

**NORTH CAROLINA DIVISION OF
AIR QUALITY**

Application Review

Issue Date:

Region: Wilmington Regional Office
County: Columbus
NC Facility ID: 2400162
Inspector's Name: Jmanda Dunston
Date of Last Inspection: 02/07/2024
Compliance Code: 3 / Compliance - inspection

Facility Data

Applicant (Facility's Name): MaxPro Manufacturing, LLC

Facility Address:

MaxPro Manufacturing, LLC
 31 Industrial Boulevard South
 Whiteville, NC 28472

SIC: 3081 / Unsupported Plastics Film And Sheet

NAICS: 326113 / Unlaminated Plastics Film and Sheet (except Packaging) Manufacturing

Facility Classification: Before: Title V **After:** Title V

Fee Classification: Before: Title V **After:** Title V

Permit Applicability (this application only)

SIP: 02D .0521
NSPS: N/A
NESHAP: 02Q .0317 (HAPs)
PSD: N/A
PSD Avoidance: 02Q .0317 (VOCs)
NC Toxics: 02D .1100; 02Q .0711
112(r): N/A
Other: 02Q .1806

Contact Data

Facility Contact

Ron Foley
 Senior Vice President
 (910) 316-9099
 PO Box 567
 Whiteville, NC 28472

Authorized Contact

Ron Foley
 Senior Vice President
 (910) 316-9099
 PO Box 567
 Whiteville, NC 28472

Technical Contact

Ron Foley
 Senior Vice President
 (910) 316-9099
 PO Box 567
 Whiteville, NC 28472

Application Data

Application Number: 2400162.24A
Date Received: 09/16/2024
Application Type: Renewal
Application Schedule: TV-Renewal
Existing Permit Data
Existing Permit Number: 10272/T03
Existing Permit Issue Date: 09/26/2023
Existing Permit Expiration Date: 03/31/2025

Total Actual emissions in TONS/YEAR:

CY	SO2	NOX	VOC	CO	PM10	Total HAP	Largest HAP
2023	---	0.3600	101.76	0.3000	---	6.96	4.08 [Toluene]
2022	---	0.4700	125.49	0.4000	---	8.53	4.94 [Toluene]
2021	---	0.1700	166.82	0.1400	---	11.65	6.91 [Toluene]
2020	---	0.1500	152.82	0.1300	---	10.80	6.72 [Toluene]
2019	---	---	152.85	---	---	11.10	7.09 [Toluene]

Review Engineer: Suraiya Akter

Review Engineer's Signature:

Date:

Comments / Recommendations:

Issue 10272/T04

Permit Issue Date:

Permit Expiration Date:

1. Purpose of Application

MaxPro Manufacturing, LLC, (MaxPro) currently holds Title V Permit No. 10272T03 with an expiration date of 03/31/2025 to manufacture specialty glass window film for vehicles and buildings in Whiteville, Columbus County, North Carolina. This permit application is for a permit renewal without modification. The renewal application was received on September 16, 2024, or at least six months prior to the expiration date. Therefore, according to the General condition K of the existing permit, the existing permit shall remain in effect, regardless of expiration date, until DAQ issues or denies the renewed permit.

2. Facility Description

MaxPro manufactures high tech window tint for vehicles and buildings. The process is not continuous (24/7) but by batch as sales come in. According to the most recent inspection from 2/7/2024 by Jmamba Dunston of WiRO, the facility operates from 8AM to 9PM, with two shifts.

The only permitted source at the facility is the gravure coating station with associated curing and cleaning operations (ID No. ES-CL1). The maximum physical capacity of the machine is 150 feet per minute (fpm) and a 76-inch-wide web according to the original application. The gravure coating station can only apply one coating at a time, and normally three coatings are utilized to make most of the window films. The process steps consist of laminating two films together, applying a scratch resistant coating and applying a pressure sensitive mounting material.

It is classified as a Title V facility that is avoiding the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) programs with a 250 tons per year limit for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and a 10 tons per year limit on individual hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) plus a 25 tons per year limit on total HAPs, respectively. The air emissions from this source are primarily determined by mass balance. The facility tracks the hourly, daily, and monthly VOC, HAP and TAP usage by computer, and submits the emission reports quarterly.

