

Filename: S:\wp11\PERMITS\Permit.V\AECC\V20640.tsd1.wpd  
From: Barbara Cenalmor  
Date: February 1, 2010

**Technical Support Document  
Title V Permit Renewal  
Arizona Environmental Container Corporation  
Permit #V20640.000**

<b>1.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Applicant	2
1.2	Attainment Classification	2
1.3	Permitting History	2
1.4	Compliance/Enforcement History	2
<b>2.</b>	<b>PROCESS DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>EMISSIONS</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	General Methodology	3
3.1.1.	Emission Factors	4
3.2	Potential and “Typical” Emissions	4
3.2.1	VOCs/HAPs	4
3.2.2	PM10	4
3.2.3	Gas-fired Heater emissions	5
<b>4.</b>	<b>REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND MONITORING</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	TITLE V/PSD Applicability	5
4.2	Regulatory Emission Limitations	5
4.2.1	Opacity and Reasonable Precautions	5
4.3	NSPS/NESHAP Applicability	5
4.4	Non-Applicable Requirements	6
4.4.1	Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM)	6
4.4.2	Arizona HAPs Rule	6
<b>5.</b>	<b>AMBIENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>6</b>
5.1	VOCs	6
5.2	HAPs/AAAQGs	6
<b>6.</b>	<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>6</b>

# 1. BACKGROUND

## 1.1 Applicant/Application History

This is a permit renewal for a facility that manufactures fiberglass swimming pools and spas, which is owned and operated by Arizona Environmental Container Corporation (“AECC”), an Arizona corporation. The facility is located at 850 N. Davidson Boulevard, Eloy, Arizona, upon parcels also identified by Pinal County Assessor numbers 408-02-008G-8 and 408-02-026. The SIC Code is 3089.

This technical support document only summarizes any permitting actions up to this permit renewal. Additional information may be found in the Technical Support Documents for previous versions of this permit.

This analysis reflects consideration of (at least) the following:

- Renewal application received on 1/7/2010, signed by Kirk Sullivan, Owner/President.

## 1.2 Attainment Classification

This facility is located in an area designated as “attainment” for all pollutants.

## 1.3 Permitting History

The following is a list of permits applied for and/or issued since this facility’s initial permit.

Permit	Date Issued	Type	Description
V20612.000	3/23/2000	Title V	Initial Title V permit
V20612.R01	10/20/02	Significant Revision	Removes no longer applicable requirement: 40# rule
V20612.R02	1/20/05	Significant Revision	Incorporates applicable requirements of 40 CFR 63, Subpart WWWW
V20623.000	9/23/05	Renewal	Authorizes new building for mold construction/repair

## 1.4 Compliance/Enforcement History

Inspections are regularly conducted at this facility to ensure compliance with its applicable permit conditions. AECC is currently in compliance with the permit conditions cited in permit V20623.000. The facility is inspected every fiscal year and the following inspection will take place before July, 2010. The following table summarizes the recent inspections that have been conducted on the source in the last 5 years:

Inspection Date	Type of Inspection	Results
1/14/09	Annual compliance	In compliance
3/12/08	Annual compliance	In compliance

3/1/07	Annual compliance	In compliance
4/11/06	Annual compliance	In compliance
2/11/05	Annual compliance	In compliance

## 2. PROCESS DESCRIPTION

Arizona Environmental Container produces fiberglass swimming pools and spas, as well as similar products like aquaculture tanks, outdoor horse training water pools, cisterns, etc.... The facility consists of a main building with 8 bays for manufacturing fiberglass pools and spas using a lay-up process that incorporates applying glass fiber and resin using spray guns. An adjacent building contains 2 more bays for mold construction and repair.

In the manufacturing operation, a gel coat is applied to a waxed mold with a gel coat spray gun system. The spray gun system mixes the gel coat with a catalyst as the material is applied. The gel coat typically contains a mixture of styrene and methylmethacrylate ("MMA"). This gel coat surface will become the pool surface. A fiberglass mat is manually applied by hand over the gel coated mold surface, and resin is applied to the fiber glass mat with a resin spray gun system.

Due to the operating environment for the permittee's products, the resin utilized qualifies as "corrosion resistant." While corrosion resistant resin offers superior longevity when exposed to sunlight and the various chemicals utilized in a swimming pool environment, corrosion resistant resin also produces relatively higher emissions of styrene than do other resins.

