ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

February 7, 1974

| WEBER MARKING | SYSTEMS, | INC. |) | | |
|---------------|-----------|------------|---|-----|--------|
| | Petit | tioner, |) | | |
| V . | | | ý | PCB | 73-485 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | PROTECTIO | ON AGENCY, |) | | |
| | Respo | ondent. | ý | | |

James Thomas appeared on behalf of the Petitioner Peter Orlinsky, Attorney appeared on behalf of the EPA

OPINION AND ORDER OF THE BOARD (by Mr. Henss)

Petitioner Weber Marking Systems, Inc. filed Petition for Variance on November 14, 1973 seeking relief from Rule 205(f) of the Illinois Air Pollution Control Regulations until at least June 1, 1974 pending installation of control equipment.

Weber operates a facility in Arlington Heights, Illinois for the manufacture of stencils which are used in mechanical marking equipment. Petitioner utilizes two stencil coating machines and a carbon tissue coating machine to apply a mixture of organic liquids on the stencils and carbon tissues. The organic mixture consists of toluene, ethyl acetate and isoprobyl alcohol.

Petitioner estimates organic emissions from the plant are as follows:

| Type Organic | Maximum Emission Rate lb./hr. | Average Emission Rate lb./hr. | Maximum * Allowable Rate lb./hr. |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Ethyl and Isopropyl | 90 | 48 | 13.5 |
| Alcohol | 50 | 40 | 13.J |
| Ethyl Acetate | 96 | 67 | 14.4 |
| Toluene | 228 | 115 | 34.2 |
| Trichloroethane | 287 | 70 | ** |

^{* -} Agency estimate based upon an 85% reduction per Rule 205(f)(1)(B)

^{** -} Petitioner recently substituted an "exempt" solvent for trichloroethane.

In an effort to achieve compliance with Rule 205(f), Petitioner ordered a solvent recovery system from the Phillips-Croftshaw Company on August 17, 1973. This system has a guaranteed removal efficiency of 95% when operated at its designed capacity load. The Agency believes that the solvent recovery system will bring Petitioner's plant into compliance with Rule 205(f)(1)(B). The unit was to have been fully operational by December 31, 1973 thereby allowing Weber to achieve compliance with Rule 205(f).

On October 26, 1973 Phillips-Croftshaw informed Petitioner that the delivery of several critical components of the plant (such as the distillation column, reboiler, heat exchangers, etc.) would be delayed until late January or early February 1974. The delay was caused by shortages of fabricating plate, heads and exchanger tubes at the fabricating shops which produce components of the plant.

The solvent recovery system will probably be in operation by April 5, 1974 but, in no event, later than June 1, 1974. Petitioner states that a denial of the variance would impose an arbitrary and unreasonable hardship upon Petitioner in that Petitioner would be forced to shut down the stencil coating operation which accounts for approximately 40% of their business. A shutdown would cause the unemployment of about 400 employees and would cause undue hardships to the 40,000 customers using Petitioner's equipment. Petitioner estimates a denial would cost Petitioner "many millions of dollars".

The plant is located in an industrial/commercial tract. No occupied houses are located within 1/2 mile in any direction of the plant. Neither Petitioner nor the Agency has received any complaints about the organic discharges from the plant.

The Agency recommends granting this variance subject to certain conditions. From the record it is obvious that Weber made a conscientious effort to comply with the Regulations. Petitioner cannot be held responsible for the shortages which will delay completion of the solvent recovery system. While a denial of the variance would not necessarily force a closing of the operation, it would certainly place Weber in danger of prosecution for continuing excessive discharges despite diligent efforts to abate the discharges.

Petitioner has satisfied this Board that it deserves the variance shield for its continuing operations and we shall grant the variance subject to conditions suggested by the Agency.

ORDER

It is the Order of the Pollution Control Board that Weber Marking Systems, Inc. be granted variance from Rule 205(f) for its

Arlington Heights manufacturing facility until such time as the solvent recovery system is fully operational, but in no event beyond June 1, 1974. This variance is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Petitioner shall submit monthly progress reports indicating progress toward completing the installation and operation of the solvent recovery system. The progress reports shall commence March 1, 1974 and shall be submitted to: Environmental Protection Agency, Division of Air Pollution Control, Control Program Coordinator, 2200 Churchill Road, Springfield, Illinois 62706.
- Within 60 days after the initial operation of the solvent recovery system, Petitioner shall cause a stack test to be performed to demonstrate compliance with Rule 205(f). Petitioner shall give 5 days notice of said test to: Environmental Protection Agency, Division of Air Pollution Control, Region II office, Illinois Naval Armory, East Randolph and the Lake, Chicago, Illinois 60602 (telephone 312/793-4966) and allow Agency observation if desired. Petitioner shall submit complete results of the stack test to the Agency at the address given in Part 1 of this Order as soon as such results are available.

Christan L. Moffett, Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, hereby certify the above Opinion and Order was adopted this day of _______, 1974 by a vote of ________.

Christen of Moffett