

The Commission, having considered the following Applications for Permit submitted by the following respective firms and having reviewed the staff recommendations and the Summary Reports attached hereto does hereby approve said Applications subject to the conditions contained with the Application, Summary Reports, or amendments thereto; provided, however, that the applicant complies with all general terms of the permit and all special terms and conditions to the permit, if any, which are so specified.

APPLICATIONS FOR PERMIT - INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES

<u>PERMIT NO.</u>	<u>FACILITY & LOCATION</u>	<u>COST</u>
362-A	Stauffer Chemical Company Little Rock, Arkansas	\$ 76,000
363-A	Ethyl Corporation Magnolia, Arkansas	100,000
364-A	Ethyl Corporation Magnolia, Arkansas	40,000
365-A	MidSouth Woodcraft Company, Inc. Helena, Arkansas	19,000
366-A	Transvaal, Inc. Jacksonville, Arkansas	119,925
367-A	Jonesboro Mill & Farm Supply, Inc. Jonesboro, Arkansas	15,000
368-A	Chemform Corporation West Memphis, Arkansas	31,000
250-A(MODIFICATION)	Lane Poultry Grannis, Arkansas	22,000
281-A(MODIFICATION)	Acme Brick Company Perla, Arkansas	--
75-A (MODIFICATION)	Arkansas Cement Corporation Foreman, Arkansas	5,540,000
249-A(MODIFICATION)	Pollution Control, Inc. El Dorado, Arkansas	150,000

COMMISSIONERS

[Handwritten signatures and initials]

Billy Fran
CHAIRMAN

SUBMITTED BY JARRELL E. SOUTHALL DATE PASSED 9/24/76

The Summary Reports, prepared by the staff, are designed to facilitate the administration of the air pollution control program for the State of Arkansas and, otherwise, for the convenience of the Commission and other interested persons. Copies of the Minute Orders, the Permits, and the Summary Reports are to be attached to the Applications for Permit which are on file in the Department's central office. It is further noted that the approvals of these applications are based upon information contained within the Application for Permit - not the Summary Reports. Nevertheless, the applicant is expected to forthwith notify the Department of any discrepancies found between the two documents.

COMMISSIONERS

[Handwritten signatures]

CHAIRMAN

SUBMITTED BY Jarrell E. Southall

DATE PASSED 9/24/76

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: Stauffer Chemical Company
Little Rock, Arkansas

CSN: 600001

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 09/03/76 AMENDED: _____

CASE REFERENCES: 41-A, 67-A

SUMMARY:

Stauffer Chemical Company on Arch Street Pike in Little Rock proposes the installation of lifters in its two kilns that are used in the production of crushed bauxite and clay ore. The installation of the lifters in the kilns will increase Stauffer's plant capacity from 11,000 pounds an hour per kiln to 19,000 pounds an hour, and it will enable Stauffer to produce a more uniform product while reducing natural gas consumption by 50 million cubic feet a year.

Stauffer proposes to install a Ducon Cyclone in series with a Western Precipitator Venturi Scrubber to control dust emissions. The emissions from each kiln are to be 7.5 pounds an hour or less. This is an efficiency of 99%. Stauffer is to sample each kiln after the project has been completed to insure these emission rates are met.

ESTIMATED COST: \$76,000 TOTAL PROJECT: \$126,000

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: UPON APPROVAL

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: 01/01/77

REVIEWED BY: PDD APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 362-A

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: Ethyl Corporation
Magnolia, Arkansas

CSN: 140028

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 08/09/76 AMENDED: _____

CASE REFERENCES: _____

SUMMARY:

Ethyl Corporation proposes to construct a facility for the production of alkyldimethylamine at its Magnolia facility. Ethyl is applying for a permit under the terms of Section 3C of the Arkansas Air Pollution Control Code and asks that specific parts of the process be kept confidential.

Ethyl will produce alkyldimethylamine (ADMA) having the chemical formula $R(CH_3)_2N$, where R represents an alkyl, straight chain hydrocarbon. Raw materials will be hydrogen bromide, dimethylamine, sodium hydroxide, and alpha olefins.

Hydrogen bromide is reacted with olefin to produce alkyl bromide which, in turn, is reacted with dimethylamine and caustic to produce ADMA.