After sufficient layers of resin coated mat are applied to the mold, hand rollers are used to force the resin into the mat, eliminating air bubbles and dry spots and tightly laminating the composite structure. Additional layers of resin coated mat are applied as needed to achieve the required thickness, determined by the structural requirements for a specific pool. The resin infused material is allowed to polymerize and harden. Miscellaneous styrene-containing putties and fillers may be used to touch up the pool either in the laminating area or during final assembly.

After the final coat or resin has formed a hardened coat, the mold and pool assembly is moved outside to complete the curing process.

When fully solidified, compressed air is fed between the pool and the mold to remove the pool from the mold. The mold may require minor cleaning or repair ("mold care") and a mold release agent is applied to facilitate removal of the next built-up part from the mold. The pool edges are trimmed by hand powered tools equipped with collectors; the trimmed material is discarded. The trimming operation results in large fragments and particles too large to become airborne and result in fugitive emissions. Grinding of surface imperfections will be performed by hand tools equipped with vacuum-bag collectors. Smaller particulates generated both inside and outside the building will be controlled by the vacuum bag collectors in the hand tools, by portable "shop-vac" vacuum collectors as needed and normal "good housekeeping" procedures. Holes are cut as needed in the pool to accommodate drain and filter lines and other items installed in the final assembly process. After passing a final quality control inspection, the pool is prepared for shipping.

Eight separate bays allow for independent manufacturing operations in each separate bay. Production may occur on a continuous basis, 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, 52 weeks per year, which equals 8760 hours per year. The facility has four exhaust fan systems, each servicing a "block" of two layup bays.

## 3. EMISSIONS

### 3.1 General Methodology

The principal emissions from the facility will include volatile organic compounds generally, and

styrene and MMA specifically. Solvents, namely acetone or an aqueous compound, are used to flush and clean hose lines and equipment. Emissions of particulate matter are incidental in nature. Although natural-gas fired heating units will produce nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide and sulfur dioxide, none of those emissions trigger meaningful regulatory consequence.

### 3.1.1. Emission Factors

For purposes of calculating HAP (and VOC) emissions from the resins and gelcoats involved in this operation, emission factors for nonatomized mechanical/spray applications from Table 1 from 40 CFR Part 63 Subpart WWWW were used. Since the HAPs calculated (styrene and MMA) are also VOC, these calculations were also used to estimate the Potential to Emit of this facility. For any other organic compounds used (solvents, thinners, waxes, mold cleaners...), it is assumed that all VOCs evaporate.

$$\text{Gelcoat EF} = ((0.4506\% \text{HAPs}) - 0.0505) * 2000 \text{ [lb/ton gelcoat used]}^1$$

$$\text{Resin EF} = ((0.157\% \text{HAPs}) - 0.0165) * 2000 \text{ [lb/ton resin used]}^2$$

## 3.2 Potential and “Typical” Emissions

### 3.2.1 VOCs/HAPs

Permittee submitted calculations for potential emissions with this permit renewal, assuming 6 days of operation per week. The table below reflects emissions assuming operations for 7 days per week<sup>3</sup>. In addition, the table includes emissions from anticipated “typical” production rates.

Potential emissions are based on the manufacture of 1 large pool per bay, 8 bays, 7 days per week, 52 weeks per year.

	VOC/HAP POTENTIAL Emissions (TPY)	VOC/HAP “TYPICAL” Emissions (TPY)
Gelcoat	50.51	5.78
Resin	141.91	16.25
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>192.52</b>	<b>22.03</b>

### 3.2.2 PM10

An estimated 0.25 tons per year of PM10 particulates will be emitted from the grinding process. This assumes 0.5 inch of material is ground from the edge of each pool produced and 50 percent falls within the PM10 range.

---

<sup>1</sup>From 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart WWWW, Table 1 for “Open Molding Operation” using “Nonatomized spray gel coat application” with “ nonvapor suppressed gel coat.”

<sup>2</sup>From 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart WWWW, Table 1 for “Open Molding Operation” using “Nonatomized mechanical resin application” with “ nonvapor suppressed resin”.

<sup>3</sup>PTE for VOCs is higher than estimated during the previous renewal V20623.000. Such renewal based potential emissions on 2004 product use and was calculating breaking down product use. The estimate included in this permit application for V20640.000 uses an average HAP% for resins and an average for HAP% for gel coats and does not break down the use of each different resin and gelcoat.

An estimated 3.3 tons per year of PM10 particulates will be emitted from the buffing operation. This assumes 1.0 mil of material is removed from the entire surface produced and 50 percent falls within the PM10 range.

