

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
PETITION OF ROYAL FIBERGLASS POOLS,) AS 2009-04
INC. FOR AN ADJUSTED STANDARD FROM) (Adjusted Standard-Air)
35 ILL. ADM. CODE 215.301)
)

NOTICE

TO: John Therriault, Assistant Clerk Carol Webb, Hearing Officer
Illinois Pollution Control Board Illinois Pollution Control Board
James R. Thompson Center James R. Thompson Center
100 West Randolph, Suite 11-500 100 West Randolph, Suite 11-500
Chicago, Illinois 60601-3218 Chicago, Illinois 60601-3218

Dale A. Guariglia
Brandon W. Neuschafer
Bryan Cave LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 3600
211 N. Broadway
St. Louis, MO 63102-2750

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that I have today filed with the Office of the Pollution Control Board the ILLINOIS EPA'S RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS POSED BY THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD AT THE HEARING ON OCTOBER 28, 2009 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency a copy of which is herewith served upon you.

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY

By: /s/ Charles E. Matoesian

Charles E. Matoesian
Assistant Counsel
Division of Legal Counsel

DATED: November 16, 2009

1021 North Grand Avenue East
P.O. Box 19276
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276
217.782.5544
217.782.9143 (TDD)

**THIS FILING IS SUBMITTED
ON RECYCLED PAPER**

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
PETITION OF ROYAL FIBERGLASS POOLS,) AS 2009-04
INC. FOR AN ADJUSTED STANDARD FROM) (Adjusted Standard-Air)
35 ILL. ADM. CODE 215.301)
)

**ILLINOIS EPA'S RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS POSED BY THE ILLINOIS
POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD AT THE HEARING ON OCTOBER 28, 2009**

NOW COMES Respondent, ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY ("Illinois EPA" or "Agency"), by its attorney, Charles E. Matoesian, and files this response to the questions of the Illinois Pollution Control Board's ("Board") asked at the hearing held on October 28, 2009.

Question 1, Page 47 – 48 of the transcript:

There's a condition D on page 7 of the recommendation, and I'll restate it. It says, "The relief granted in this proceeding shall be limited to the emissions activities at Royal's Dix facility as of the date of this filing." Royal's original petition indicated that they had a production level of around 220 pools per year but there was a desire to go to 400 pools per year as a cap. I just was wondering if you could please clarify whether or not the Agency's proposed condition to limit the emissions activities actually related only to the types of emissions activities or was it meant to relate to the level or the amount of emissions?

Response: Condition D on page 7 of the Illinois EPA recommendation relates only to the types of emissions activities, i.e., fiberglass pool manufacturing at the Dix facility. Condition D is not meant to relate to the level or the amount of emissions. However, the level and amount of emissions are to be in compliance with the proposed permit conditions, that includes the annual production cap of 400 pools.

Question 2, page 49 – 50 of the TR:

Yesterday the Illinois EPA filed a response to some of the pre-hearing questions that we had had, and in the response to question 21(d) of the hearing officer order, the Agency talks about the scaling factors and whether or not it was appropriate to use those when applying the ozone increment, and the Agency makes the statement that it doesn't endorse the use of scaling factors that are based on

steady-state assumptions, and then it goes on to say that ozone is not steady-state. I was wondering if there was a contradiction there, if it needed to be clarified. Did the Agency mean that they didn't endorse scaling factors for non-steady-state assumptions other than steady-state?

Response: The IEPA's October 27, 2009 written response to Question 21(d) of the Hearing Officer Order stated, in part, the following: "The Agency does not endorse the use of scaling factors that are based on steady-state, Gaussian plume-type assumptions." Regrettably, this sentence is an incomplete expression of the intended concept. The sentence should have read: The Agency does not endorse the use of scaling factors that are based on steady-state, Gaussian plume-type assumptions for estimating alternative averaging time concentrations of pollutants that are secondarily formed.

Question 3, page 50 of the TR:

Further on in that response, on page 3, it talks about a combined ozone increment and ozone design value of 72 parts per million. Just wanted to make sure, I think they meant parts per billion?

Response: The units for the "combined ozone increment and ozone design value" were incorrectly specified as parts per million ("72 ppm"). The correct units are parts per billion (ppb), and so the text should have read 72 ppb.

Question 4, page 50 of the TR:

And then the other question I had was they do talk about the ozone design value being 73 parts per billion, but then they talk about a combined ozone increment and ozone design value of 72, and I was wondering how it goes down when you combine the two, or was that an oversight?

Response: The design value is dependent upon the specific years of monitoring data from which it is calculated. As indicated in the IEPA's October 27, 2009 written response to Question 21(d), the "2005-2007 8-hour ozone design value" for the Hamilton County monitor is "73 ppb". The 2007-2009 8-hour ozone design value using the Hamilton County monitoring data is 68 ppb (this lower value reflects cleaner ambient air in more recent years). The addition of the 4 ppb ozone increment from the Air Quality Impact Analysis gives a total "combined ozone increment and ozone design value" of 72 ppb. It should be noted that IEPA follows USEPA's convention of reporting the 8-hour average ozone concentration, when expressed in units of parts per million, to three decimal places (any digits to the right of the third decimal place are truncated).

Respectfully submitted,
**ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY**

By: /S/ Charles E. Matoesian
Charles E. Matoesian
Assistant Counsel
Division of Legal Counsel

DATED: November 16, 2009
1020 North Grand Avenue East
P.O. Box 19276
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276
217/7782-5544
(217)782-9807 Facsimile