Overhead and bottom waste organic liquids are collected in a drum and are burned as fuel in a direct fired boiler. Hydrogen bromide emissions are controlled by a scrubber permitted No. 324-A which was sized to accomodate this expansion.

There will be no controlled or uncontrolled emissions from this process excepting air, water, nitrogen, and carbon dioxide in excess of 0.5 pounds an hour.

ESTIMATED COST: \$100,000 TOTAL PROJECT: \$2,000,000

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: 10/01/76

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: 06/01/77

REVIEWED BY: PDD APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 363-A

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: Ethyl Corporation

Magnolia, Arkansas

CSN: 140028

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 08/11/76 AMENDED: _____

CASE REFERENCES: _____

SUMMARY:

Ethyl Corporation proposes to install a facility for the control of ethylene emissions at its Magnolia facility. Ethyl applies for this permit under the confidentiality provisions of Section 3 of the Arkansas Air Pollution Control Code.

The vents from the ethylenedibromide reactors will be manifolded together and sent to a confidential recovery system. The exhaust gases from this system will then be sent to an existing wet scrubbing system. The ethylene emissions will be reduced from 47.3 pounds an hour to essentially zero. All other emissions will remain the same.

ESTIMATED COST: \$40,000 TOTAL PROJECT: \$40,000

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: 11/01/76

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: 03/15/77

REVIEWED BY: PDD APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 364-A

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: MidSouth Woodcraft Company, Inc.

West Helena, Arkansas

CSN: 540010

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 09/02/76

AMENDED: 09/07/76

CASE REFERENCES: _____

SUMMARY:

MidSouth Woodcraft operates a plant which manufactures hardwood laminated squares which are sold to furniture manufactures. The most common usage is for lathe turnings. The particulate emissions are currently controlled with two cyclones, and the particulate captured by these cyclones is transferred to a tee-pee burner. MidSouth proposes the installation of a Rees Conair system on the cyclone receiving waste from two planers, and seven saws. The Conair system introduces water upstream of the fan to promote agglomeration of the wood particles. An opacity sensor at the cyclone discharge controls the level of water injection. A similar installation has been shown to reduce cyclone emissions by at least 80%.

QUALIFICATIONS:

- (1) The proposed system is to achieve at least an 80% reduction in emissions.
- (2) The vendor of the equipment shall test the efficiency of the system upon commencement of operation. Tests shall be conducted in the presence of Department personnel and in accordance with procedures approved by the Director.

ESTIMATED COST: \$19,000 TOTAL PROJECT: \$19,000

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: 10/01/76

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: 11/01/76

REVIEWED BY: CDH APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH QUALIFICATIONS

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 365-A

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: Transvaal, Inc.
Jacksonville, Arkansas

CSN: 600028

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 09/16/76 AMENDED: _____

CASE REFERENCES: _____

SUMMARY:

See Attached

ESTIMATED COST: \$119,925 TOTAL PROJECT: \$119,925

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: 10/01/76

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: 12/01/76

REVIEWED BY: CDH APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH QUALIFICATIONS

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 366-A

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

The applicant proposes the installation of additional safeguards for the operation of its tetrachlorobenzene dechlorination process. To produce the acid and esters of 2,4,5-trichlorophenol (2,4,5-T), the applicant has, for the past nineteen years, produced the sodium salt of 2,4,5-T by the caustic dechlorination of 1,2,4,5-tetrachlorobenzene. The dechlorination reaction, at its initial stage, is highly exothermic and must be carefully controlled to prevent the reactant mass from causing pressures to exceed the pressures of the reactor. High temperatures and pressures present an additional problem by causing the formation of various members of the dioxin family such as 2,3,7,8-tetrachloro-dibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD). Dioxin contamination of 2,4,5-T is to be avoided because concentrations of dioxin in excess of 0.1 ppm in the acid or esters of 2,4,5-T are banned by EPA. Moreover, excessive concentrations of dioxin poses severe environmental problems at the site of manufacture.

