

radio frequency that are used to remove moisture from veneer are not considered to be veneer dryers or veneer redryers, although these process units are typically used to redry veneer.

Emissions test data from the NCASI sampling program indicate that emissions from radio frequency veneer redryers are minimal compared to the emissions from veneer dryers heated by conventional means (such as direct firing or steam heating). Thus, the monitoring requirements for veneer redryers described above would not apply to process units that dry or redry veneer using microwaves or radio frequency.

5. Monitoring and Recordkeeping Requirements for Hardwood Veneer Dryer Work Practice Requirements

Veneer dryers that meet the definition of "hardwood veneer dryer" in today's proposed rule would not be subject to the proposed control requirements. Hardwood veneer dryers are defined in the proposed rule as veneer dryers that process less than 30 percent softwood species on an annual volume basis. If you own or operate a hardwood veneer dryer, you would be required to keep a record (such as a purchase or production record) of the annual volume percentage of softwood species processed in the dryer to show that your dryer continuously meets the definition of a hardwood veneer dryer.

6. Monitoring and Recordkeeping Requirements for Softwood Veneer Dryer Work Practice Requirements

The proposed work practice requirement for softwood veneer dryers is to minimize fugitive emissions from the dryer doors and green end. If you own or operate a softwood veneer dryer, you would be required to develop a plan for minimizing fugitive emissions from the dryer, and you would have to keep records to document that you are following your plan to show continuous compliance with the work practice requirement.

7. Additional Recordkeeping Requirements for Sources Complying With Emissions Averaging Alternative

If you comply with the emissions averaging provisions, you would be required to keep records of all information necessary to calculate debits and credits, including records of your process unit operating hours, records of total HAP measurements for debit-generating process units, and records of performance tests for credit-generating process units. You would also have to keep monitoring records for

add-on control systems used to control credit-generating process units.

I. How Did We Select the Notification and Reporting Requirements?

We selected the proposed notification and reporting requirements based on requirements in the NESHAP General Provisions (40 CFR part 63, subpart A) and specific requirements for the PCWP source category.

The notification requirements that we are proposing include Initial Notifications, notification of performance test, Notification of Compliance Status, and notification dates. These notification requirements are based on requirements in §§ 63.7(b) and (c), 63.8(e) and (f), 63.9(b) through (h), and 63.10(d)(2).

In addition, we selected notification requirements for the emissions averaging provisions. If you comply with the emissions averaging provisions, you would have to submit an EAP to the Administrator for approval at least 1 year prior to the compliance date, or 1 year prior to the date you would begin using an emissions average to comply with the proposed rule, whichever is later. The EAP would have to be submitted prior to the date you would begin using an emissions average so that the Administrator would have time to review and approve or disapprove the plan, and so that you would have time to ensure that the emissions credits would equal or exceed the emissions debits.

The proposed reporting requirements that we selected include semiannual compliance reports, required in § 63.10(e)(3), and immediate SSM reports, required in § 63.10(d)(5)(ii). If there are no deviations from the compliance options, operating requirements, or work practice requirements during the reporting period, then you would only be required to include a statement that there were no deviations in your semiannual compliance report. If there are deviations from the compliance options, operating requirements, or work practice requirements during a reporting period, then you would be required to submit the information required in today's proposed rule in your semiannual compliance report. If you have a startup, shutdown or malfunction during the reporting period, and you take actions consistent with your SSM plan (SSMP), then your compliance report would have to include the information in § 63.10(d)(5)(i). The submittal date for the compliance report is based on information in § 63.10(e)(3)(v).

If there is a startup, shutdown, or malfunction during the reporting period, and you take actions inconsistent with the SSMP, then you would be required to submit an immediate SSM report. The report would have to include the actions taken for the event and the information provided in § 63.10(d)(5)(ii). The submittal date for the immediate SSM report is based on § 63.10(d)(5)(ii). For facilities complying with the emissions averaging provisions, the semiannual compliance report would have to contain calculations showing that the AMR equals or exceeds the RMR in addition to the requirements outlined above for semiannual compliance reports.

We have included a routine control device maintenance exemption in today's proposed rule to provide an allowance for control device downtime associated with routine maintenance such as bakeouts, washouts, and media replacement. We would like to clarify that there will also be instances when a control device is offline for correction of malfunctions such as electrical problems, mechanical problems, utility supply problems, pre-filer upsets, production malfunctions (*e.g.*, dryer fires), and weather-related problems. Because these malfunctions are sudden, infrequent, and not reasonably preventable, they would be covered under the SSM provisions of today's proposed rule. In addition, control device downtime due to process upsets that require shutdown and restarting of equipment would be covered under the SSM provisions.

IV. Summary of Environmental, Energy and Economic Impacts

A. How Many Facilities Are Impacted by This Proposed Rule?

This proposed rule is expected to affect an estimated 223 existing major source facilities that manufacture PCWP. The impacted facilities generally manufacture one or more of the following products: softwood plywood, softwood veneer, medium density fiberboard (MDF), oriented strandboard (OSB), particleboard, hardboard, laminated strand lumber, and laminated veneer lumber. The number of impacted facilities was determined based on the estimated potential to emit (*i.e.*, uncontrolled HAP emissions) from each facility and whether or not the facility already operates control systems necessary to meet the proposed standards. Facilities with estimated potential to emit 25 tons or more of total HAP or 10 or more tons of an individual HAP are major sources of HAP and are