Appendix N Technical Benchmarking Modeling – All Other Scenarios





Technology Benchmarking Appendix

| Technology | Estimated Reduction Efficiency | Rationale | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Dust collector/baghouse (DC) | 95% | Reduction efficiency is based on Owens Corning engineering estimates taking into account past experience with similar devices at fiberglass insulation facilities, low concentration profile of the exhaust stream and predicted particle size. | |
| Dry Electrostatic Precipitator (DEP) | 95% | | |
| Wet Electrostatic Precipitator (WEP) | 95% | | |
| Spray Chamber Scrubber | 20% | Reduction efficiency is based on Owens Corning engineering estimates taking into account past | |
| Cyclone Spray Chamber | 20% | engineering estimates taking into account past experience with similar devices at fiberglass insulation facilities, low concentration profile of the exhaust stream and predicted particle size. Reduction efficiency is a rough estimate based on limited information available from source testing at the Guelph facility. This technology has been considered not technical feasible but included for the purposes of completeness. | |
| Low or High Pressure Venturi Scrubber | 20% | | |
| Substituting with Low Sublimation Chromium refractory | 10% | | |
| Conversion to air/gas combustion | 86% | Reduction efficiency is based on a single source testing data point at another similar facility. | |
| Use of more accurate combustion control skids with constructing front end superstructures (two technologies must be combined to be effective) | 50% | Reduction efficiency is based on assessment of source testing programs at various production rates and process parameters. | |
| Re-engineering the exhaust points to overcome site specific dispersion challenges | 65-90% | Reduction efficiency is based on the assessment of annual average dispersion factors for technically feasible changes to stack configurations for sources included in the reconfiguration. | |

Explanation of Reduction Efficiencies for Technically Feasible Options

The following sections of this appendix are organized by each Pollution Control Combination in the order of ranking. Each appendix contains a summary of the emission rate calculations for each source as well as the modeling inputs and results.

The Default Pollution Control Combination (combination ID G_R1) is presented in Appendix L and the Preferred Pollution Control Combination (combination ID E_R9) is presented in Appendix M.

Assessment Results of Technically Feasible Pollution Control Strategies

| Combination ID | Polution Control Strategy Description | Ranking | Overall Percent Reduction |
|---------------------|--|---------|---------------------------------|
| G_R1 (default) | Electrostatic Precipitator (DEP/WEP) or Dust Collector on furnace and forehearth stacks combined with the use of Low Sublimation Chromium (LSC) refractory and conversion of the forehearths to air/gas combustion | 1 | 95.23% |
| M_R1 | Electrostatic Precipitator (DEP/WEP) or Dust Collector on furnace and forehearth stacks combined with conversion of the forehearths to air/gas combustion | 2 | 95.16% |
| H_R1 | Electrostatic Precipitator (DEP/WEP) or Dust Collector on furnace and forehearth stacks combined with the use of LSC refractory and the installation of more accurate combustion controls in combination with front end superstructures to prevent air ingress | 3 | 94% |
| N_R1 | Electrostatic Precipitator (DEP/WEP) or Dust Collector on furnace and forehearth stacks combined with incorporating more accurate combustion control skids and construction of frontend superstructures | 4 | 93% |
| V_R1 | Electrostatic Precipitator (DEP/WEP) or Dust Collector on furnace and forehearth stacks | 5 | 91% |
| E_R9 (preferred) | Incorporating more accurate combustion control skids and construction of front end superstructures and re-engineering exhaust stacks impacted by reconfiguration | 6 | 88.5% |
| I_R3 | Scrubber on forehearth stack, use of Low Sublimation Chromium (LSC) refractory and forehearth conversion to air/gas combustion | 7 | 77% |
| O_R2 | Scrubber on forehearth stack and forehearth conversion to air/gas combustion | 8 | 75% |
| S_R1 | Forehearth conversion to air/gas combustion | 9 | 73% |
| J_R2 | Scrubber on forehearth stack, use of Low Sublimation Chromium (LSC) refractory and incorporating more accurate combustion control skids and construction of front end superstructures | 10 | 50% |
| P_R2 | Scrubber on forehearth stack and incorporating more accurate combustion control skids and construction of front end superstructures | 11 | 48% |
| T_R1 | Incorporating more accurate combustion control skids and construction of front end superstructures | 12 | 39% |
| W_R2 | Scrubber on forehearth stack | 13 | 27% |