3.2.3 Gas-fired Heater emissions.

The permit application for this facility indicates that the gas-fired make-up-air heaters will only use a "small quantity" of natural gas. The permit imposes a limit on the aggregate heat input capacity for all natural-gas fired equipment, which caps maximum emissions of products-of-combustion as follows:

•	CO	1.0 tpy
•	NO <sub>x</sub>	4.4 tpy
•	SO <sub>x</sub>	0.0 tpy
•	PM <sub>10</sub>	0.0 tpy

**4. REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND MONITORING**

4.1 TITLE V/PSD Applicability

This facility constitutes a "major source" of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) and requires a permit pursuant to Title V of the CAA Amendments of 1990.

Even without limitations, the source does not constitute a "major emitting source" for VOCs within the meaning of 40 CFR §51.166, and is not required to go through a Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) review.

4.2 Regulatory Emission Limitations and Compliance/Monitoring

4.2.1 Opacity and Reasonable Precautions

While the federally enforceable opacity limitation is 40%, there is a locally enforceable 20% opacity limitation that applies to point sources not already regulated by a new source performance standard.

At this facility, the 20% limitation would apply to the fuel burning and trimming/finishing operations since they are not regulated by any other standard. To monitor for compliance with this standard, the permit requires semi-annual opacity "screenings", and required Method 9 opacity tests only when visible emissions are observed. These screenings are also required for open-area fugitive sources.

Also, the permit requires weekly filter inspections.

The Reasonable Precautions requirements apply to any operations that generate particulate matter, whether during production, or in the storage yard from vehicle traffic or actual storage.

4.3 NSPS/NESHAP Applicability

40 CFR Part 63 Subpart WWWW, Reinforced Plastics MACT

This facility is a major source of HAPs and subject to the Reinforced Plastic Composites MACT standard. MACT requirements included in the current permit are a combination of requirements from a "case-by-case" MACT established by PCAQCD for the original Title V permit, and requirements from the promulgated MACT standard which have been incorporated into the permit

during revisions. Additional information on the “case-by-case” MACT can be found in the Technical Support Document for permit V20612.000, and information on other requirements can also be found in the TSDs for revisions V20612.R01 and .R02.

The four compliance options in this MACT standard allow the permittee to demonstrate compliance by simply meeting the organic HAP emission limits of Table 3 of the subpart, whether it is done by averaging, or by meeting the HAP contents product by product.

The MACT standard provides more flexible compliance limits for corrosion-resistant/ high-strength (CR/HS) and high performance gel coats and resins. These resins and gel coats are specifically defined in 40 CFR §63.5935. The permit requires that Permittee keep supporting evidence that the resins and gel coats are CR/HS and/or high performance. The evidence needs to show that these products comply with the definitions in §63.5935.

#### 4.4 Non-Applicable Requirements

##### 4.4.1 Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM)

The requirements of 40 CFR 64, Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM), are not applicable since AECC does not use a control device to achieve compliance with any emission limitation or standard for a pollutant for which the source has potential pre-control device emissions greater than or equal to major source levels for that pollutant.

##### 4.4.2 Arizona HAPs Rule

The Arizona HAPs rule was promulgated in 2006 and it became effective as of January 2007. It includes standards for new and modified sources of HAPs, as of 1/07. It does not apply to major sources already subject to a NESHAP or MACt standard.

### 5. AMBIENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT

#### 5.1 VOCs

No VOC impact analysis has been conducted since the potential to emit from this facility does not trigger any modeling requirements (PSD).

#### 5.2 HAPs/AAAQGs (conducted during the 2005 renewal)

A SCREEN3 analysis shows that the worst-case scenario of 225.15 tons per year styrene (this total includes other HAPs which are not styrene) will result in an impact of 1310  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . This falls well below the 1-hr Arizona Ambient Air Quality Guideline of 3500  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .

### 6. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADS	Agglomerative Dust Suppression
AP-42	“Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume 1: Stationary Point and Area Sources”, 5 <sup>th</sup> Edition
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAM	Compliance Assurance Monitoring
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon Monoxide
hr	Hour
lb	Pound
MACT	Maximum Achievable Control Technology
MMBTU	Million British Thermal Units

Mod. .... Modification  
MSDS .... Material Safety Data Sheet  
NOX .... Nitrogen Oxides  
NSPS .... New Source Performance Standard  
NSR .... New Source Review  
PCAQCD .... Pinal County Air Quality Control District  
PGCAQCD .... Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District  
PM10 .... Particulate Matter nominally less than 10 Micrometers  
PSD .... Prevention of Significant Deterioration  
SIC .... Standard Industrial Code  
SOX .... Sulfur Dioxide  
tpy .... tons per year  
TSD .... Technical Support Document  
VOC .... Volatile Organic Compound  
yr .... year