

Staying in Compliance & in Business with UV/EB

Rita M. Loof

Director, Environmental Affairs

RadTech International NA

RadTech International

- Environmental Health & Safety Committee
 - Providing information about UV/EB to federal, state and local government
 - Ensuring a place for UV/EB in legislation
 - Provide industry added tools to make a case for UV/EB

Enduser subjected to various regulations

- Federal level: Title V
- State level
- Local level: Local rules and regulations
 - Southern California typically has the most stringent emission requirements
- Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs); Toxics,
- Greenhouse Gases; Energy Efficiency

Command and control vs. incentives

- Command and control rules
 - Technology forcing
 - Mandate a specified VOC limit
- Incentives
 - Exemptions from rules
 - Regulatory relief

UV/EB's role

- Avoid applicability
 - Staying below thresholds through VOC reduction
- No need to install air pollution control devices
- UV/EB enables facilities to stay in compliance
- Drastic emission reductions (near zero emissions)
- No secondary adverse impacts (greenhouse gases, combustion contaminants, hazardous waste)

Federal regulations

- Title V- Facility Permit vs. permit unit approach
 - Applies to major sources, definition varies by region
 - Public notification
- How can UV/EB help me comply?
 - Avoiding applicability
 - “De minimus” facility $\leq 19,184$ gallons/year of UV/EB materials with VOC content < 50 grams/liter
- EPA Control Techniques Guidelines for Flat Wood Paneling Coatings (2006)
 - “This technology is gaining greater acceptance and, where applicable, achieves a near 100 percent reduction of VOC emissions”.

State regulations

- California Air Resources Board
 - Air Toxics Control Measure for composite wood products
 - Reduction of formaldehyde emissions from particle board, medium density fiberboard, hardwood plywood, composite veneer
 - Third-party certifier
- ARB estimates
 - 2.5 billion square feet of composite wood products sold in CA annually
 - 400 tons of formaldehyde generated
- ARB Suggested Control Measure for wood coatings
 - 275 grams per liter limit, mirrors SCAQMD rule

Examples of requirements

- SCAQMD Rule 1136
 - Applies to:
 - Clear & Pigmented Sealers
 - Clear & Pigmented Topcoats
 - Pigmented Primers & Undercoats
 - VOC limit is 275 grams/liter
 - Shutters (until 7/1/05)
 - Clear Topcoat680 g/l
 - Pigmented topcoat.....600 g/l

Do UV/EB materials comply with limits?

- Yes, typical VOC content of a UV/EB formulation is < 50 grams/liter
 - Generally UV/EB materials do not contain any VOC's
 - Fluctuations in VOC content can be attributable to test methods
 - Measurement of VOC content difficult with low VOC materials

SCAQMD Technical Assessment

- SCAQMD findings:
 - UV /EB wood coatings have been around for over 40 years
 - Water & acetone formulations can achieve thinner film depositions
 - All application types are available (flow, roller, sprayable)
 - Various glosses available
 - Stains, other semitransparent materials, pigmented coatings available
 - **“UV coating on wood substrate is a viable option to regulatory compliance and coating performance for a wide variety of products.”**

Pollution prevention in lieu of add-on-controls

- Lowest Achievable Emission Rate/Best Available Control Technology (Major Sources)
 - UV/EB defined as “Superclean” (< 5% by wt. VOC)
 - BACT/LAER for:
 - Wood & plastic coatings
 - Printing

Less regulatory hassles with UV/ EB

- Reduced SCAQMD recordkeeping for UV/EB
 - Monthly recordkeeping: Materials < 50 grams/liter at all facilities
 - Total exemption from recordkeeping: Materials <50 grams/liter at facilities <4 TPY
- Added flexibility with emission averaging option
Rule 1136 (c)(1)(D)(i)
- Permit exemption - Rule 219

SCAQMD plan

- UV/EB identified as an “advanced technology” to help SCAQMD achieve its clean air goals (Chapter 4, page 68)
- “UV and EB curing products can be used on virtually all substrates, from metal and wood to glass and plastic.”
- “Other advantages include the attainment of very high gloss levels, reduction of VOC emissions and solvent odors, and reduced energy consumption.”