The USAF Aerospace Research Laboratories in a May, 1975 report indicated that "Orange" (50-50 mixture of butyl esters of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D) prepared by Transvaal was considerably less contaminated with dioxin than "Orange" produced by other suppliers. The USAF report indicated an average dioxin content of less than 0.05 ppm in the "Orange" prepared by Transvaal while average dioxin concentration of other suppliers ranged from 0.12 ppm to 14.2 ppm. The low contamination levels of dioxin from the Transvaal process are thought to result from the lower temperatures and pressure maintained during the dechlorination process.

The safeguards proposed by Transvaal are intended to further control the dechlorination process to assure (1) that temperatures and pressures conducive to dioxin formation are avoided to the maximum practicable extent and (2) that emissions during normal and upset conditions are subject to improved control. Control of the dechlorination process is proposed as follows:

- (1) Temperature and pressures of each of the three equally sized reactor vessels are to be continuously monitored and recorded.
 - (2) Operator is to control temperature, by addition of water to the reactor's cooling jacket and by feed control, to maintain desired operating temperature and pressure.
 - (3) Addition of water is to be automatic in the event that operator fails proper control.
 - (4) At maximum working pressure a two inch relief valve will open.
 - (5) At 5% above maximum working pressure, a second two inch relief valve will open, if not already opened by the operator.
 - (6) At 10% above the working pressure, a rupture disk will open discharging reactant mass to a water quench tank (approximately seven times the volume of the reactor).
-

- (7) Emissions from the small relief valves are to discharge to a scrubber (design of which is not yet complete) of sufficient volume to minimize contaminant discharge during major upset conditions (relief from quench tank).
- (8) The quench tank (its volume, the volume of the water contained therein and its pressure relief system) is to be designed to contain all products of reaction should the reactor vessel purge at 10% over pressure through the rupture disk. The quench tank will normally be at atmospheric pressure. Should the reactor purge at 10% over pressure, instantaneous pressure rise to 50 PSI in the quench tank is expected. This pressure will relieve to the scrubber through a 1" vent line. Should the pressure exceed 100 PSI, the quench tank will purge to the scrubber through a relief valve.
- (9) There is only one quench tank for three reactors. Thus, operation of the three reactors is to be scheduled such that only one reactor is to be undergoing initial (exothermic) conditions at any one time.
- (10) Procedures to either "kill" the reaction or to maintain normal controls during outages of water and electricity are to be developed and employed.

Approval is hereby granted with the following qualifications:

- (1) Details of scrubber design are to be submitted and approved by the Department prior to commencement of the construction of the scrubber.
 - (2) Prior to commencement of operation of the dechlorination process, the applicant shall:
 - (a) Construct a segregated wastewater handling system, approved by the Department, such that wastewater from the dechlorination area can be held separate from all other waste streams. Disposition of contaminated wastewater shall be in conformance with procedures established by the Department.
 - (b) Completion of a comprehensive sampling of surrounding soils and sediments of wastewater streams to determine the concentrations, if any exist, of dioxin in such soils and sediments. The results of said sampling and analysis shall be submitted to the Director. At his discretion, the Director may, after review of the sampling data, require further sampling and analysis before commencement of operation is permitted and may make such modifications to this permit as he considers appropriate.
-

- (3) After commencement of operation of the dechlorination process, the applicant shall:
 - (a) Conduct periodic analyses of the product and the air and water waste streams for dioxin concentrations in a manner and at such frequency as approved by the Director.
 - (b) Maintain, for inspection by Department personnel, the continuous recordings of the temperature and pressure for each dechlorination reactor for at least six months after the period of record.
 - (c) Analyze and report to the Department the concentration of dioxin in any waste stream or relief stream from any reacting mass which experienced upset. Until sufficient information has been obtained to assure that no dioxin results in waste or relief streams at 5% excess working pressure, upset shall mean attainment of 5% excess working pressure. Thereafter, upset shall mean 10% excess working pressure in any reactor.
 - (4) The applicant shall, after consultation with the Department, undertake further modifications in operation of the dechlorination process (including equipment, process controls and pollution controls) as may be deemed necessary, upon review of developing information, to prevent the generation of dioxin and to prevent its release into the environment.
-

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: Jonesboro Mill and Farm Supply, Inc.

