

Environmental
Protection Agency

John F. Kasich Governor

Alfred Roman Lt. Governor

Robert M. Anderson Director

October 25, 2011

RE: PERRY FIBERGLASS PRODUCTS, INC.
DAPC FACILITY ID # 0247030996
SECOND NOTICE OF VIOLATION
HIGH PRIORITY VIOLATION GC 2

CERTIFIED MAIL

Mr. Chad Pulliam
Perry Fiberglass Products, Inc.
597 Haverty Ct., Suite 140
Rockledge, FL 32955

Dear Mr. Pulliam:

Ohio EPA is issuing a second Notice of Violation ("NOV") to Perry Fiberglass Products, Inc. ("Perry") for erroneously maintaining records of organic compound (OC) emissions from emissions units P001 through P004.

On January 17, 2011, Ohio EPA received a letter, dated January 16, 2011, from you. It was a response to a letter sent from this office, dated January 6, 2011, requesting additional information.

In the response, Perry is maintaining its position that all four filament winders have been installed even though two of the four units were not equipped with dedicated creels and resin baths. The reasoning is that the permits (02-17574 and P0105151) did not specifically state or imply that the equipment (creels and resin baths) must be installed on the emissions units. Furthermore, Perry questions how OEPA defines an emissions unit in terms of attributing emissions to it.

OEPA disagrees with your company's position that the two filament winders, in which Perry had not installed dedicated creels and resin baths, were in fact installed. Emissions from drying/curing of product should not be attributed to those units, but to the units that have installed dedicated creels and resin baths. Furthermore, design plans and supportive emissions calculations as provided in permit-to-install (PTI) applications indicated that all filament winders were to be equipped and operated with creels and resin baths. Also, in accordance with Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) rule 3745-21-07(G)(5), OC emissions resulting from air drying of product for the first 12 hours after their removal from an emissions unit shall be included with the other emissions from the emissions unit, for determining compliance with OAC rule 3745-21-07(G)(2).

MR. CHAD PULLIAM
OCTOBER 25, 2011
PAGE 2

Therefore, OEPA's position is that only two filament winders have been installed and for each of those units Perry must maintain records that account for emissions generated from all emissions activities, including pre- and post-sprayup of resin/gelcoat on the mandrel, applying saturated resin fiberglass rovings on a spinning mandrel and drying/curing of product.

Please note that U.S. EPA has approved the revision of OAC rule 3745-21-07 as promulgated on February 18, 2008, for inclusion in Ohio's State Implementation Plan (SIP). The rule is federally effective as of September 19, 2011. This rule change, among other things, eliminates OC limits of 8 pounds per hour and 40 pounds per day from emissions units using photochemical reactive materials.

OEPA will be exercising enforcement discretion on the matter of demonstrating compliance with the emissions limits in OAC rule 3745-21-07(G)(2), but this does not waive the right by U.S. EPA to take enforcement action.

In addition to calculating emissions incorrectly for purposes of determining compliance, Perry has also calculated emissions incorrectly in its fee emission report submittal. Please ensure that all future submittals calculate emissions based on the actual number of installed emissions units as described above.

As you are aware, additional regulations have been promulgated for this industry, including OAC rule 3745-21-25 (Control of VOC emissions from reinforced plastic composites production operations) and 40 CFR, Part 63, Subpart WWWW (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Reinforced Plastic Composites Production). VOC and Organic HAP limits for different resin types used in filament application of open molding are listed in both state and federal regulations, respectively, and Perry must comply with these limits.

Please provide a response within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter that Perry has corrected its record keeping for the filament winders and that these units are in compliance with the emissions limits in Table 3 of 40 CFR, Part 63, Subpart WWWW and Table 2 of OAC rule 3745-21-25. Please include with your response the identification of each installed unit (P001 and P00X), emission calculations for each filament winder from all emissions activities (pre- and post-sprayup of resin/gelcoat on the mandrel, applying saturated resin fiberglass rovings on a spinning mandrel and drying/curing of product, etc. – show calculations for each emissions activity along with which emissions factors were used), and a list of resins and gel coats with their organic HAP content and VOC content, identify their application methods, their calculated emission factors from Table 1 and their appropriate emission limits in Table 2 and Table 3 above. Failure to respond to this request in the requested time frame can result in a referral to the Central Office of Ohio EPA for the appropriate enforcement action.

MR. CHAD PULLIAM
OCTOBER 25, 2011
PAGE 3

The submission of the requested information does not constitute a waiver of Ohio EPA's authority to seek civil penalties as provided in ORC 3704.06 or for U.S. EPA to seek civil penalties pursuant to federal law. Ohio EPA will decide whether to pursue or decline to pursue penalties regarding this matter at a later date.

If you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact me at (330) 963-1187.

Sincerely,



Tony Becker
Environmental Specialist
Division of Air Pollution Control

TB:bo

pc: Tim Fischer, DAPC-NEDO
Tom Kalman, DAPC-CO
Bill MacDowell, U.S. EPA Region 5