

oversight in the final rule. See § 63.4930(b) and § 63.4931(c).

Depending on the compliance option that you choose, you could need to keep records of the following:

- Organic HAP content, volatile matter content, coating solids content, and quantity of the coatings, thinners, and cleaning materials used during each compliance period;

- All documentation supporting initial notifications and notifications of compliance status.

If you demonstrate compliance by using a capture system and control device, you must keep records of the following:

- The occurrence and duration of each startup, shutdown, or malfunction of the emission capture system and control device;

- All maintenance performed on the capture system and control device;

- Actions taken during startup, shutdown, and malfunction that are different from the procedures specified in the affected source's startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan (SSMP);

- All information necessary to demonstrate conformance with the affected source's SSMP when the plan procedures are followed;

- All information necessary to demonstrate conformance with the affected source's plan for minimizing emissions from mixing, storage, and waste handling operations;

- Each period during which a CPMS is malfunctioning or inoperative (including out-of-control periods);

- All required measurements needed to demonstrate compliance with the standards; and

- All results of performance tests.

The rule requires you to collect and keep records according to certain minimum data requirements for the CPMS. Failure to collect and keep the specified minimum data is a deviation that is separate from any emission limit, operating limit, or work practice standard. A complete definition of what constitutes a deviation is provided in § 63.4981 of the final rule.

If you use a capture system and control device to reduce HAP emissions, you must make your SSMP available for inspection if the Administrator requests to see it. The plan must stay in your records for the life of the affected source or until the source is no longer subject to the standards. If you revise the plan, you must keep the previous superseded versions on record for 5 years following the revision.

E. Semiannual Reports

Each reporting year is divided into two semiannual reporting periods. You

must submit a semiannual report after the end of each semiannual period. If no deviations occur during a semiannual reporting period, your semiannual compliance report must state that the affected source has been in compliance. A deviation, as defined in § 63.4891 of the final rule, is any instance in which you fail to meet any requirement or obligation of the standards or any term or condition adopted to meet the standards. The following information is required in semiannual compliance reports when deviations occur:

- If you are complying by using capture systems and add-on control devices, report all deviations from the operating parameter values established for the capture system and the control device operating parameters.

- If you are complying by using solvent recovery systems and liquid-liquid material balances, report material balance calculations for all months when the material balance deviated from the emission limit.

- If you are complying by using low-HAP coating materials, report all deviations from the emission limit.

- If you are complying by using a combination of capture and control systems with low-HAP coating materials, report all deviations from the emission limit and all deviations from operating parameters described above.

If any of the following events occur, you must report that event in the next semiannual report following the event:

- A change occurs at your facility or within your process that might affect its compliance status.

- A change from what was reported in the initial notice occurs at your facility or within your process.

- You decide to change to another emission limitation option.

- You had a startup, shutdown, or malfunction of an emission control device during the semiannual period and the actions taken were consistent with your SSMP.

VII. What Are the Environmental, Energy, and Economic Impacts of the Rule?

We developed model plants to aid in the estimation of the impacts the MACT floor level of control would have on the metal furniture industry. Three model plants distinguished by size, as measured by the total volume of coating solids used, were developed. We then estimated impacts for each model plant and scaled these individual impacts to nationwide levels based on the number of facilities corresponding to each model plant size. We used the model plant approach because we did not have

adequate data to determine impacts for each actual facility.

A variety of compliance methods are available to the industry to meet the standards. We analyzed the information obtained from the industry questionnaire responses, industry site visits, trade groups, and industry representatives to determine which compliance methods would most likely be used by existing and new sources. We expect that the most widely used method would be low-HAP content liquid coatings (coatings with HAP contents at or below the emission limits) and lower-HAP cleaning materials. Powder coatings and add-on capture and control systems would likely be used to a lesser extent. Various combinations of these methods may be used. For the purpose of assessing impacts, we assumed that all existing sources would convert to lower-HAP content liquid coatings, thinners, and cleaning materials.

We first estimated the impacts of the emission limits on the three model plants. To scale up the model plant impacts to nationwide levels, we multiplied the individual model plant impacts by the estimated number of major sources in the United States corresponding to each model plant size. We used United States Census Bureau data as the basis for this estimate, which was a total of 655 facilities. For more information on how impacts were estimated, see Chapters 7 and 8 of the BID to the proposed standards, EPA-453/R-01-010, October 2001.

A. What Are the Air Impacts?

For existing major sources, we estimated that compliance with the emission limits would result in a reduction of nationwide organic HAP emissions of 14,800 Mg/yr (16,300 tpy). This represents a reduction of approximately 73 percent from the baseline organic HAP emissions of 20,300 Mg/yr (22,308 tpy).

We anticipate that all new sources will take steps to reduce their actual and potential HAP emissions to below the major source threshold and avoid becoming subject to the NESHP. Therefore, we are not attributing any HAP emission reduction for new sources to the rule.

B. What Are the Cost Impacts?

An affected source may incur three types of costs to comply with the standards: Capital, direct, and indirect. Capital costs represent the one-time purchase of equipment. We have included coatings, thinners, and cleaning materials as direct costs incurred on a continuing basis for