

efficiency for enclosures are discussed below.

We are proposing the use of EPA Method 25A, "Determination of Total Gaseous Organic Matter Concentration Using a Flame Ionization Analyzer," for measuring THC emissions because most of the metal can facilities that are already required to measure THC emissions use that method. Also, most of the available emissions data that we used to evaluate THC control efficiencies were measured using Method 25A and reported on an as carbon basis. Method 25A is better suited than EPA Method 25, "Measurement of Total Gaseous Nonmethane Organic Emissions as Carbon (TGNMO)," for measuring emission streams from metal can coating lines which typically have lower THC concentrations (less than 50 parts per million) and relatively high moisture contents. However, unlike Method 25, Method 25A does measure methane as a THC. Because many of the well-controlled metal can facilities are required by permit to reduce VOC emissions, those facilities generally are allowed to subtract methane emissions from the THC measurement when reporting VOC emissions because methane is not a VOC, according to EPA's definition of VOC. Therefore, we also would allow you to subtract methane emissions from measured THC values using EPA Method 18, "Measurement of Gaseous Organic Compound Emissions by Gas Chromatography." Method 18 is a self-validating method.

We are proposing the use of EPA Method 204, "Criteria for and Verification of Permanent or Temporary Total Enclosure," and Methods 204A through 204F for determining the capture efficiency of enclosures. Methods 204A through 204F include the following: Method 204A, "Volatile Organic Compounds Content In Liquids Input Stream," Method 204B, "Volatile Organic Compounds Emissions In Captured Stream," Method 204C, "Volatile Organic Compounds Emissions In Captured Stream (Dilution Technique)," Method 204D, "Volatile Organic Compounds Emissions In Uncaptured Stream From Temporary

Total Enclosure," Method 204E, "Volatile Organic Compounds Emissions In Uncaptured Stream From Building Enclosure," and Method 204F, "Volatile Organic Compounds Content In Liquid Input Stream (Distillation Approach)." If the enclosure meets the criteria in EPA Method 204 for a PTE, then you may assume that its capture efficiency is 100 percent. If the enclosure is not a PTE, then you would have to build a temporary total enclosure (TTE) around it that meets the definition of a TTE in EPA Method 204, and you would be required to determine the capture efficiency of the TTE using Methods 204A through 204F (as appropriate). You would then have to measure emissions from both the control device and the TTE and use the combined emissions to determine compliance.

Industry representatives have expressed concern with using EPA Methods 204 and 204A through F for determining capture efficiency of coating line enclosures. The industry representatives have indicated that some facilities may have difficulty retrofitting a PTE or TTE that meets the EPA Method 204 criteria. Partial enclosures may be able to achieve high capture, but Methods 204 and 204A through F are the only available methods for testing the efficiency of partial enclosures. We recognize the need for flexibility in determination of capture efficiency for metal can coating line enclosures and welcome your comments on alternative approaches for determining capture efficiency. Today's proposed rule would allow facilities to petition the Administrator for use of alternative test methods.

I. How Did We Select Notification, Recordkeeping, and Reporting Requirements?

You would be required to comply with the applicable requirements in the NESHAP General Provisions, subpart A of 40 CFR part 63, as described in Table 5 of the proposed subpart KKKK. We evaluated the General Provisions requirements and included those we determined to be the minimum notification, recordkeeping, and reporting necessary to ensure compliance with and effective

enforcement of the proposed standards, modifying them as appropriate for the metal can surface coating category.

IV. Summary of Environmental, Energy, and Economic Impacts

The proposed standards would affect 142 major source metal can surface coating facilities. The impacts are presented relative to a baseline reflecting the level of control prior to the standards. Due to consolidation throughout the industry, there is not expected to be any net growth within the metal can surface coating industry within the next 5 years. Therefore, the estimate of the impacts is presented for existing facilities only. For a facility that is already in compliance with the standards, only monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting cost impacts were estimated. For more information on how impacts were estimated, see the BID (EPA-453/R-02-008).

The outcome of two delisting petitions that have been submitted to EPA could significantly affect the estimated impacts of this rulemaking. These petitions are the petition to delist EGBE from the HAP list and the petition to delist the two-piece beverage can subcategory from the source category list. Both petitions are being reviewed by the EPA. If granted, the delisting of either EGBE or the two-piece beverage can subcategory could affect the proposed emission limits and the number of affected sources. Thus, the estimated impacts of this proposed rule could change. Once decisions on the petitions are finalized, we will evaluate whether any changes to the proposed rule are appropriate.

A. What Are the Air Impacts?

The proposed emission limits are expected to reduce nationwide organic HAP emissions from existing major affected sources by approximately 6,160 Mg/yr (6,800 tpy). That represents a reduction of 71 percent from the baseline organic HAP emissions of 8,700 Mg/yr (9,600 tpy). Table 5 of this preamble gives a summary of the primary air impacts for major coating segment groupings associated with implementation of the proposed rule.

TABLE 5.—SUMMARY OF PRIMARY AIR IMPACTS BY SUBCATEGORY OR COATING SEGMENT FOR EXISTING SOURCES

Subcategory or or coating segment	Emissions before NESHAP, Mg/ yr (tpy)	Emissions after NESHAP, Mg/yr (tpy)	Emissions reduction, Mg/ yr (tpy)	Percent reduction
Two-piece D&I beverage can body coatings	4,468 (4,922)	1,644 (1,811)	2,824 (3,111)	63