

establish NESHAP for the listed source categories and subcategories under section 112(d) of the CAA. Because BSCP manufacturing is a listed source category containing major sources of HAP, we are required by the CAA to establish NESHAP for BSCP manufacturing.

As stated previously, MACT can either be established at the MACT floor, or can be some control level more stringent than the MACT floor or beyond the floor. Section 112(d)(3) of the CAA does not allow us to consider cost when determining MACT floors. We are only allowed to consider costs when we examine beyond-the-floor control options according to section 112(d)(2) of the CAA. We acknowledge the commenters' concerns regarding the cost of the proposed rule. At proposal, we determined that beyond-the-floor control measures would not be appropriate for the BSCP industry, in part because of costs.

Following proposal, we reevaluated the MACT floors for existing tunnel kilns and have revised the standards to incorporate use of DLA on existing large tunnel kilns. We also revised the MACT standards for new and reconstructed small tunnel kilns, existing small kilns that are rebuilt such that they become large kilns, and existing large DLA-controlled tunnel kilns that are rebuilt such that the standards are based on the level of performance that can be achieved by a DLA. (MACT requirements for existing small tunnel kilns and new and reconstructed large tunnel kilns remain unchanged.) We continue to agree that beyond-the-floor control measures are not warranted for the BSCP industry. The revised MACT standards for new and reconstructed small tunnel kilns, existing small kilns that are rebuilt such that they become large kilns, and existing large DLA-controlled kilns that are rebuilt are the same as the revised standards for existing large tunnel kilns. These revised standards are less costly and should reduce concerns regarding cost of retrofitting or rebuilding existing kilns and starting up new small kilns. Environmental benefits of today's final BSCP rule are discussed later in this preamble.

EPA reviewed the economic impact analysis report submitted by the commenter. We have revised our EIA to identify additional small businesses affected by the rule. We have also incorporated the lower revised cost estimates into the EIA. Impacts on small businesses are considerably lower in the revised analysis and prices are predicted to rise by less than one percent on average. The results of our

revised EIA, as well as a discussion of the impact of today's final rule on small businesses, are presented later in this preamble.

Comments on the costs of monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping were incorporated into the revised OMB 83-I form and supporting statement as appropriate. A discussion of the OMB 83-I form and supporting statement prepared in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act is presented later in this preamble.

F. Test Data and Emission Limits

1. HF and HCl Emission Limits

Commenters stated that the test data EPA used to set the HF and HCl limits are questionable. An independent consultant, hired by the BSCP industry, reviewed the data and determined that six of the seven test runs used the wrong filter media. A glass filter media was used instead of a Teflon filter. The commenter suggested that, as a result, the data could be biased. One commenter also charged that EPA removed high test runs without any technical basis even though all of these runs met the same quality control (QC) criteria as other runs. Finally, one commenter stated that EPA's use of both HF and total fluorides (TF) data to develop the average uncontrolled HF emission factor (which was used in developing the HF emission limit) was unsupported, and the commenter believes that EPA should use only the HF test data because HF is the regulated pollutant.

We have reviewed the emission tests mentioned by the commenter and agree that there are some problems with most of the available test data, and we have accounted for any potential bias by revising the emission limits. In consultation with EPA's Emission Measurement Center (EMC), we used a conservative approach to determine the possible impact of the bias on the percent reduction emission limits. The analysis showed that our available percent reduction data could be as much as about 5 percent high, and we, therefore, decreased the corresponding HF and HCl percent reduction requirements by 5 percent and adjusted the corresponding production-based emission limits accordingly. In response to the commenter's assertion that we dropped two test runs without a technical reason, we examined the test runs in question and incorporated one of the two runs back into the data set used for developing the standards. Finally, in response to the appropriateness of using TF data in calculating the average HF emission

factor, while the average of the TF and HF data sets suggest that TF and HF measurements are similar, we recognize the inconsistencies between the few available side-by-side HF and TF tests and we, therefore, decided to remove the TF data from the HF emission factor calculation. Based on the three issues discussed above, we revised the emission limits for kilns where MACT is based on use of DIFF, DLS/FF, or WS (*i.e.*, for new large kilns). Today's final rule requires new large kilns to limit HF emissions to 0.029 kilograms per megagram (kg/Mg) (0.057 pounds per ton (lb/ton)) of fired product or reduce HF emissions by 90 percent; and limit HCl emissions to 0.028 kg/Mg (0.056 lb/ton) or reduce HCl emissions by 85 percent.

The revised HF and HCl emission limits for existing large tunnel kilns, new and reconstructed small tunnel kilns, existing small kilns that are rebuilt such that they become large kilns, and existing large DLA-controlled tunnel kilns that are rebuilt are based on the use of a DLA for HAP reduction. Two HF emission tests (both conducted on the same source) and two total fluorides emission test are available for DLA-controlled kilns, and the tests showed HF or TF control efficiencies of 92.3 percent (HF), 96.4 percent (HF), 93.3 percent (TF), and 93.5 percent (TF). Similar to the DIFF and DLS/FF tests, we identified problems with the two HF emission tests that could have biased the control efficiencies high. To account for this uncertain bias, and considering typical vendor guarantees for DLA systems (vendors will guarantee 90 percent HF reduction unless a lesser percentage meets the customer's need, in which case the vendors typically provide lower guarantees), we selected a percent reduction emission limit of 90 percent for HF. We applied this 90 percent reduction to the revised average HF emission factor of 0.29 kg/Mg (0.57 lb/ton) to calculate a production-based HF emission limit of 0.029 kg/Mg (0.057 lb/ton). Control efficiency data for HCl are available from two tests on a single DLA-controlled kiln. The tests averaged 30.7 percent control, and we selected a percent reduction HCl emission limit of 30 percent. We applied this 30 percent reduction to the average HCl emission factor of 0.19 kg/Mg (0.37 lb/ton) to calculate a production-based HCl emission limit of 0.13 kg/Mg (0.26 lb/ton).

Percent of HAP metals in PM. Several commenters noted that HAP metals and PM data from four facilities (0.16 percent, 0.99 percent, 2.8 percent, and 4.5 percent) were used to arrive at 1.9 percent of the PM is PM HAP. The