

same 75 percent overall control as the regulatory alternative for stationary process vessels larger than 250 gal at existing sources. We do not know the number of such vessels or their size distribution. Therefore, we conducted the analysis for a model 250 gal vessel with a tightly-fitting vented cover at baseline that is used in the production of a coating that is manufactured using toluene. As for the other analyses, we assumed the vessel is controlled using a condenser to meet the regulatory alternative, and the condenser can be served by the same refrigeration unit as for the stationary process vessels. We concluded that the total impacts of this alternative are unreasonable in light of the emission reduction achieved. The incremental HAP reduction achieved by this beyond-the-floor alternative is 0.07 Mg/yr, and the incremental cost is over \$25,000/Mg of HAP controlled. If the vessel at baseline does not have a tightly-fitting vented cover, the baseline emissions would be greater by an unknown amount, but the total costs would still be unreasonable. We also assumed that there would be no additional electricity or energy impacts because they are based on sized refrigeration systems, and addition of one or more vessels smaller than 250 gal would not require additional refrigeration capacity. Also, there would be no wastewater, solid waste, or other non-air quality health or environmental impacts.

Comment: One commenter requested flexibility in the control requirements for process vessels. The commenter noted that the proposed standard was tailored to the use of condensers on every process vessel, but it is not suited for the use of other control technologies or varying control levels among process vessels. The commenter also urged us to provide flexible averaging provisions that would allow different levels of control on different vessels while achieving overall control equivalent to that achieved by requiring the same control efficiency for each vessel. Furthermore, the commenter stated the proposed emissions averaging provisions are not useful because most vessels are not larger than 10,000 gallons; too few emission points are allowed in the average; it is too complex and burdensome; submitting a plan in the precompliance report 18 months before the compliance date is infeasible because facilities would not have determined how to comply by that date, and the requirement to obtain approval prior to making changes is cumbersome and restricts operations; it does not account for changes in the mix of

processes being run; and it should be available for use at anytime, not just when demonstrating initial compliance.

Response: The final rule includes an emissions averaging option for stationary process vessels at existing sources that may address the commenter's concerns. To demonstrate initial compliance with the emissions averaging option, an owner or operator must estimate three sets of emissions for each vessel in the averaging group. First, the owner or operator must determine the uncontrolled emissions. Procedures for estimating uncontrolled emissions are specified in § 63.1257(d)(2), except that for purging events the final subpart HHHHH specifies a procedure for estimating the specific partial pressure of each HAP rather than allowing an assumption of saturation or 25 percent of saturation. Second, the owner or operator must estimate emissions from each vessel in the averaging group as if it were controlled in accordance with the percent reduction standard (*i.e.*, 60 percent or 75 percent reductions depending on the vapor pressure of the HAP in the emission stream). Third, the owner or operator must determine the actual emissions, which may range from uncontrolled for some vessels to control levels significantly higher than those determined in the previous step. The owner or operator must include these data and calculations in the precompliance report along with rationale for why the sum of the actual emissions on a quarterly basis will be less than the sum of the emissions if 60 percent or 75 percent, as applicable, were achieved for each individual vessel. To demonstrate ongoing compliance, the owner or operator must track the number of batches produced, calculate the quarterly actual emissions and emissions under the regular percent reduction standard for each vessel, and sum the two sets of quarterly emissions. Compliance is demonstrated if the sum of the actual emissions is lower than the sum of emissions under the regular percent reduction standard.

D. Standards for Storage Tanks

Comment: One commenter stated the MACT floor for storage tanks was determined incorrectly because we did not consider the actual performance of scrubber controls. The commenter also stated that the standard must be revised because tank capacity and HAP partial pressure cutoffs are illegal.

Response: None of the storage tanks containing organic HAP at the surveyed facilities was controlled with a scrubber. Therefore, the MACT floors for both existing and new sources are based on the actual reported performance of

sources' controls and our consideration of whether sources are reducing emissions by other means besides controls.

Regarding tank capacity cutoffs, we considered two subcategories of storage tanks in our floor analysis: tanks with capacities less than 10,000 gal and storage tanks with capacities greater than or equal to 10,000 gal. We did not specifically request information for storage tanks with capacities less than 10,000 gal, and we did not receive any information about such smaller tanks. However, since the costs relative to the amount of control achieved tend to increase as the size of the storage tank decreases, we consider it highly unlikely that the industry is reducing emissions from tanks with capacities smaller than 10,000 gal when they are not reducing emissions from tanks with larger capacities. Thus, we concluded that the existing source and new source MACT floors for storage tanks with capacities less than 10,000 are no emissions reduction. We did not set beyond-the-floor standards for these smaller tanks because the total impacts to reduce emissions from storage tanks smaller than 20,000 gal were found to be unreasonable, and impacts for smaller tanks would be even less favorable.

With respect to storage tanks with capacities greater than or equal to 10,000 gal, fewer than 6 percent of the storage tanks in our database use controls or reduce emissions by any other means. Thus, we concluded that the existing source MACT floor for all storage tanks with capacities greater than or equal to 10,000 gal is no emissions reduction.

In setting the MACT floor for existing sources, we considered whether some facilities may implement emission reduction measures to reduce emissions from storage tanks, instead of using control technologies. Internal and external floating roofs are used to minimize emissions in many other industries, and vapor balancing when filling the tank is another common technique in other industries. However, we did not obtain any information in the responses to the ICR or from other resources that such measures are being used in the miscellaneous coating manufacturing industry. Another factor that can affect the emissions level is the color of the tank, but we have no information to suggest that any facilities are not already using the most favorable color scheme. Also, we have no information that any other measures are being used to reduce emissions. Therefore, because we lack information indicating that a sufficient number of storage tanks employ measures other