## **MERA FLOWCHART SUMMARY FORM**

City:	Compar	ny:	Eurecat U.S. Incorporated	Permit No.:	9335					
Project Type:         CAMD         Regulated Entity Number:         RN100661644           Project Reviewer:         Mr. Patricio Griego         Customer Reference No.:         CN600370290           Facility Name:         Catalyst Processing           COMPOUNDS UNDER REVIEW:         VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barirum, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc           EFFECTS REVIEW PERFORMED BY PERMIT ENGINEER:         YES         NO         N/A           1.         Was the project a decrease in annual emissions with no increase in short-term emissions?         X           2.         Was the proposed facility on the TARA Emissions Screening List?         X           3.         Did the proposed project involve an increase of a special interest constituent?         X           4A.         Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL ≥ 2 μg/m³?			Pasadena							
Project Reviewer:			Harris							
Facility Name:   Catalyst Processing	Project Type:		_							
COMPOUNDS UNDER REVIEW:         VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc         EFFECTS REVIEW PERFORMED BY PERMIT ENGINEER:       YES       NO       N/A         1.       Was the project a decrease in annual emissions with no increase in short-term emissions?       X         2.       Was the proposed facility on the TARA Emissions Screening List?       X         3.       Did the proposed project involve an increase of a special interest constituent?       X         4A.       Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL ≥ 2 μg/m³?	Project Reviewer:			Customer Reference No.:	CN600370290					
VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc         EFFECTS REVIEW PERFORMED BY PERMIT ENGINEER:       YES       NO       N/A         1.       Was the project a decrease in annual emissions with no increase in short-term emissions?       X         2.       Was the proposed facility on the TARA Emissions Screening List?       X         3.       Did the proposed project involve an increase of a special interest constituent?       X         4A.       Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL ≥ 2 μg/m³?	Facility Name: Catalyst Processing									
magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  EFFECTS REVIEW PERFORMED BY PERMIT ENGINEER:  1. Was the project a decrease in annual emissions with no increase in short-term emissions?  2. Was the proposed facility on the TARA Emissions Screening List?  3. Did the proposed project involve an increase of a special interest constituent?  If YES, which location?  If YES, which constituent?  4A. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL ≥ 2 µg/m³?  List constituent(s):  aluminum, antimony, barium, calcium, copper, iron, manganese, molybdenum, potassium, selenium, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, and zinc  4B. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL < 2µg/m³?  X If YES, TARA comments required to complete impacts review. TARA comment was to continue flowsheet for compounds  List constituent(s):  arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, mercury, nickel, silver, and vanadium  5. Was the emission increase impact, (X)(E), less than 0.1 ESL?  List constituent(s):  VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to	COMPOUNDS UNDER REVIEW:									
uranium, vanadium, and zinc         EFFECTS REVIEW PERFORMED BY PERMIT ENGINEER:       YES       NO       N/A         1.       Was the project a decrease in annual emissions with no increase in short-term emissions?       X         2.       Was the proposed facility on the TARA Emissions Screening List?       X         3.       Did the proposed project involve an increase of a special interest constituent?       X         If YES, which location?       If YES, which constituent?       X         4A.       Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL ≥ 2 μg/m³?										
EFFECTS REVIEW PERFORMED BY PERMIT ENGINEER:       YES       NO       N/A         1.       Was the project a decrease in annual emissions with no increase in short-term emissions?       X         2.       Was the proposed facility on the TARA Emissions Screening List?       X         3.       Did the proposed project involve an increase of a special interest constituent?       X         4A.       Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL ≥ 2 μg/m³?			ry, molybdenum, nickel, platinu	m, potassium, selenium, silver, sodiu	m, strontiι	ım, tungsi	ten,			
1. Was the project a decrease in annual emissions with no increase in short-term emissions?					1					
2. Was the proposed facility on the TARA Emissions Screening List? X  3. Did the proposed project involve an increase of a special interest constituent? X  If YES, which location?  If YES, which constituent?  4A. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL ≥ 2 μg/m³? X  List constituent(s): aluminum, antimony, barium, calcium, copper, iron, manganese, molybdenum, platinum, potassium, selenium, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, and zinc  4B. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL < 2μg/m³? X  If YES, TARA comments required to complete impacts review. TARA comment was to continue flowsheet for compounds  List constituent(s): arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, mercury, nickel, silver, and vanadium  5. Was the emission increase impact, (X)(E), less than 0.1 ESL? X  List constituent(s): VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to					YES	_	N/A			
3. Did the proposed project involve an increase of a special interest constituent?    If YES, which location?	1.	Was the project a decr	ease in annual emissions with n	o increase in short-term emissions?		Х				
