not been carried over from these SIP approved permits for reasons that are explained below.

⁴ Among other things, USEPA observed that the stream-lining benefits can consist of "reduced cost and administrative complexity, and continued compliance flexibility...". *White Paper 2*, page 41.

⁵ See, In the Matter of Tesoro Refining and Marketing, Petition No. IX-2004-6, Order Denying in Part and Granting in Part Petition for Objection to Permit, at page 8 (March 15, 2005); see also, White Paper 2 at page 39 ("reference must be detailed enough that the manner in which any referenced materials applies to a facility is clear and is not reasonably subject to misinterpretation").

⁶ The Order provides that permit authorities must ensure the following: "(1) referenced documents be specifically identified; (2) descriptive information such as the title or number of the document and the date of the document be included so that there is no ambiguity as to which version of the document is being referenced; and (3) citations, cross references, and incorporations by reference are detailed enough that the manner in which any referenced material applies to a facility is clear and is not reasonably subject to misinterpretation." See, Petition Response at page 43, citing White Paper 2 at page 37.

⁷ See, White Paper 2 at page 39.

⁸ Nothing in USEPA guidance, including the White Paper 2 or previous orders responding to public petitions, supports the notion that permit authorities incorporating a document by reference must also restate contents of a given plan in the body of the Title V permit. Such an interpretation contradicts USEPA recognition that permit authorities need not restate or recite an incorporated document so long as the document is sufficiently described. White Paper 2 at page 39; see also, In the matter of Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 74th St. Station, Petition No. II-2001-02, Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Petition for Objection to Permit at page 16 (February 19, 2003).

⁹ This approach is consistent with USEPA guidance, which has previously embraced a similar approach to certain SSM plans. See, Letter and Enclosures,

dated May 20, 1999, from John Seitz, Director of Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, to Robert Hodanbosi and Charles Lagges, STAPPA/ALAPCO, pages 9-10 of Enclosure B.

¹⁰ The PM₁₀ Contingency Measure Plan is not being provided the same flexibility with respect to revising the plan's contents, as the underlying SIP rule treats the contents of the plan as federally enforceable. Any future revisions to this plan during the permit term are required to undergo procedures for permit modification. See, Condition 5.3.3(d).

¹¹ Each incorporated plan addressed by this Section of the Statement of Basis is part of the source's permit file. As such, these plans are available to any person interested in viewing the contents of a given plan may do so at the public repository during the comment period or, alternatively, may request a copy of the same from the Illinois EPA under the Freedom of Information Act. See also 71 FR 20447.

¹² The provisions of the Act for Periodic Monitoring in CAAPP permits reflect parallel requirements in the federal guidelines for State Operating Permit Programs, 40 CFR 70.6(a)(3)(i)(A), (a)(3)(i)(B), and (c)(1).

¹³ Section 39.5(7)(p)(i) of the Act also provides that a CAAPP permit shall contain "Compliance certification, testing, monitoring, reporting and record keeping requirements sufficient to assure compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit."

¹⁴ The classic example of regulatory standards for which Periodic Monitoring requirements must be established in a CAAPP permit are state emission standards that pre-date the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments that were adopted without any associated compliance procedures. Periodic Monitoring must also be established in a CAAPP permit when standards and limits are accompanied by compliance procedures but those procedures are determined to be inadequate to assure compliance with the applicable standards or limits.

¹⁵ Another example of emission standards for which requirements must be established as part of Periodic Monitoring is certain NSPS standards that require initial performance testing but do not require periodic testing or other measures to address compliance with the applicable limits on a continuing basis.

¹⁶ The need to establish Monitoring requirements as part of Periodic Monitoring when existing compliance procedures are determined to be inadequate, as well as when they are absent, was confirmed by the federal appeals court in *Sierra Club v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 536 F.3d 673, 383 U.S. App. D.C. 109.

¹⁷ The need to establish Monitoring requirements as part of Periodic Monitoring is also confirmed in USEPA's Petition Response. USEPA explains that "...if there is periodic monitoring in the applicable requirements, but that monitoring is not sufficient to assure compliance with permit terms and conditions, permitting authorities must supplement monitoring to assure such compliance." Petition Response, page 6.

¹⁸ The test for the adequacy of "Periodic Monitoring" is a context-specific determination, particularly whether the provisions in a Title V permit

reasonably address compliance with relevant substantive permit conditions. 40 CFR 70.6(c)(1); see also 40 CFR 70.6(a)(3)(i)(B); see also, *In the Matter of CITGO Refinery and Chemicals Company L.P.*, Petition VI-2007-01 (May 28, 2009); see also, *In the Matter of Waste Management of LA. L.L.C. Woodside Sanitary Landfill & Recycling Center, Walker, Livingston Parish, Louisiana*, Petition VI-2009-01 (May 27, 2010); see also, *In the Matter of Wisconsin Public Service Corporation's JP Pulliam Power Plant*, Petition V-2009-01 (June 28, 2010).

¹⁹ A number of these factors are specifically listed by USEPA in its Petition Response. USEPA also observes that the specific factors that it identifies in its Petition Response with respect to Periodic Monitoring provide "...the permitting authority with a starting point for its analysis of the adequacy of the monitoring; the permitting authority also may consider other site-specific factors." Petition Response, page 7.