3. History/Background/Application Chronology

History/Background

April 21, 2020	1 st time TV permit was issued, permit no. 10272T02.
June 10, 2020	Facility was inspected by Jmamba Dunston and found to be in compliance.
December 02, 2020	Facility was inspected by Jmamba Dunston and found to be in compliance.
July 01, 2021	Facility was inspected by Jmamba Dunston and found to be in compliance.
March 08, 2022	Facility was inspected by Jmamba Dunston and found to be in compliance.
April 13, 2023	Facility was inspected by Jmamba Dunston and found to be in compliance
September 26, 2023	Air Permit No. 10272T03 was issued on 9/29/2023 with an expiration date of 03/31/2025 in response to application no. 2400162.23A. This permit revision was

conducted in response to a minor modification request to add a Slot Die option for coating operation. The existing type was a Gravure Die only. This slot die will occupy the same space as the existing Gravure Die in the coating line. One type will replace the other based on the production requirements therefore, only one type of coating will be operating at any time.

February 19, 2024 Facility was inspected by Jmenda Dunston and found to be in compliance with the existing requirements.

Application Chronology

September 16, 2024 Received permit application 2400162.24A for renewal.

September 23, 2024 Sent acknowledgment letter indicating that the application for permit renewal was complete.

September 23, 2024 Application was assigned to Suraiya Akter

November 14, 2024 The application for permit renewal raised some confusion, therefore the following Technical ADD info request was sent to the applicant with the following questions:

1. In the facility description (Section 2 of the application), you added “Please note, the new Slot Die Coating attachment will occupy the same space as with the original equipment, Gravure Coating and therefore, only one equipment (either Gravure Coating or slot Die Coating) will operate at any time.” But you already modified that with a minor modification application from 2023. Is there going to be any new other New Slot or its referring to the existing one?
2. In section 3 of the application, it seems you are requesting to add an avoidance condition (to void Subpart JJJJ) that already exists in the permit. So, we do not understand what you are requesting here.

November 14, 2024 Following response was received in response to the ADD INFO request sent on 11/14/2024 via email:

1. The wording is same as 2013 and NO NEW Slot machine will be added to the permit. The Current permit with approved equipment holds good and NO additions were made or proposed at this time. I was just referring the old verbiage in Section 2.0
2. The Current permit with approved Subpart JJJJ condition holds good and NO additional requests are being made in the renewal. I was just referring to the old verbiage in Section 3.0

Therefore, this application was a straightforward renewal application without any modification.

December 3, 2024 Draft permit was forwarded to Joe Voelker for feedback.

January 21, 2025 Received Joe’s comments and feedback on the first draft.

January 28, 2025	WIRO and RCO had a meeting to discuss reducing the quarterly reporting requirements as required under 02Q .0317 to semiannually. See 02Q .0317 discussion in Section 5 below.
January 29, 2025	Edited version addressing comments and semiannual reporting requirement was forwarded to Joe Voelker
February 2, 2024	Comments and edits received from Joe Voelker
February 3, 2025	Permit draft forwarded to applicant, region and SSCB for feedback
February 4, 2025	Jmanda Dunston from WiRO reviewed the drafts and had no comments except for a few spelling and grammatical errors in the permit review.
February 11, 2025	Samir Parekh from SSCB confirmed they have no comments.
February 28, 2025	Mr. Chuck Pakala from MaxPro reviewed the draft permit and had no comments, except for a possible request to reduce the toxics reporting requirement in Section 2.2.A.2 to semiannual—similar to the reduction for HAPs and VOCs in Sections 2.2.A.3 and 2.2.A.4.
March 3, 2025	Technical ADD INFO request was sent to MaxPro regarding the PFAS
March 29, 2025	Jmanda Dunston from WiRO confirmed their agreement to set all reporting requirements to semiannual for consistency, as requested by the applicant on February 28, 2025
April 23, 2024	The response to technical ADD INFO request from March 3 was received.
April 25, 2024	Draft permit and permit review forwarded to Joseph Voelker for revision.
May 5, 2025	Received feedback from Joseph Voelker, no comments.
May 15, 2025	Most updated draft permit and review was forwarded to Mark and Connie for comments.
date	Public notice started.
date	Public comment period ends.
date	EPA comment period ends.
date	Permit issued.

4. Permit Modifications/Changes and TVEE Discussion

The following table describes the modifications to the current permit as part of the renewal process. This summary is not meant to be an exact accounting of each change but a summary of those changes.

