

records of the organic HAP content, volatile matter content, coating solids content, and quantity of the coatings, thinners, and cleaning materials used during each compliance period.

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

- All required measurements, calculations, and supporting documentation needed to demonstrate compliance with the standards;
- All results of performance tests and parameter monitoring;
- All information necessary to demonstrate conformance with the requirements for minimizing emissions from mixing, storage, and handling operations for coatings, thinners, and cleaning materials;
- All information necessary to demonstrate conformance with the affected source's SSMP when the plan procedures are followed;
- The occurrence and duration of each SSM of the emission capture system and control device;
- Actions taken during SSM that are different from the procedures specified in the affected source's SSMP; and
- Each period during which a CPMS is malfunctioning or inoperative (including out-of-control periods).

The final 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 would be a deviation that is separate from any emission limits, operating limits, or work practice standards.

Deviations, as determined from these records, must be recorded and also reported. A deviation is any instance when any requirement or obligation established by the final rule is not met, including but not limited to the emission limits, operating limits, and work practice standards.

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 If you revise the plan, you must keep the previous superseded versions on record for 5 years following the revision.

**Periodic Reports.** Each reporting year is divided into two semiannual reporting periods. If no deviations occur during a semiannual reporting period, you must submit a semiannual report stating that the affected source has been in continuous compliance. If deviations

occur, you must include them in the report as follows:

- Report each deviation from the emission limits.
- Report each deviation from the work practice standards if you use an emission capture system and control device.
- If you use an emission capture system and control device other than a solvent recovery system for which you conduct liquid-liquid material balances, report each deviation from an operating limit and each time a bypass line diverts emissions from the control device to the atmosphere during a controlled coating operation.
- Report other specific information on the periods of time and details of deviations that occurred.

You must include in each semiannual report an identification of the compliance option(s) you used and of time periods when you changed to another option.

**Other Reports.** You must submit reports for periods of SSM of the capture system and control device. If the procedures you follow during any SSM are inconsistent with your plan, you must report those procedures with your semiannual reports in addition to immediate reports required by § 63.10(d)(5)(ii) of the NESHAP General Provisions.

#### **IV. What Are the Environmental, Energy, Cost, and Economic Impacts?**

##### *A. What Are the Air Impacts?*

The final rule will reduce nationwide organic HAP emissions from existing major sources by approximately 4,400 Mg/yr (4,900 tpy). This represents a reduction of 63 percent from the baseline organic HAP emissions of 7,000 Mg/yr (7,800 tpy).

##### *B. What Are the Non-Air Health, Environmental, and Energy Impacts?*

Based on information from the industry survey responses, we found no indication that the use of low- or no-organic-HAP content coatings, thinners, and cleaning materials at existing sources would result in any increase or decrease in non-air health, environmental, and energy impacts. There would be no change in utility requirements associated with the use of these materials, so there would be no change in the amount of energy consumed as a result of the material conversion. Also, there would be no significant change in the amount of materials used or the amount of waste produced.

##### *C. What Are the Cost and Economic Impacts?*

Total annual cost of compliance for the estimated 215 existing major sources was projected to be \$22.5 million. Due to consolidation throughout the industry, there is not expected to be any net growth within the wood building products surface coating industry during the next 5 years. Therefore, there are no projected impacts for new sources.

We performed an economic impact assessment (EIA) to provide an estimate of the facility and market impacts of the final rule as well as the social costs. In general, we expect the economic impacts of the promulgated standards to be minimal, with expected price increases for affected wood building products surface coating facilities of only 0.04 percent.

For affected sources, the median profit margin will remain unchanged, with small entities being slightly more affected by the final rule. The median profit margin for small entities is expected to decrease from 2.8 percent to 2.7 percent while the median profit margin for large entities is expected to decrease from 3.1 percent to 3.0 percent. Therefore, we do not expect an adverse economic impact on the industry as a whole.

The distribution of costs across wood building products surface coating facilities is slanted toward the lower impact levels with many facilities incurring costs related only to annually recurring monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting, and for only a few sources that choose to use their existing add-on controls, initial performance testing and parameter monitoring. The EIA indicates that these regulatory costs are expected to represent only 0.2 percent of the value of coating services, which should not cause producers to cease or alter their current operations. Hence, no firms or facilities are at risk of closure because of the promulgated standards. For more information, refer to the "Economic Impact Analysis for the Wood Building Products NESHAP" in the docket.

#### **V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

##### *A. Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review*

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), EPA must determine whether the regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Executive Order defines "significant regulatory