

II. What Changes and Clarifications Have We Made to the Proposed Standards?

In response to public comments received on the proposed standards, we made several changes in developing the final rule. The substantive comments and our responses and rule changes are summarized in the following sections. A more detailed summary of comments and responses can be found in the BID for the final rule which is available from several sources (see **ADDRESSES**).

A. Applicability

We have made several changes to clarify the applicability of the final rule to certain coating, printing, slashing, dyeing, and finishing operations. We have also made changes to clarify which other web surface coating operations are not subject to the requirements of this final rule.

One commenter requested that we clarify the intent of proposed exemptions for research and development facilities from the rule requirements. The commenter believes the word facility and the definition of research or laboratory facility could be read to mean that the research or laboratory facility must be a facility separate from any facility that is doing commercial coating, dyeing, etc., in order to be exempt from subpart OOOO applicability. Typically in this source category, research and development activities are conducted on web coating and printing lines or dyeing and finishing operations located within a manufacturing plant. These research and development operations are co-located with manufacturing lines in order to test the product at the same manufacturing variables (e.g., temperature and humidity) as those of the products currently being used. Therefore, the final rule language has been written to reflect this. The use of the terms research or laboratory operations, rather than facilities, will also make this language consistent with the affected source description in the final rule. A corresponding change has also been made to the definition of research or laboratory facility to reflect this change.

One commenter observed that the proposal preamble described exemptions to the proposed rule for certain tape and tire manufacturing activities covered by the NESHAP for Paper and Other Web Coating and the NESHAP for Tire Manufacturing MACT, respectively. The commenter pointed out that the proposed rule text failed to mention any of these exemptions. These explicit exemptions were inadvertently

omitted from the proposed rule language. The final rule has been written to include the appropriate exemptions.

Three commenters expressed concern that, as proposed, the final rule could be interpreted to apply to synthetic fiber manufacturing operations. We have written the final rule to clarify that coating, slashing, dyeing, and finishing operations that are part of a synthetic fiber manufacturing process, and are part of the affected source of another NESHAP, such as the Group IV Polymers and Resins NESHAP (40 CFR 63, subpart JJJ) are not subject to the requirements of the final rule. For example, finishes that are applied in an affected source to which subpart JJJ applies are not subject to the requirements of the final rule.

One commenter noted the preamble to the proposed rule stated that coating and printing operations conducted at ambient temperatures and not involving drying or curing equipment are not subject to the provisions of the rule. The commenter requested that this language be included in the applicability section of the final regulation. In order to clarify the applicability of the final rule to web coating and printing operations conducted at ambient temperatures, the final rule has been written to exclude web coating or printing operations that do not involve drying or curing equipment such as ovens, tenter frames, steam cans, or dryers from the requirements of the final rule. Web coating and printing operations that dry at ambient temperatures are not representative of the coating and printing operations in the database used to determine the MACT floor for the coating and printing subcategory. These low-production rate operations make up only a small segment of the overall coating and printing industry. It was also determined that the emission capture and control technologies applicable to these operations would be considerably different (because of temperature, concentration, and flow rate differences) than those operations involving drying and curing equipment which are the basis of the MACT floor determination.

B. Overlap With Other Rules

Two commenters pointed out that the preamble text of the proposed rule created duplicate applicability for some sources, i.e., web coating lines that coat paper and other web substrates as well as fabric and other textile substrates. The commenters requested clarification on which NESHAP would apply to web coating lines that coat both types of substrate. The Paper and Other Web

Coating NESHAP applies to web coating lines engaged in the coating of fabric for use in flexible packaging, pressure sensitive tapes and abrasive materials. The final rule has been written to clarify that web coating lines where both fabric and other webs are coated for use in flexible packaging, pressure sensitive tapes or abrasive materials or where fabric is being laminated to a paper and other web substrate are subject to 40 CFR 63, subpart JJJJ, and not today's final rule.

For other web coating lines engaged in the coating of fabric and other webs on the same web coating line, we have written in a provision to the final rule whereby a source can determine which MACT standard they must comply with based on the predominant surface coating activity conducted on the web coating line. Predominant activity has been determined to be 90 percent or more of the mass of substrate coated. For example, a web coating line that coats 90 percent paper and 10 percent fabric substrates would have to comply with the Paper and Other Web NESHAP (40 CFR 63, subpart JJJJ).

C. Affected Source

Seven commenters stated that the proposed rule was inconsistent with regard to its applicability to cleaning materials and preparation activities. The commenters requested revisions to the proposed rule related to its applicability to cleaning materials and preparation activities. We agree with the commenters that the final rule should not regulate cleaning materials and preparation materials in the slashing or the dyeing and finishing subcategories. Slashing and dyeing and finishing operations are aqueous processes, and, therefore, the cleaning materials and preparation activities used in these operations do not contain organic HAP. The most common cleaning material used in these operations is water. The final rule has been written to clarify that cleaning and preparation materials used in the slashing and the dyeing and finishing subcategories are not regulated materials.

D. Emission Limits and Options

Seven commenters requested that an add-on control compliance option be included in the final rule for the dyeing and finishing subcategory. The commenters pointed out that as the industry moves from mass base goods production to specialized niche production, and as new products and technologies are developed and implemented, flexibility in the production process will be the key to the survival of this industry. We agree