DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
ACTIVITY REPORT: Self Initiated Inspection

N741731055

FACILITY: AUSTEMPER INC.		**SRN / ID:** N7417
LOCATION: 33180 KELLY RD., CLINTON TWP		**DISTRICT:** Southeast Michigan
CITY: CLINTON TWP		**COUNTY:** MACOMB
CONTACT: Wallace James , Facilities Manager		**ACTIVITY DATE:** 08/26/2015
STAFF: Rem Pinga	**COMPLIANCE STATUS:** Non Compliance	**SOURCE CLASS:** MINOR
SUBJECT: Unannounced Level 2 Self-initiated inspection		
RESOLVED COMPLAINTS:		

On 08/26/2015, I conducted a level 2 unannounced self-initiated inspection at Austemper, Inc., located at 33180 Kelly Road, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035. The purpose of the inspection was to determine the facility's compliance with the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act; Part 55, Air Pollution Control, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, 1994 PA 451, as amended (Act 451), the Administrative Rules, and the conditions of the facility's recently issued Permit to Install No. 276-04A. During the pre-inspection meeting, I stated the purpose of my visit, showed my credential (ID Badge), and gave a copy of the pamphlet "Environmental Inspections: Rights and Responsibilities" to Mr. Sam Domke, Plant Manager and facility contact person. Mr. Domke informed me that all records are sent to Mr. Wallace "Skip" James, Facilities Manager, at the corporate office in Wixom, Michigan.

The facility conducts miscellaneous metal parts heat treat processes for customers in the automotive, and other industries. Heat treating is a process to harden the metal by subjecting the metal in a two stage heat application processes. The first phase is called austeritizing (hardening) process. In this process, the metal is subjected to high temperature such as 1300°F to alter the properties, then cooled rapidly through a cooling medium known as the quenching process. After the first heating stage, the metal is usually cleaned and then subjected to a lower temperature heating known as tempering process.

The facility was issued PTI No. 276-04A for 2 hardening furnaces with molten salt quenching and 1 tempering furnace. Recordkeeping requirements were submitted to AQD staff by email from Mr. Wallace "Skip" James. Per PTI No. 276-04A special condition FGHEATREAT(I)(2), I did not observe any visible emissions both inside and outside the facility. Per PTI No. 276-04A special condition FGHEATREAT(I)(1), the calculated monthly 12-month rolling time period PM emissions from January 2014 through July 2015 were over the permit limit of 2.16 tpy. Per PTI No. 276-04A special condition FGHEATREAT(II)(1), the monthly molten salt usage rate as calculated monthly based on 12-month rolling time period also exceeded the 4,320 pounds permit limit from March 2014 through July 2015. Per PTI No. 276-04A special condition FGHEATREAT(VI)(2), I obtained sample records of visible emissions observations conducted daily when FGHEATREAT operated. During inspection, I observed 2 hardening furnaces operating and noted the different zone temperatures above 1550°F. The tempering furnace was installed and operational but not operating at the time of the inspection. The quench tanks are located in ground and fully covered as part of the continuous belt line connected to each hardening furnace. Parts coming out of the belt line from quenching were either dried for packaging or conveyed to the tempering furnace and subjected to a secondary lower temperature heat treating process.

On 09/09/2015, I called Mr. Wallace James and discuss the noncompliance issues I observed during records review. He mentioned that some of the high salt usage may be due to leakage or improper recording resulting from not accounting the amount of salt replaced during a complete tank cleaning, etc.. I informed Mr. James that AQD protocols require that I sent the company a Notice of Violation with a response to the VN usually requested over 3 weeks. Mr. James can include in the response to the VN any miscalculations, improper recording, or other actions to be taken to address the noncompliance. I explained the process to resolve a VN and may include a potential permit to install modification if the facility feels that the current emission limits or usage rates in the permit do not reflect the current/future business needs of the facility.

NAME KMJ DATE 9/9/2015 SUPERVISOR CJE