Page No.	Section	Description of Changes
----------	---------	------------------------

--	Cover page and throughout permit	Updated all dates and permit revision numbers.
	Section 1	Removed minor modification footnote that addressed application no. 2400162.23A.
5	Section 2.1 A	Table formatting was updated as per current shell standards
7	Section 2.2 A 2	<p>02D .1100 condition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor numbering corrections were made The regulatory citation of 15A NCAC 02Q .0308(a) was added to the recordkeeping and reporting conditions The reporting requirement was revised to be consistent with current shell standards. Changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -specifying the due date for each quarterly report -clarifying the required content of the report
7	Section 2.2 A 3	<p>02Q .0317 MACT avoidance condition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The monitoring and recordkeeping was revised to be consistent with current shell standards. No changes in intent were made other than the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Recordkeeping requirement (existing section 2.2 A.3.e) for applicability determination was removed. See permit review for details The reporting requirement was revised to be consistent with current shell standards. Changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -specifying new frequency of reporting submission, changed to semiannual instead of quarterly -specifying the due date for each semiannual report -clarifying the required content of the report
	Section 2.2 A.4	<p>02Q .0317 PSD avoidance condition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The monitoring and recordkeeping was revised to be consistent with current shell standards. No changes in intent were made. The reporting requirement was revised to be consistent with current shell standards. Changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -specifying new frequency of reporting submission, changed to semiannual instead of quarterly -specifying the due date for each semiannual report -clarifying the required content of the report
18-26	Section 4	Revised General Conditions from version 6.0, 01/07/2022, to version 8.0, 7/10/2024.

This permit renewal is being processed without modification, and no changes to the Title V Equipment Editor are needed.

5. Regulatory Review

MaxPro is subject to the following regulations. The facility's equipment and operations have not changed since the last modification in 2023.

15A NCAC 02D .0521, Control of Visible Emissions

No monitoring/recordkeeping/reporting is required for visible emissions (VE) from this source (ID No. ES-CL1). VE was observed at 0% opacity during last inspection. Continued compliance is expected.

15A NCAC 02D .1100, Toxic Air Pollutant Emissions Limitations and Reporting Requirement

Facilities that emit toxic air pollutants (TAP) at rates greater than the limits in 15A NCAC 02Q .0711 may be required to perform air dispersion modeling. MaxPro submitted dispersion modeling that was submitted on October 12, 2012, which was reviewed and approved by AQAB on December 10, 2012 (see discussion in Section 7 below). The emission rates used in those models are included in the permit as emission limits. Placement of the emission sources, configuration of the emission points, and operation of the sources shall be in accordance with the submitted dispersion modeling analysis and should reflect any changes from the original analysis submittal as outlined in the AQAB review memo. This renewal application did not require toxics review as no changes in emissions are being made.

The facility is required to submit “the maximum pounds per day emission rates for all toxic air pollutants listed in the permit with a daily emission limit during the previous calendar year quarter” and “The maximum pounds per hour emission rates for all toxic air pollutants listed in the permit with an hourly emission limit during the previous calendar year quarter” within 30 days after each calendar year quarter for compliance purposes. MaxPro continued to submit their quarterly report without any violation.

MaxPro continues to track their product purchase and usage with hourly computer monitoring of each batch of window tint by utilizing an excel spreadsheet. The most recent inspection report indicated the emissions of the toxic air pollutants (TAP) were well below the emission limits. Continued compliance is expected.

15A NCAC 02D .1806, Control and Prohibition of Odorous Emissions

This is a “State-enforceable only” requirement and is applicable facility wide. The Permittee shall implement practices or controls sufficient to prevent odorous emissions from causing or contributing to objectionable odors beyond the property boundary. The most recent inspection mentioned NCDAQ has not received any odor complaints for MaxPro. Continued compliance is expected.

15A NCAC 02D .0317, Avoidance Conditions

In order to avoid the applicability of specific rules (see 02Q .0317(a)), a facility may accept an enforceable emission limit. MaxPro has taken avoidance conditions for the 15A NCAC 02D .1111, Maximum Achievable Control Technology for HAPs and the 15A NCAC 02D .0530, Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC).

In order to remain classified as a minor source of HAPs and avoid the applicability of 15A NCAC 02D .1111 the facility shall emit less than 10 tons per year (tpy) of each HAPs and 25 tpy of all HAPs combined. The facility shall discharge less than 250 tpy of VOC into the atmosphere per consecutive 12-month period in order to avoid the applicability of 15A NCAC 02D .0530.

