

they did not identify themselves as major or synthetic minor sources.

Using the organic HAP emissions and the total volume of coating solids used in each subcategory and coating type segment for each survey respondent, we calculated the normalized organic HAP emissions (emission rate) in units of kilograms (kg) organic HAP per liter of coating solids (pounds (lb) organic HAP per gal of coating solids) used. The sources were then ranked from the lowest to the highest emission rate in each of the four subcategories and coating type segments.

For subcategories and coating segments in which there were more than 30 sources, the existing source MACT floor was based on the top 12 percent of the sources. For subcategories and coating segments with fewer than 30 sources, the existing source MACT floor was based on the top five sources. The average emission rate for each subcategory was interpreted as the median value of the included sources. The median emission rate was selected rather than the mean or mode because it is associated with an actual emission rate being achieved by a real facility. The best performing source in each subcategory or coating segment in the database determined the MACT floor for new or reconstructed affected sources.

The MACT floor analysis for new affected sources resulted in the emission limits for each subcategory and coating segment given in Table 2 of this preamble. The analysis for existing affected sources resulted in emission limits given in Table 3 of this preamble. The alternative control efficiency and outlet concentration limits for those new and existing sources using capture and control systems are given in Table 4 of this preamble. The survey data showed no appreciable differences in substrates coated, coating technologies used, or the applicability of control measures between the floor sources and the remaining sources in each subcategory and coating segment.

After the floors have been determined for new or reconstructed and existing sources in a source category or subcategory, we must set emission standards that are technically achievable and no less stringent than the floors. Such standards must then be met by all affected sources within the source category or subcategory. We identify and consider any reasonable regulatory alternatives that are beyond-the-floor, taking into account emissions reductions, cost, non-air quality health and environmental impacts, and energy requirements. Different beyond-the-floor alternatives may be considered for new

or reconstructed affected sources and existing affected sources.

The beyond-the-floor option considered for all the subcategories and for both new and existing sources was requiring the use of capture systems and add-on control devices for all metal can surface coating operations. The add-on control device chosen for the beyond-the-floor analysis was a regenerative thermal oxidizer (RTO). An RTO was chosen to reflect the highest emission reduction level possible.

In evaluating the beyond-the-floor option, we calculated the additional costs and emission reductions associated with the use of a capture system and RTO. We calculated the cost to reduce each ton of organic HAP emissions using the more stringent level of control. Requiring sources to meet the beyond-the-floor level would result in an estimated additional emissions reduction of 283 Mg/yr (312 tpy) at an estimated cost of \$14.6 million per year or \$51,600 per Mg HAP (\$46,800 per ton HAP) reduced.

Without having information on the benefits that would be achieved by reducing emissions beyond-the-floor, we determined that the additional emission reductions that could be achieved do not warrant the costs that each affected source would incur by using add-on controls. Therefore, we are not requiring beyond-the-floor levels of emissions reductions at this time. After implementation of those standards, we will evaluate the health and environmental risks that may be posed as a result of exposure to emissions from the metal can surface coating source category. At that time, we will determine whether additional control is warranted in light of the available risk information.

We note here that our assumption, used in the development of the MACT floors, that 100 percent of the organic HAP in the materials used are emitted by the affected source would not apply when the source sends organic HAP waste materials to a facility for treatment or disposal. We made that assumption because the industry survey responses provided little information as to the amount of organic HAP recovered and recycled or treated and disposed of as a hazardous waste. We, therefore, concluded that the practice may not be common within the metal can surface coating industry. We recognize, however, that some metal can surface coating facilities may conduct such activities and should be allowed to account for such activities in determining their emissions. Thus, the proposed rule allows you to reduce the organic HAP emissions by the amount

of any organic HAP contained in waste treated or disposed of at a hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facility that is regulated under 40 CFR part 262, 264, 265, or 266.

The alternative capture/control efficiency limit of 95 percent for existing sources and 97 percent for new or reconstructed sources, and the 20 parts per million by volume HAP outlet concentration limit are based on the documented emission reductions in test reports provided by metal can facilities and the EPA's study of available incinerator technology, cost, and energy use. We are requesting specific comment on the usefulness and likelihood of the proposed alternative limits and the level of control required by the alternative limits.

#### *E. How Did We Select the Format of the Standards?*

We selected the primary format of the standards to be mass of HAP per volume of coating solids. We selected volume of coating solids to normalize the rate of organic HAP emissions across all sizes and types of coating operations and facilities. Volume of coating solids used is directly related to the surface area coated and, therefore, provides an equitable basis of comparison for all coatings, regardless of differences in coating densities. A format based on the mass or weight of coating solids instead of volume could result in inequitable standards for higher-density coatings compared to coatings with lower densities per unit volume.

To provide compliance flexibility, we also provided an alternative compliance option based on percent reduction achieved by a capture system and control device or the HAP concentration exiting a control device. We selected those alternative formats because they would achieve equivalent or greater HAP emissions reduction at those facilities using capture/control systems while reducing the recordkeeping and reporting burden for those facilities. Those alternative limits are based on test report data provided by industry and reflect what we believe to be the achievable level of control available with control devices commonly used by the metal can surface coating industry.

Another choice for the format of the standards that we considered but rejected was a usage limit (mass of HAP per unit of production). As it is not our intent to limit a facility's production under those proposed standards, we rejected a usage limit.