Jonesboro, Arkansas

CSN: 160105

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 09/15/76

AMENDED: _____

CASE REFERENCES: _____

SUMMARY:

Jonesboro Mill and Farm Supply will construct and operate a mill to produce animal feed by mixing corn or milo with hog and cattle supplement or molasses. Control equipment will consist of two bag filters on each of two feed mixers and a cyclone vent cap to facilitate the dumping of dust-laden cyclone air into the mixers. Mill capacity will be 2000 lbs/hr. of feed.

The entire milling operation and the pre-milling grain storage will be enclosed.

ESTIMATED COST: \$15,000

TOTAL PROJECT: \$53,000

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: 10/01/76

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: 12/30/76

REVIEWED BY: JB

APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 367-A

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: Chemform Corporation
West Memphis, Arkansas

CSN: 540071

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 08/30/76 AMENDED: _____

CASE REFERENCES: _____

SUMMARY:

Chemform has commenced construction of a facility for the production of a newly labeled herbicide, Norflurazon. Chemform has applied for a permit under provisions of Section 3(c) of the Arkansas Air Pollution Control Code. The process and the control of air contaminant emissions, as proposed by the applicant are as follows:

The process is carried out in three separate reaction stages, followed by centrifugation, drying and packaging. All reactors and storage tanks which have potential emissions to the atmosphere are to be piped to a caustic scrubber or have conservation vents except for the completely enclosed amine system. The sump is to be covered and also piped to the scrubber. Should fugitive dusting become a problem in the packaging area, a collection system will be designed and the emissions from this sent to the scrubber. The total emissions from the scrubber are to be less than one pound an hour of HCl gas, 1.5 pounds an hour of SO₂, and trace amounts xylene and isopropyl alcohol.

ESTIMATED COST: \$31,000 TOTAL PROJECT: \$2,000,000

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: 07/01/76

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: 12/01/76

REVIEWED BY: PDD APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH QUALIFICATIONS

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 368-A

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

Permit is hereby approved subject to the following qualifications:

- (1) The applicant shall institute a sampling program, approved by the Director, no later than commencement of operation of the norflurazon facility to qualitatively and quantitatively assess the contribution of air borne contaminants arising from the scrubber, fugitive emissions within the norflurazon facility and the existing Speciality Products facility, and including emissions arising from associated water treatment facilities.
- (2) The applicant shall promptly initiate engineering studies leading to the development of an improved wastewater treatment system, for both the existing Speciality Products facility and the norflurazon facility, consistent with the requirements set for by the Division of Water Pollution Control.

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: Lane Poultry
Grannis, Arkansas

CSN: 570006

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 06/02/76 AMENDED: _____

CASE REFERENCES: Permit No. 250-A

SUMMARY:

Lane Poultry will install a chlorinator odor control system in the feather rendering building at their by-products plant in Grannis. A similar odor control system has been installed in the blood rendering building at the plant and has successfully reduced rendering odors.

This modification of existing permit No. 250-A is required since the feather rendering process has been relocated since original permit approval. Total project cost is for new feather plant.

ESTIMATED COST: \$22,000 TOTAL PROJECT: \$150,000

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: _____

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: September, 1976

REVIEWED BY: JB APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 250-A (MODIFICATION)

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: Acme Brick Company
Perla, Arkansas

CSN: 300008

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 09/16/76 AMENDED: _____

CASE REFERENCES: _____

SUMMARY:

Acme Brick Company operates a plant at Perla which manufactures face brick. In a part of this operation, clay is fed into two gas-fired rotary kilns to produce calcine, used in the manufacture of bricks. Acme was permitted (281-A) to control the flue gas emissions from these kilns with a wet scrubber.

Acme proposes to test both pine sawdust and 2% (approximately) sulfur bituminous coal as alternate fuels for firing the kilns.

QUALIFICATION:

Acme will perform particulate and gas (SO₂) emission tests for each type of fuel used and submit results to the Arkansas Department of Pollution Control and Ecology for evaluation.