SCAQMD and EPA policy

- Superclean materials equivalent to add-on-controls
- Superclean materials comply with source specific rules and BACT/LAER
- San Joaquin District concludes that UV technology is more cost effective than add-on controls

Impact of Regs. on Enduser

- Rulemakings and regs can shape business decisions.
- Spark enduser interest in UV/EB
- Provide the perspective of an “impartial” third party rather than that of a “vendor”
- Real life Anecdotes:
 - Wood Coater in Desert Hot Springs, CA
 - Printer in Chino, CA

Cost savings

- Less permit costs
 - Permit processing fee for coating/drying
= \$3,359
 - Annual Operating Fee
= \$1,087

Cost savings

Example: Facility using 20 gallons/day @ 275 g/l

$$20 \text{ gal/day} \times 2.3 \text{ lb/gal} = 46 \text{ lb/day}$$

$$46 \text{ lb/day} \times 5 \text{ day/week} \times 52 \text{ weeks/year} = 11,960 \text{ lb/yr}$$

$$11,960 \text{ lb/yr} \times 1 \text{ ton}/2,000 \text{ lb} = 2.99 \text{ tpy}$$

$$\text{Annual emission fees} = 5.98 \text{ tpy} \times \$535.33/\text{ton}$$

$$= \$3,201.27/\text{year}$$

■ Emission Reduction Credits **\$5,000/Pound VOC**

$$[46 \text{ lb/day} - 22 \text{ lbs/day}^*] \times 1.2(\text{off set factor}) \times \$5,000/\text{lb}$$

$$= \$144,000$$

*Free offsets of 22 lbs/day

Conversion to UV/EB

- = Facility using 20 gallons/day @ 50 g/l

$$20 \text{ gal/day} \times .42 \text{ lb/gal} = 8.4 \text{ lb/day}$$

$$8.4 \text{ lb/day} \times 5 \text{ day/week} \times 52 \text{ weeks/year} = 2,184 \text{ lb/yr}$$

$$2,184 \text{ lb/yr} \times 1 \text{ ton}/2,000 \text{ lb} = 1.09 \text{ tpy}$$

$$= \$ 0 \text{ /year (facilities under 4 TPY do not pay emission fees)}$$

- Emission Reduction Credits (free offsets for processes under 4 TPY)

$$= \$ 0$$

Savings from conversion selected air quality fees only

- Savings in permitting fees = \$ 3,359
- Savings in operating fees (annual) = \$ 1,087
- Savings in emission fees (annual) = \$ 3,201
- Savings in ERCs (one time fee) = \$ 144,000
- Savings = \$151,647
- Does not include additional fees (Title V ; public notice and other)

Policy change = savings

- Example: Emission factor for UV/EB materials reduced from 5% VOC to 2% VOC
- For 20 gallon/day facility
- $20 \text{ gallon/day} \times .25 \text{ lb/gallon} \times \$5,000/\text{lb}$
 $= \$ 25, 000$
- Example: GCMS testing v. ASTM testing
 - GCMS = \$1,500 PER sample

Future Trends

- Lower VOC limits
- Regulators will need new test methods to measure very low VOC levels
 - SCAQMD architectural coatings rule R1113, limits of 50 grams/liter
 - Supercompliant definition in R1113 is 10 grams/liter
- Energy Efficiency
- Greenhouse gases
- Toxic Air Contaminants
- VOC reactivity ??

Conclusion

- UV/EB can ease regulatory burdens and help industry stay in compliance and in business.
- Increased production and VOC reduction can go hand in hand
- UV/EB can offer process advantages, controls simply destroy VOC's
- There are no secondary pollutants (NO_x, SO_x, CO, greenhouse gases) generated with UV/EB
- Conversion may equal \$\$\$\$ SAVINGS

THANK YOU

- Contact information
- 909-981-5974
- rita@radtech.org
- www.radtech.org
- Regulatory resources
 - www.aqmd.gov
 - www.arb.ca.gov
 - www.epa.gov