



## PETITION

On September 22, 1998, Transwheel Corporation (Petitioner), located at 3000 Yeoman Way in Huntington, Indiana 46750, the owner/operator of an aluminum wheel reprocessing plant subject to 326 IAC 8-3-5, requested to be allowed to equip their degreaser with an oil cover, rather than a water cover, as a control device. The Petitioner believes an oil cover is an equivalent control device as provided in 326 IAC 8-3-5 (a) (5) (C). The Petitioner's degreaser is part of their surface coating and dip tank operation, which is required to limit the potential to emit VOC to less than 15 pounds per day. Accepting the Petitioner's request will not impact VOC emissions.

Upon review of the proposed revision Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) revised the Petitioner's existing permit, but also issued a letter and a notice of deficiency (NOD) to the Petitioner on October 31, 2000. The NOD stated the proposed revision constituted a Site-Specific Significant Permit Revision, and the Petitioner needed to provide information pursuant to 326 IAC 8-1-5. Approval to use an equivalent emission control device, under 326 IAC 8-3-5 (a) (5) (C), must be submitted to U.S. EPA as a state implementation plan (SIP) revision.

Therefore, the Petitioner requests that an oil cover be deemed an equivalent control device when the solvent used in the cold cleaner degreaser is miscible with water pursuant to 326 IAC 8-3-5 (a) (5) (C).

## PETITION REQUIREMENT

1) Pursuant to 326 IAC 8-1-5, a source that requests a site-specific significant permit revision must provide:

A demonstration that the alternative control program constitutes reasonably available control technology for the petitioned facility. The factors to be presented in this demonstration include but are not limited to:

- (A) the capital expenditure necessary to achieve the petitioned level of control.
- (B) the impact of these costs on the firm,
- (C) the energy requirements of the petitioned level of control,
- (D) the impact on the environment in terms of any increase in air, water, and solid waste effluent discharge of the petitioned level of control,
- (E) any adverse worker or product safety implications of the petitioned level of control, and
- (F) an analysis for each of the factors in clauses (A) thru (E) for the control levels otherwise required by 326 IAC 8.

On November 13, 2000, the Petitioner submitted the following as factors demonstrating that the alternative control program constitutes reasonably available control technology:

- (A) Capital expenditures necessary to achieve the petitioned level of control are minimal dollars.

Only minor modifications to the part hanger mount height were required to allow the chemical bath level to be raised to contain the oil cover.

(B) The impact to the firm is the annual cost of the oil cover product, which equates to approximately \$4,000 annually.

(C) There is no additional energy required for the petitioned control. The oil cover assists as a thermal blanket, therefore, if anything, the energy required to heat the solution is less.

(D) There is no change in emissions, water, and solid waste effluent discharges related to the petitioned control.

(E) There are no additional safety implications related to this petitioned control.

(F) An analysis for the control levels otherwise required by 326 IAC 8-1-5 (a) (5) finds:

(1) To attain a freeboard ratio of 0.75 or greater, the tank freeboard would have to be raised 34 inches. This could only be accomplished by raising the level of the roof or creating a pit for the chemical tanks to sit in. This is not reasonably available control technology due to the cost of altering Transwheel's building structure.

(2) The solvent is miscible in water. Therefore a water cover is not an option because the solvent is insoluble in and heavier than water.

(3) The use of an oil cover is an equivalent control system when compared to a water cover and is acceptable based on the information provided by the Petitioner pursuant to 326 IAC 8-1-5.

### FINDINGS

IDEM makes the following findings:

1. The Petitioner submitted a request that an oil cover be accepted as an equivalent control system for solvents that are miscible in water as provided in 326 IAC 8-1-5 and 326 IAC 8-3-5 (a) (5) (C).
2. A water cover cannot be used in Petitioner's operations and an oil cover is an equivalent control system to the water cover system (see Technical Support Document in Attachment A).
3. The petition submitted by the Petitioner fulfills the requirements of 326 IAC 8-1-5 and 326 IAC 8-3-5 (a) (5) (C).

### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Petitioner shall meet the requirements of 326 IAC 8-3-5 (a) (5) (C) by using an oil cover when solvent is miscible with water.

Conditions of this approval do not relieve the Petitioner from complying with any requirements listed in their permit or future rulemakings.

### ORDER

1. This Order, issued pursuant to IC 13-14-1-9 and IC 13-14-2-1, approves the petition

submitted by the Petitioner subject to the conditions of the approval and allows Petitioner to operate pursuant to 326 IAC 8-1-5 and 326 IAC 8-3-5 (a) (5) (C) in accordance with this Order.

2. This Order shall apply to and be binding upon the Petitioner, its successors and assigns. No change in ownership, corporate, or partnership status of the Petitioner shall in any way alter its status or responsibilities under this Order.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER

Pursuant to IC 4-21.5-3-3 and IC 4-21.5-3-5, IDEM will give notice of this Order to each person whom the order is directed, affected neighbors, and in a newspaper of general circulation in the county affected by this order.

Pursuant to IC 4-21.5-3-2, IC 4-21.5-3-3, IC 4-21.5-3-5 and IC 4-21.5-3-7, this Order becomes effective eighteen (18) days after service through the United States mail, unless a petition for judicial review is filed before or on the eighteenth (18<sup>th</sup>) day. Standing and substantive requirements are specified in IC 4-21.5-5-3 and IC 4-21.5-5-7, respectively.

Pursuant to IC 4-21.5-5-9, a person seeking judicial review of the Order may, by filing a verified petition, request an order of the court staying this Order, pending a decision by the court.

If you have procedural or scheduling questions regarding your request for review you may contact the Office of Environmental Adjudication at (317) 233-0850 at 100 North Senate Avenue, Room 1049, Indianapolis, IN 46204.

Dated at Indianapolis, Indiana, this 22nd day of December, 2004.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Janet G. McCabe  
Assistant Commissioner  
Office of Air Quality