**Ventura County Air Pollution Control District**
**Breakdown Investigation Report**

**Breakdown # 0954**

Type of breakdown: ☒ Control Equipment ☐ CEMS

Company: XYZ COMPANY Permit No.: 2007

Location: 321 FORREST GREEN STREET, NEWBURY PARK, CA 92320

City/Area: Newbury Park, CA 92320

Equipment Involved: Thermal Oxidizer

Occurrence Date/Time 1/6/03 @ 2342 | Reported Date/Time 1/7/03 @ 0844

Person Contacted: MAY DAY Title: CEO

Investigation Date/Time: 1/7/03 1159 Correction Date/Time: 1/7/03 @ 0028

Re-inspection Date/Time:

| Yes | No | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☐ | Permit condition(s) violated | No(s).: PC #7 - Collection/destruction efficiency |
| ☒ | ☐ | Rule(s) violated | No(s).: 74.21.B.4 - Collection/destruction efficiency |
| ☐ | ☒ | Reported within 4 hours? | |
| ☒ | ☐ | Persisted for less than 24/96 hours, or the end of the production run | |
| ☐ | ☒ | Did violation result from operator error, improper operating or maintenance procedures? If yes, describe in narrative. | |
| ☒ | ☐ | Were steps taken to correct the condition or minimize emissions? If yes, describe in narrative. | |
| ☐ | ☒ | Were complaints received? | How many? |
| ☐ | ☒ | Will a petition for variance be filed? | |
| ☒ | ☐ | Are operating records available? | |
| ☐ | ☒ | Violation notice(s) issued? | No(s).: |
| ☒ | ☐ | Follow-up within 1 week? | |
| ☒ | ☐ | Occurrence constitutes a breakdown? | |

Engineer or Inspector Signature: Lyle Olson Date: 1/28/03

Supervisor's Comments:

Supervisor's Signature: [illegible] Date: 1/28/03

**Ventura County Air Pollution Control District**
**Breakdown Investigation Report**

**Breakdown # 954**

1. What was the problem? When and how did the operator become aware of the problem?

   The thermal oxidizer shutdown when there was a Southern California Edison power interruption. The whole facility was blacked out 2342 on 1/6/03.

2. Prior to the breakdown was the air pollution control or CEMS equipment properly maintained?

   XYZ COMPANY has no control over its facility power supply. However, the thermal oxidizer is subject to annual maintenance. Prior to the event, the thermal oxidizer was operating properly at a stable temperature of approximately 1480 degrees F.

3. Were repairs made in an expeditious manner? Was overtime or off-shift labor utilized?

   The thermal oxidizer temperature dropped approximatele 420 degrees F. The temperature was back up to operating temperature within 46 minutes.

4. Were emissions minimized as to amount and/or duration, and how? What were the excess emissions?

   XYZ COMPANY has followed its policy not to restart production until the thermal oxidizer is fully functional. Excess emissions were less than the full production emission level of 14.12 pounds over the 46 minute event.

5. Is the problem part of a recurring pattern indicating inadequate design, operation or maintenance?

   There were previous SCE power interruptions on 6/16/02, 6/29/02, and 12/22/03. There were two probable SCE power interruptions on 1/5/02.

6. If the equipment is a control device, what sources does it control, and what sources were in operation at the time of the breakdown? If the equipment is a CEMS, what sources are monitored by it?

   The thermal oxidizer controls the equipment in Building 007, including 4 photo resist coaters, 3 photo resist coater/developers, 2 lift-off solvent cleaning stations, 8 solvent cleaning stations, and 3 ovens.

7. Additional Comments