The facility tracks the hourly, daily, and monthly VOC and HAP usage by computer, and submits the emission reports quarterly.

A review of the quarterly reports submitted by the facility showed 12-month total emissions well below the avoidance limits for HAP and VOC since the beginning of the facility’s operation. As such, and after discussion with DAQ’s Wilmington Regional Office (WiRO) and Raleigh Central Office (see Section 3 above), the reporting shall be reduced from quarterly to semiannually as allowed pursuant to 15A NCAC 02Q .0508(f).

For the avoidance condition for 02D .1111, the current permit requires the following at Section 2.2 A.3.e:

The Permittee shall keep a record of the applicability determination on site at the source for a period of five years after the determination, or until the source becomes an affected source. The determination must include the analysis demonstrating why the Permittee believes the source is unaffected pursuant to 40 CFR Part 63.10(b)(3).

Note that this recordkeeping requirement is unnecessary as the permit condition itself at Section 2.2 A.3 requires MaxPro to calculate 12-month rolling totals to document that it is an area source. Since the recordkeeping requirement at the existing Section 2.2 A.3.e is redundant and unnecessary, it will be removed from the revised permit.

Historical totals for VOC and HAP emissions are well documented in the technical review during permit revision T03 in 2023. In addition, MaxPro appeared to be in compliance with this rule during most recent compliance inspection. At the end of December 2023, the 12-month rolling total HAP emissions for each pollutant was as follows:

HAPs	lbs/year	tons/year
Toluene	8157.36	4.07
n-Hexane	5632.5	2.81
MIBK	0	0
Hexamethylene	5.88	0.003
Ethyl Benzene	26.56	0.013
Xylene	89.34	0.045
Total	13911.64	6.96

The 12-month rolling total HAP emissions at the end of December 2023 was 6.96 tons. Therefore, facility indicated compliance with 10/25 tpy limit for HAPs. Similarly, the 12-month rolling total VOC emissions at the end of December 2023 was 101.73 tons which also complied with 250-ton limit. Continued compliance is expected.

15A NCAC 02Q .0711, Emission Rates Requiring a Permit

This is a state-enforceable only condition. In general, this rule applies to new facilities (see 02Q .0704) or make modifications (see 02Q .0706) that cause an increase in TAP emission rates and the TAP emission rates are greater than the TAP permitting emission rates (TPER) listed in 02Q .0711. The existing permit includes a specific condition for this rule.

A review of the emissions inventory suggests that MaxPro is in compliance with the TPERs listed under 02Q .0711. MaxPro shall maintain the facility records of operational information demonstrating the TPERs listed in the permit have not been exceeded. No reporting is required.

6. NSPS, NESHAPS/MACT, PSD, 112(r), CAM

NSPS

The facility is not currently subject to any New Source Performance Standards. The technical review document of permit revision T02 (dated 4/21/20) and T03 (dated 9/26/23) has the details of the non-applicability of Subpart QQ, FFF and VVV. This permit renewal does not change the facility's NSPS status.

NESHAP/MACT

IF MaxPro was classified as a major source of HAPs, the gravure/slot die coating and laminating line would be subject to MACT Subpart KK, “National Emission Standards for the Printing and Publishing Industry” and MACT Subpart JJJJ “National Emission Standards for Paper and Other Web Coatings.” However, the facility has taken avoidance limits of 10/25 tpy for HAP emissions under 02Q .0317, classifying it as an area source of HAPs. See discussion in Section 5 above. As an area source, the facility is not subject to the requirements of MACT Subpart KK and JJJJ.

No area source NESHAPs apply to MaxPro.

PSD

This facility is a PSD minor source. The facility contains a facility-wide PSD avoidance condition for VOC at Section 2.2 A. a. Columbus County has triggered increment tracking under PSD for the emissions of PM₁₀, SO₂ and NO_x. This renewal application does not involve an increase of any regulated NSPR pollutants. No further review is necessary.

112(r)

The facility is not subject to Section 112(r) of the Clean Air Act requirements because it does not store any of the regulated substances in quantities above the 112(r) thresholds. No change with respect to 112(r) is anticipated under this permit renewal.