ESTIMATED COST: _____ TOTAL PROJECT: _____

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: _____

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: _____

REVIEWED BY: JBJ APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH QUALIFICATION

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 281-A (Modification)

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: Arkansas Cement Corporation
Foreman, Arkansas

CSN: 310005

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 05/27/76 AMENDED: 09/15/76

CASE REFERENCES: _____

SUMMARY:

Arkansas Cement Corporation has submitted applications to amend Permit No. 75A in order that coal, rather than natural gas, can be used as the primary fuel to fire the three cement kilns operated by the Corporation at Foreman, Arkansas and, additionally, to replace the electrostatic precipitators currently serving the three kilns. In view of the historic unreliability of the three existing electrostatic precipitators, their replacement is considered necessary to assure continued compliance with provisions of the Arkansas Implementation Plan for Air Pollution Control (the Plan) and the Arkansas Air Pollution Control Code.

The scheduled commencement of operation of the coal system is anticipated during the first quarter of 1977. Completion of the replacement of the electrostatic precipitators is anticipated July, 1978.

ESTIMATED COST: \$5,540,000 TOTAL PROJECT: Coal - \$6,120,000

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: _____

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: ESP's - 07/1978

REVIEWED BY: CDH APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 75-A (MODIFICATION)

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

Approval of the construction and operation of the coal system and replacement of the electrostatic precipitators is hereby granted under the provisions of the Arkansas Water and Air Pollution Control Act and the Arkansas Air Pollution Control Code subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The company shall promptly submit procedures which will assure maximum practicable control of the existing electrostatic precipitators through a program of intensive maintenance until such time that replacement of the precipitators is completed or compliance with the provisions of the Plan is attained under normal maintenance.
- (2) Full compliance with the provisions of the Air Pollution Control Code will be achieved no later than July 1, 1978.
- (3) Control of the coal handling system is to be accomplished in order to minimize fugitive emissions.

Issuance of this permit is granted solely with respect to the Air Code. It is recognized that additional information concerning emissions and schedules of construction will be necessary prior to the Commission's determination under the provisions of the Plan. Therefore, the applicant is hereby advised that the staff is directed to secure such information as may be required to satisfy the requirements of the Plan, including the development of a proposed revision to such Plan and the announcement of the necessary public hearing should a revision be deemed appropriate.

See Attached Minute Order approved by the Executive Committee on August 27, 1976 for background information.

DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY
D.A.P.C.

SUMMARY REPORT RELATIVE TO PERMIT APPLICATION

SUBMITTED BY: Pollution Controls, Inc.
El Dorado, Arkansas

CSN: 700098

FIRST SUBMITTAL: 09/13/76 AMENDED: _____

CASE REFERENCES: _____

SUMMARY:

See Attached

ESTIMATED COST: \$150,000 TOTAL PROJECT: \$400,000

COMMENCEMENT OF INSTALLATION: _____

COMMENCEMENT OF OPERATION: _____

REVIEWED BY: CDH APPROVED: JES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH QUALIFICATIONS

ASSIGNED PERMIT NUMBER: 249-A(MODIFICATION)

COMMISSION MINUTE ORDER NUMBER: _____

On July 26, 1974, Permit No. 249-A was issued to Pollution Controls, Inc. of El Dorado for the construction of a chemical waste disposal facility. A permit to operate the facility was to be issued upon finalization of design and performance capabilities of the facility. As originally proposed, the facility would be capable of disposing of liquid and solid waste. Since issuance of Permit 249-A, the applicant has submitted supplemental information describing the installation and operation of a liquid waste incinerator. The scrubber serving that incinerator is of improved design and efficiency compared to that originally proposed.

On September 20, 1976, the applicant submitted an application for modification of Permit No. 249-A under provisions of Section 3(c) of the Air Code claiming as proprietary and secret "certain processes, operations and hardware involving modification to the high energy venturi scrubber." Approval to conduct initial phases of operation has been requested by the applicant to "cure" the refractories in the incinerator and related ducting. Once curing has been completed, operation of the facility to test and, to confirm, combustion calculations, flow rates, retention times, the efficiency of the scrubber and the effectiveness of operating controls and fail-safe devices is contemplated.

Upon review of the test data, an operating permit, with appropriate qualifications, will be submitted to the Commission for its consideration and issuance, if deemed appropriate. Operation of the incineration facility is hereby approved solely for the purpose of "curing" and testing. Fuels used for this purpose are to be limited to natural gas, fuel-oil, cutting oils and solvents containing halogenated hydrocarbons, which hydrocarbons are easily composed by thermal oxidation.

Testing is to be accomplished using techniques and procedures approved by the Director.