

enhanced biological treatment unit. The final rule also allows for offsite treatment provided the affected sources that ship their wastewater to an offsite facility for treatment as a hazardous waste note this fact along with the name of the facility to which the wastewater is shipped in their notification of compliance status report. If the wastewater is shipped offsite for treatment in an enhanced biological treatment unit, the offsite facility must comply with the monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements in subpart HHHHH. For new sources, the applicability triggers for control are more stringent, affecting all streams that contain partially soluble and soluble HAP at a concentration greater than or equal to 1,600 ppmw.

#### Transfer Operations

Standards for transfer operations at existing and new sources require 75 percent control of HAP emissions from product loading to tank trucks and railcars if the amount of material transferred contains at least 11.4 million liters per year (l/yr) (3.0 million gal/yr) of HAP, and the material has a HAP partial pressure greater than or equal to 10.3 kPa (1.5 psia). Acceptable control strategies also include routing displaced vapors back to the process, or the use of condensers operated below specified temperature limits.

#### Equipment Leaks

The final rule requires compliance with leak detection and repair (LDAR) programs for equipment leaks. Existing sources must comply with the sensory-based LDAR provisions of 40 CFR part 63, subpart R, the NESHAP for Gas Distribution Facilities. Alternatively, existing sources may comply with the LDAR program in 40 CFR part 63, subpart TT, or subpart UU (the National Emission Standards for Equipment Leaks—Control Level 1 and Control Level 2, respectively) because these alternatives are equivalent to or more stringent than the sensory-based LDAR program. New sources must comply with either the subpart TT or subpart UU LDAR provisions. For heat exchange systems at existing and new sources, the final rule requires a leak detection program, consistent with the program in 40 CFR 63.104 (the Hazardous Organic NESHAP (HON)).

Cleaning operations are considered part of the miscellaneous coating manufacturing operations at existing and new sources. Therefore, cleaning fluids are considered to be process fluids, and the requirements for process vessels, storage tanks, equipment leaks, and wastewater systems that apply to

other process operations also apply to cleaning operations.

#### C. What Are the Testing and Initial Compliance Requirements?

To verify that the required reductions have been achieved, you must either test or use calculation methodologies, depending on the emission stream characteristics, control device, and the type of process vent. Initial compliance demonstration provisions for stationary process vessels at miscellaneous coating manufacturing sources reference the 40 CFR part 63, subpart SS, closed vent system and performance test provisions and the capture efficiency Method 204 in appendix M to 40 CFR part 51. Control devices handling greater than 9.1 Mg/yr (10 tpy) of HAP must be tested, while engineering assessments are allowed for control devices with lower loads and for condensers. Performance test provisions are based on worst case operating conditions for devices controlling process vents.

The initial compliance demonstration procedures reference 40 CFR part 63, subpart SS, for storage tanks complying using control devices and transfer operations, and 40 CFR part 63, subpart WW, for storage tanks complying using floating roofs.

#### D. What Are the Continuous Compliance Requirements?

The final rule requires monitoring to determine whether you are in compliance with emission limits on an ongoing basis. This monitoring is done either by continuously measuring HAP emissions reductions or by continuously measuring a site-specific operational parameter, the value of which you would establish during the initial compliance demonstration. These parameters are required to be monitored at 15-minute intervals throughout the operation of the control device. For control devices that do not control more than 1 tpy of HAP emissions, only a daily verification of the operating parameter is required, as is provided in 40 CFR part 63, subpart GGG. To demonstrate compliance with work practice standards, such as the requirement to maintain floating roofs, inspection of equipment serves as the monitoring demonstration.

#### E. What Are the Notification, Recordkeeping, and Reporting Requirements?

The final rule requires recordkeeping and initial and semiannual reporting. The initial notification is required within 120 days of the effective date of the NESHAP. That report, which is very brief, serves to alert appropriate

agencies (State agencies and EPA Regional Offices) of the existence of your affected source and puts them on notice for future compliance actions. The precompliance report details compliance alternatives that require preapproval and is required 6 months prior to the compliance date. The notification of compliance status (NOCS) report, which is due 150 days after the compliance date of the NESHAP, is a comprehensive report that describes the affected source and the strategy being used to comply. The final rule also incorporates a number of provisions in subpart A of 40 CFR part 63 (General Provisions), among them the startup, shutdown and malfunction provisions.

### III. Summary of Environmental, Energy, and Economic Impacts

#### A. What Are the Air Emission Reduction Impacts?

We estimate nationwide baseline HAP emissions from the miscellaneous coating manufacturing sources to be 6,900 Mg/yr (7,600 tpy). We project that the final rule will reduce HAP emissions by about 4,400 Mg/yr (4,900 tpy). Because many of the HAP emitted by miscellaneous coating manufacturing facilities are also VOC, the proposed NESHAP will also reduce VOC.

Combustion of fuels to generate electricity and steam will increase secondary emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) by about 25 Mg/yr (27 tpy). These impacts were estimated assuming electricity is generated in coal-fired power plants and steam is produced in natural gas-fired industrial boilers.

#### B. What Are the Cost Impacts?

The cost impacts include the capital cost to install control devices and monitoring equipment, and include the annual costs involved in operating control devices and monitoring equipment, implementing work practices, and conducting performance tests. The annual cost impacts also include the cost savings generated by reducing the loss of product or solvent in the form of emissions. The total capital costs for existing sources are estimated to be \$57 million, and the total annualized costs for existing sources are estimated to be \$16 million. Total capital costs for new sources are estimated to be \$1.3 million per new facility and total annualized costs are estimated to be \$.25 million per new facility. Three new facilities were estimated in the first 3 years after promulgation of this rule.