CAM

The CAM rule (40 CFR 64; 15A NCAC 02D .0614) applies to each pollutant specific emissions unit (PSEU) at major TV facilities that meets all three following criteria:

- the unit is subject to any (non-exempt: e.g., pre-November 15, 1990, Section 111 or Section 112 standard) emission limitation or standard for the applicable regulated pollutant.
- the unit uses any control device to achieve compliance with any such emission limitation or standard.
- The unit has potential pre-control device emissions of the applicable regulated air pollutant that are equal to or greater than 100 percent of the amount, in tons per year, required for a source to be classified as a major source (i.e., 100 tons per year for criteria pollutants or 10/25 tons per year for HAPs).

No controls are utilized to comply with an emission limit or a standard for any applicable regulated pollutant. No changes occurred during this renewal. Therefore, CAM does not apply to this facility at this time.

7. Facility Wide Air Toxics

The facility last conducted modeling that was reviewed by Mr. Charles Buckler of DAQ’s Air Quality Analysis Branch (see Modeling Memorandum dated December 10, 2012). The modeling analysis showed compliance with all the Acceptable Ambient Levels (AALs). The TAP limits were added to the 15A NCAC 02D .1100 permit condition at that time. The following table is a summary of the “Table 1 Maximum Modeled Impacts:”

Toxic Air Pollutant	TPER Limit	Permit Emission Limit	AAL (ug/m ³)	%AAL
Ethyl acetate (141-78-6)	36 lb/hr	100 lb/hr	140,000	2.3
Hexane, n- (110-54-3)	23 lb/day	528 lb/day	1,100	64

MEK (methyl ethyl ketone, 2-butanone) (78-93-3)	22.4 lb/hr AND 78 lb/day	100 lb/hr AND 2400 lb/day	88,500 3,700	3.6 35
MIBK (methyl isobutyl ketone) (108-10-1)	7.6 lb/hr AND 52 lb/day	60 lb/hr AND 1440 lb/day	30,000 2,560	6.5 30
Toluene (108-88-3)	14.4 lb/hr AND 98 lb/day	30 lb/hr AND 720 lb/day	56,000 4,700	1.7 8.2

According to the most recent compliance inspection dated 2/19/24, the emission for the TAPs were well below the emission limits above. The 12-month rolling total emissions for each pollutant by the end of December 2023 along with the limit comparison are given below:

Toxic Air Pollutant	Emission reported in Inspection report			Permit Emission Limit	Compliance
	lbs/year	lbs/hr	lbs/day		
Ethyl acetate	38238.78	4.37	104.76	100 lb/hr	Yes
Hexane, n-	5632.45	0.64	15.43	528 lb/day	Yes
MEK (methyl ethyl ketone, 2-butanone)	14,863.94	1.70	40.72	100 lb/hr AND 2400 lb/day	Yes
MIBK (methyl isobutyl ketone)	0	0	0	60 lb/hr AND 1440 lb/day	NA
Toluene	8157.36	0.93	22.355	30 lb/hr AND 720 lb/day	Yes

MaxPro is required to submit quarterly reports for TAPs, reports are received on time and contain the required information. Therefore, compliance is indicated. This renewal did not change any emissions therefore no modeling is required at this time. MaxPro will continue to comply with the current emissions limits by recordkeeping and reporting requirements. See further discussion in Section 5 above.

8. Facility Emissions Review

The facility-wide potential emissions have not changed because of this TV permit renewal. Actual emissions for criteria pollutants and HAPs for the previous five years reporting periods are provided in the header of this permit review.

9. Compliance Status

DAQ has reviewed the compliance status of MaxPro. During the most recent inspection, conducted on 02/07/2024 the facility appeared to be in compliance with all applicable requirements. Furthermore, the facility has had no air quality violations within the last five years. The facility's Annual Compliance Certification was received on 03/01/2024 and indicated compliance with all applicable requirements in 2023.

10. Public Notice/EPA and Affected State(s) Review

A notice of the DRAFT Title V Permit shall be made pursuant to 15A NCAC 02Q .0521. The notice will provide for a 30-day comment period, with an opportunity for a public hearing. Consistent with 15A NCAC 02Q .0525, the EPA will have a concurrent 45-day review period. Copies of the public notice shall be sent to persons on the Title V mailing list and EPA. Pursuant to 15A NCAC 02Q .0522, a copy of each permit application, each proposed permit and each final permit shall be provided to EPA. Also pursuant to 02Q .0522, a notice of the DRAFT Title V Permit shall be provided to each affected State at

or before the time notice provided to the public under 02Q .0521 above. The State of South Carolina is an affected state/local program within 50 miles of the facility.