If YES, which location?  If YES, which constituent?  4A. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL ≥ 2 μg/m³?  List constituent(s):  aluminum, antimony, barium, calcium, copper, iron, manganese, molybdenum, platinum, potassium, selenium, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, and zinc  4B. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL < 2μg/m³?  If YES, TARA comments required to complete impacts review. TARA comment was to continue flowsheet for compounds  List constituent(s):  arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, mercury, nickel, silver, and vanadium  5. Was the emission increase impact, (X)(E), less than 0.1 ESL?  List constituent(s):  VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to	2.			•		X				
If YES, which constituent?  4A. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL ≥ 2 μg/m³?  List constituent(s):  aluminum, antimony, barium, calcium, copper, iron, manganese, molybdenum, platinum, potassium, selenium, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, and zinc  4B. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL < 2μg/m³?  If YES, TARA comments required to complete impacts review. TARA comment was to continue flowsheet for compounds  List constituent(s):  arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, mercury, nickel, silver, and vanadium  5. Was the emission increase impact, (X)(E), less than 0.1 ESL?  List constituent(s):  VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to	3.	Did the proposed proje	ct involve an increase of a spec	ial interest constituent?		Х				
<ul> <li>4A. Was the project increase &lt; 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL ≥ 2 μg/m³?</li> <li>List constituent(s):         <ul> <li>aluminum, antimony, barium, calcium, copper, iron, manganese, molybdenum, platinum, potassium, selenium, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, and zinc</li> </ul> </li> <li>4B. Was the project increase &lt; 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL &lt; 2μg/m³?         <ul> <li>X</li> <li>If YES, TARA comments required to complete impacts review. TARA comment was to continue flowsheet for compounds</li> <li>List constituent(s):</li></ul></li></ul>										
List constituent(s):  aluminum, antimony, barium, calcium, copper, iron, manganese, molybdenum, platinum, potassium, selenium, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, and zinc  4B. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL < 2μg/m³?  If YES, TARA comments required to complete impacts review. TARA comment was to continue flowsheet for compounds  List constituent(s):  arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, mercury, nickel, silver, and vanadium  5. Was the emission increase impact, (X)(E), less than 0.1 ESL?  List constituent(s):  VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to										
potassium, selenium, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, and zinc  4B. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL < 2μg/m³?  If YES, TARA comments required to complete impacts review. TARA comment was to continue flowsheet for compounds  List constituent(s): arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, mercury, nickel, silver, and vanadium  5. Was the emission increase impact, (X)(E), less than 0.1 ESL?  List constituent(s): VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to	4A.									
4B. Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL < 2μg/m³?  If YES, TARA comments required to complete impacts review. TARA comment was to continue flowsheet for compounds  List constituent(s): arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, mercury, nickel, silver, and vanadium  5. Was the emission increase impact, (X)(E), less than 0.1 ESL?  List constituent(s): VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to		. ,								
If YES, TARA comments required to complete impacts review. TARA comment was to continue flowsheet for compounds  List constituent(s): arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, mercury, nickel, silver, and vanadium  5. Was the emission increase impact, (X)(E), less than 0.1 ESL?  List constituent(s): VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to					ınd zinc					
compounds List constituent(s): arsenic, beryllium, chromium, cobalt, mercury, nickel, silver, and vanadium  5. Was the emission increase impact, (X)(E), less than 0.1 ESL?  List constituent(s): VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to	4B.	Was the project increas	se < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL < $2\mu$	ug/m³?	X					
5. Was the emission increase impact, (X)(E), less than 0.1 ESL?  List constituent(s):  VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to										
List constituent(s):  VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to		List constituent(s):	arsenic, beryllium, chrom	nium, cobalt, mercury, nickel, silver, a	and vanadium					
chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to	5.	Was the emission incre	ease impact, (X)(E) , less than 0	.1 ESL?	Х					
nickel, platinum, potassium, selenium, silver, sodium, strontium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to		List constituent(s): VOC as benzene, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, boron, calcium,								
vanadium, and zinc  SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER: Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above.  Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to										
<b>SUMMARY BY PERMIT REVIEWER:</b> Discuss determination of acceptability for each constituent using criteria outlined above. Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to										
Even though many of the compounds fell out at Step 4A, I used screen modeling for Step 5 and used the emission rates to										
	· · ·									
determine the impacts for all the compounds potentially emitted and the impacts were all less than 10% of their respective										
ESLs. Therefore, no further modeling was required.										

Patricio L. Griego	8/15/2005	Kurt Kind	9/12/05
Project Reviewer	Date	Team Leader/Section Manager/Backup	Date