

MERA FLOWCHART SUMMARY FORM

Company:	Eurecat U.S. Incorporated	Permit No.:	9335
City:	Pasadena	Project No.:	114307
County:	Harris	Account No.:	HG-1218-D
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, 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
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?		
4A.	Was the project increase < 0.04 lb/hr and the ESL $\geq 2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$?		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 < $2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$?	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 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