

control emissions (relative to the floor of no emissions reduction) is reasonable.

In our second analysis, we searched the database for any facilities with HAP throughput and partial pressure that meet the cutoffs established for the regulatory alternative. We identified only one facility that potentially met the criteria. The estimated impacts for this facility are comparable to those for the model facility. Assuming the commenter is correct that most of the reported throughput at this facility is not associated with coating manufacturing, then the impacts of the standard may be lower than we estimated.

#### H. Pollution Prevention

*Comment:* One commenter stated that the exemption for equipment that contain less than 5 percent HAP is not a viable pollution prevention alternative. Several commenters consider the lack of a viable pollution prevention alternative to be a serious shortcoming in the rule as proposed, and they suggested several options for consideration. First, numerous commenters favored an option that allows manufacturers to take credit for reductions achieved by voluntarily choosing to manufacture lower HAP coatings or making other changes in production technology. Second, two commenters suggested exempting any compliance coating manufacturing from subpart HHHHH if the facility certifies that the coatings are manufactured to meet the surface coating rules. Third, one commenter suggested that we consider allowing delayed implementation of subpart HHHHH or provide an opt-out provision for facilities whose emissions drop below major source thresholds; this would minimize the impact of the "once-in, always-in" policy. Fourth, if none of the preceding options is acceptable, one commenter requested that the stringency of the standards be reduced because the industry has already achieved reductions as great as or greater than those expected by the proposed standards. Many commenters cited numerous changes in the industry over the past few years that have reduced emissions from coating manufacturing and have not been accounted for in setting the standards. For example, the shift in production to waterborne, UV cure, and high solids coatings, some of which has been driven by other regulatory requirements, contribute to reducing emissions from coating manufacturing as well as from coating application. One commenter estimated that the shift to manufacturing compliant coatings to

meet the surface coating MACT will reduce HAP content of coatings by 265,000 tpy, which also translates into the same reduction in HAP throughput for the manufacturing processes. Assuming 0.5 to 1.0 percent of the throughput is emitted during manufacturing means this reduction in throughput has already achieved a significant fraction of the expected reductions under subpart HHHHH. Other changes that have reduced emissions include the shift to using low vapor pressure solvents, making coatings exclusively in one vessel, and the production of smaller batch sizes with shorter lead times. Finally, the commenters noted that the industry has undertaken various voluntary efforts to reduce emissions including the paint industry's Coatings Care program, ACC's Responsible Care program, EPA's National Environmental Track program, and various State and local programs.

*Response:* We do not agree that facilities can demonstrate that any of the suggested alternatives are comparable to the specified emission standards. A percent reduction in the HAP content of products may not necessarily yield an equivalent percent reduction in emissions. A format such as a demonstration in reduction of HAP content at coatings manufacturers is not easily linked to overall HAP usage upon application.

#### I. Initial Compliance

*Comment:* One commenter has encountered difficulty in applying existing EPA stack sampling methods to determine condenser inlet concentrations of VOC and HAP for use in demonstrating the control efficiency of the condenser. The commenter manufactures adhesives and sealants in closed vessels to which solvent is introduced through closed piping systems, and solids are introduced via closed screw conveyors. Nitrogen is used to purge the conveyors and vessels, and the exhaust gas is vented to a chilled water condenser. The commenter noted that the vapor space in the process vessels is typically saturated with solvent vapor, which quickly overwhelms the sampling equipment. The commenter noted that the sampling equipment also artificially increases the emissions by drawing off vapor from the precondenser headspace that would not otherwise represent emissions. Furthermore, the commenter stated that the method and volume of nitrogen inerting dramatically affects the sampling effectiveness without actually altering total emissions. Therefore, the commenter supported the proposed option that would allow

compliance to be demonstrated by documenting operation at a suitable outlet temperature, but the commenter recommended modifying the option to consider the combined effect of covers and other vessel sealing devices as well as the efficiency of the condenser.

*Response:* Without additional details regarding operation of the equipment, characteristics of the gas stream(s), and modifications to the testing protocol that have already been attempted, we cannot provide constructive suggestions for modifying the sampling methods. However, we note that performance testing is only one of three options for demonstrating initial compliance for condensers. As the commenter indicated, a second option is to demonstrate that the condenser operates below a specified temperature, where the required level is based on the HAP partial pressure of the gas stream entering the condenser. The third option is to determine the percent reduction based on calculations of the uncontrolled and controlled emissions using the equations specified in § 63.1257(d).

#### J. Ongoing Compliance

*Comment:* According to one commenter, the monitoring provisions are arbitrary and capricious because they exempt sources with the greatest emissions (*i.e.*, those that fall outside of the MACT floor due to size have the loosest monitoring).

*Response:* We disagree with the commenter's assertions. The final rule, like the proposed rule, requires monitoring of all control devices. In some cases, to minimize the burden on small operations (*e.g.*, small control devices controlling process vessel vents), the final rule has different monitoring requirements for lower-emitting sources; however, these sources are not sources with the greatest HAP emissions as asserted by the commenter.

*Comment:* One commenter considered the proposed quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) requirements for continuous parameter monitors to be unduly burdensome and stated that they contravene existing EPA standards and test methods. The commenter recommended that sources be required to develop preventive maintenance programs that are based on manufacturer's recommendations and actual operating/maintenance history of the instruments. Another commenter recommended adding a provision that allows sources to request approval, using the precompliance report, of alternatives to the QA/QC procedures