11. Other Regulatory Considerations

A P.E. seal is NOT required for this renewal application.

A zoning consistency determination is NOT required for this renewal application.

A permit fee is NOT required for this renewal application.

PFAS

To undertake any future standards-setting for PFAS emissions, the DEQ is currently collecting information on PFAS uses, creation (product or byproduct), and its environmental releases through a set of screening questions from some air quality permit applicants. As shown in the application chronology in section 3, the DEQ sent a set of PFAS screening questions to MaxPro Manufacturing, LLC. The facility replied with “no” to all PFAS screening questions (See Attachment 1). Thus, DAQ has decided not to further investigate the PFAS issue for this facility.

12. Recommendations

The permit renewal application for MaxPro has been reviewed by DAQ to determine compliance with all procedures and requirements. DAQ has determined this facility is complying or will achieve compliance, as specified in the permit, with all requirements that are applicable to the affected sources. DAQ recommends the issuance of Air Permit No 10272T04.

Attachment 1

MaxPro's Response to DAQ PFAS Questionnaire

DAQ Question 1:

Will your facility use any material or products in your operations that contain fluorinated chemicals? If so, please identify such materials or products and the fluorinated chemicals they contain. **NO (based on EPA list 430 PFAs chemicals-
<https://comptox.epa.gov/dashboard/chemical-lists/epapfasinv>)**

DAQ Question 2:

Will your facility formulate/create products or byproducts (directly or indirectly) that contain fluorinated chemicals (across multiple media)? If so, please identify such products or byproducts and the fluorinated chemicals they contain. **NO**

DAQ Question 3:

Will your facility generate solid, liquid, or gaseous related emissions, discharges, or wastes/products containing fluorinated chemicals? If so, please identify such waste streams or materials and the fluorinated chemicals they contain. **NO**

DAQ Question 4:

Do your facility's processes or operations use equipment, material, or components that contain fluorinated chemicals (e.g., surface coating, clean room applications, solvents, lubricants, fittings, tubing, processing tools, packaging, facility infrastructure, air pollution control units)? Could these processes or operations directly or indirectly (e.g., through leaching, chemical process, heat treatment, pressurization, etc.) result in the release of fluorinated chemicals into the environment? **NO**

DAQ Question 5:

List the fluorinated chemicals identified (i.e., through testing or desktop review) above in your response under the appropriate methods/approaches? If one is not, are they on any other known US or International target lists? OTM-45 (air emissions) Methods 533 & 537.1 (drinking water) SW-846: Method 8327 (water) Draft Method 1633 (water, solids, tissue) Total PFAS" Draft Method 1621 for Adsorbable Organic Fluorine (wastewater) Non targeted analytical methods Qualitative approach through suspect screening. **NO**

DAQ Question 6:

Are there other facilities or operations in the U.S. or internationally engaged in the same or similar activities involving fluorinated chemicals addressed in your response to the above questions? If so, please provide facility identification information? In addition, are there any ISO (International Organization for Standardization) certification requirements? **DO NOT KNOW**

DAQ Question 7:

Do you plan to store AFFF on site, use it in fire training at the site, use it for fighting fires at the facility, or include it in a fire fighting system at the site? **NO**

DAQ Question 8:

Are other emerging contaminants (e.g., 1,4-dioxane, brome, perchlorate, 1,2,3-Trichloropropane) used in some capacity within your facility or operations? **NO**

DAQ Question 9: Do you need technical assistance to answer the questions above.

Permit condition language

State-enforceable only

Disclosure of Information Relating to Emissions of Fluorinated Chemicals [15A NCAC 02Q.0308(a); 15A NCAC 02Q.0309(b)]

The Permittee shall have an ongoing duty to disclose the presence of materials containing fluorinated chemicals at the facility that have the potential to result in the emission of fluorinated chemicals to the environment. Such disclosures shall be in writing and submitted to the Regional Office Supervisor within thirty days of the Permittee becoming aware of such information, unless such information has already been disclosed to DAQ by the Permittee. The disclosure shall describe the identity, quantity, and use of such material to the extent known. DAQ may require the permittee to conduct analysis or testing of fluorinated chemical emissions as necessary to properly evaluate emissions sources at the facility. As used in this condition, the term “fluorinated chemicals” includes but is not limited to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS).