

appendix A, and addenda A to method 10.

As also mentioned earlier, we request comments on the ability and use of FTIR systems to meet the validation and quality assurance requirements of Method 320 of 40 CFR part 63, appendix A, for the purpose of determining compliance with the emission limitation for formaldehyde emissions. In addition, we request comments on the use of Method 323 of 40 CFR part 63, appendix A, SW-846 Method 0011, and CARB 430 to determine compliance with the emission limitations for formaldehyde.

We request any HAP emissions test data available from stationary combustion turbines; however, if you submit HAP emissions test data, please submit the full and complete emission test report with this data. Without a complete emission test report, which includes sections describing the stationary combustion turbine and its operation during the test as well as identifying the stationary combustion turbine for purposes of verification, discussion of the test methods employed and the Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) procedures followed, the raw data sheets, all the calculations, etc., which such reports contain, submittal of HAP emission data by itself is of little use.

B. Can We Achieve the Goals of the Proposed Rule in a Less Costly Manner?

We have made every effort in developing the proposal to minimize the cost to the regulated community and allow maximum flexibility in compliance options consistent with our statutory obligations. We recognize, however, that the proposal may still require some facilities to take costly steps to further control emissions even though those emissions may not result in exposures which could pose an excess individual lifetime cancer risk greater than one in 1 million or exceed thresholds determined to provide an ample margin of safety for protecting public health and the environment from the effects of HAP. We also recognize that in some cases the proposal may require facilities to undertake emissions testing and monitoring even when the rule will not require them to reduce emissions at all. However, this is necessary to assure the proper initial performance and continuing performance of the emission reduction-pollution prevention technology. We are, therefore, specifically soliciting comment on whether there are further ways to structure the proposed rule to focus on the facilities which pose significant risks and avoid the

imposition of high costs on facilities that pose little risk to public health and the environment.

Representatives of the plywood and composite wood products industry provided EPA with descriptions of three mechanisms that they believed could be used to implement more cost-effective reductions in risk. The docket for today's proposed rule contains white papers prepared by the plywood and composite wood products industry that outline their proposed approaches (see docket OAR-2002-0060). These approaches could be effective in focusing regulatory controls on facilities that pose significant risks and avoiding the imposition of high costs on facilities that pose little risk to public health or the environment, and we are seeking public comment on the utility of each of these approaches with respect to the proposed rule.

One of the approaches, an applicability cutoff for threshold pollutants, would be implemented under the authority of CAA section 112(d)(4); the second approach, subcategorization and delisting, would be implemented under the authority of CAA sections 112(c)(1) and 112(c)(9); and the third approach would involve the use of a concentration-based applicability threshold. We are seeking comment on whether these approaches are legally justified and, if so, we ask for information that could be used to support such approaches. In addition, on August 21, 2002, the Agency received a petition from the Gas Turbine Association (GTA) requesting that natural gas fueled combustion turbines be delisted and a study that they believed would justify delisting. Section 112(c)(9) of the CAA provides EPA with the authority to delist categories or subcategories either in response to the petition of any person or upon the Administrator's own motion. The GTA states that the study supports a determination that HAP emissions from gas turbines would not result in a lifetime cancer risk greater than one in a million to the individual in the population most exposed to the emissions or non-carcinogenic health risk exceeding a level which is adequate to protect public health with an ample margin of safety. We have reviewed the GTA study and responded to the GTA on October 11, 2002 with questions and areas that we believe need further analysis. The EPA's request for further information and all information provided by the petitioner to date is located in the docket for today's proposed rule.

The MACT program outlined in CAA section 112(d) is intended to reduce

emissions of HAP through the application of MACT to major sources of toxic air pollutants. Section 112(c)(9) is intended to allow EPA to avoid setting MACT standards for sources or subcategories of sources that pose less than a specified level of risk to public health and the environment. The EPA requests comment on whether the proposals described here appropriately coordinate these provisions of CAA section 112. The two health-based approaches focus on assessing inhalation exposures or accounting for adverse environmental impacts. EPA specifically requests comment on the appropriateness and necessity of extending these approaches to account for non-inhalation exposures of certain HAP which may deposit from the atmosphere after being emitted into the air or to account for adverse environmental impacts. In addition to the specific requests for comment noted in this section, we are also interested in any information or comment concerning technical limitations, environmental and cost impacts, compliance assurance, legal rationale, and implementation relevant to the identified approaches. We also request comment on appropriate practicable and verifiable methods to ensure that sources' emissions remain below levels that protect public health and the environment. We will evaluate all comments before determining whether to include an approach in the final rule.

1. Industry HAP Emissions and Potential Health Effects

For the stationary combustion turbines source category, four HAP account for essentially all of the mass of HAP emissions. Those four HAP are formaldehyde, toluene, benzene, and acetaldehyde. Additional HAP which have been measured in emission tests that were conducted at natural gas fired and distillate oil fired combustion turbines are: 1,3 butadiene, acrolein, ethylbenzene, naphthalene, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH), propylene oxide, and xylenes. The following metallic HAP emissions have been measured from distillate oil fired stationary combustion turbines: arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, lead, manganese, mercury, nickel, and selenium.

Of the four HAP emitted in the largest quantities by this source category, all can cause toxic effects following sufficient exposure. The potential toxic effects of these four HAP are discussed previously in this preamble.

In accordance with section 112(k), EPA developed a list of 33 HAP which present the greatest threat to public