



Federal Register

**Monday,
June 19, 2000**

Part II

Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR Part 63

**National Emission Standards for
Hazardous Air Pollutants: Group I
Polymers and Resins; and National
Emission Standards for Hazardous Air
Pollutants: Group IV Polymers and
Resins; Final Rule**

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[AD-FRL-6585-7]

RIN 2060-AH47

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Group I Polymers and Resins; and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Group IV Polymers and Resins

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rules; amendments.

SUMMARY: On September 5, 1996 and September 12, 1996, the EPA promulgated national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) for Group I Polymers and Resins and the NESHAP for Group IV Polymers and Resins, respectively. In November 1996, petitions for review of the September 1996 Polymers and Resins I and IV rules were filed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The petitioners raised numerous technical issues and concerns with these rules. In addition, on January 17, 1997, amendments to the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industry NESHAP (*i.e.*, the Hazardous Organic NESHAP, or HON) were promulgated; the HON is heavily referenced by both of the Polymers and Resins I and IV NESHAP. On March 9, 1999, the EPA proposed amendments to the Polymers and Resins I and IV NESHAP to address the issues raised by the petitioners and to update the rules as necessitated by the HON amendments. This document takes final action on those proposed amendments.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 19, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Docket number A-92-44 for the Group I Polymers and Resins NESHAP and Docket number A-92-45 for the Group IV Polymers and Resins NESHAP contain supporting information used in developing the standards. The dockets are located at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,

401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460 in Room M-1500, Waterside Mall (ground floor), and may be inspected from 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information concerning these final rule amendments, contact Mr. Robert Rosensteel, Organic Chemicals Group, Emission Standards Division (MD-13), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541-5608, facsimile number (919) 541-3470, electronic mail address rosensteel.bob@epa.gov. For information concerning applicability and rule determinations, contact your State or local representative or the appropriate EPA Regional Office representatives.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Following is a listing of EPA Regional contacts.

EPA Regional Office Contacts

- Director, Office of Environmental Stewardship
Attn: Air Compliance Clerk
U.S. EPA Region I, 1 Congress Street, Suite 1100 (SEA), Boston, MA 02114-2023, (617) 918-1740
- Umesh Dholakia
U.S. EPA Region II, 290 Broadway Street, New York, NY 10007-1866, (212) 637-4023
- Doreen Au
U.S. EPA Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103, (215) 814-5471
- Lee Page
U.S. EPA Region IV, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, GA 30303-3104, (404) 562-9131
- Shaun Burke, IL/IN, (312) 353-5713
- Joseph Cardile, MI/WI, (312) 353-2151
- Erik Hardin, MN/OH, (312) 353-2402
- U.S. EPA Region V, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604-3507
- John Jones
U.S. EPA Region VI, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 (6EN-AT), Dallas, TX 75202, (214) 665-7233
- Gary Schlicht
U.S. EPA Region VII, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, KS 66101, (913) 551-7097
- Tami Thomas-Burton
U.S. EPA Region VIII, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202, (303) 312-6581

- Ken Bigos
U.S. EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, (415) 744-1240
- Dan Meyer
U.S. EPA Region X, 1200 Sixth Street, Seattle, WA 98101, (206) 553-4150

Docket. The docket is an organized and complete file of all the information considered by the EPA in the development of this rulemaking. The docket is a dynamic file because material is added throughout the rulemaking process. The docketing system is intended to allow members of the public and industries involved to readily identify and locate documents so that they can effectively participate in the rulemaking process. Along with the proposed and promulgated standards and their preambles, the contents of the docket will serve as the record in the case of judicial review. (See section 307(d)(7)(A) of the Clean Air Act (CAA).) An index for each docket, as well as individual items contained within the dockets, may be obtained by calling (202) 260-7548 or (202) 260-7549. Alternatively, docket indexes are available by facsimile, as described on the Office of Air and Radiation, Docket and Information Center Website at <http://www.epa.gov/oar/docket>. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying docket materials.

Worldwide Web (WWW). In addition to being available in the docket, an electronic copy of this final rule will be available on the WWW through the Technology Transfer Network (TTN). Following signature, a copy of the rule will be posted on the TTN's policy and guidance page for newly proposed or promulgated rules <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/oarpg>. The TTN provides information and technology exchange in various areas of air pollution control. If more information regarding the TTN is needed, call the TTN HELP line at (919) 541-5384.

Regulated Entities. The regulated category and entities affected by this action include:

| Category | Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Codes | (NAICS) | Examples of regulated entities |
|----------------|--|---------------------|---|
| Industry | 2821, 2822 | 325211, 325212 | Butyl Rubber, Halobutyl Rubber, Epichlorohydrin Elastomer, Ethylene Propylene Rubber, Hypalon™, Neoprene, Nitrile Butadiene Rubber, Nitrile Butadiene Latex, Polybutadiene Rubber, Styrene-Butadiene Rubber or Latex, Acrylonitrile Butadiene Styrene Resin, Styrene Acrylonitrile Resin, Methyl Methacrylate Acrylonitrile Butadiene Styrene Resin, Methyl Methacrylate Butadiene Styrene Resin, Poly(ethylene terephthalate) Resin, Polystyrene Resin, and Nitrile Resin producers. |

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers likely to be interested in the revisions to the regulations affected by this action. To determine whether your facility is regulated by this action, you should carefully examine all of the applicability criteria in § 63.480 of the Polymers and Resins I rule and § 63.1310 of the Polymers and Resins IV rule. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of these amendments to a particular entity, consult your State or local representative or the appropriate EPA Regional Office representatives listed in the preceding **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

Judicial Review. Amendments to Polymers and Resins I and IV NESHAP were proposed on March 9, 1999 (64 FR 11560). This action announces the EPA's final decisions on the rules. Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, judicial review of final rules is available by filing a petition for review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit August 18, 2000. Under section 307(b)(2) of CAA, the requirements that are the subject of these final amendments may not be challenged later in civil or criminal proceedings brought by the EPA to enforce these requirements.

Outline. The information presented in this preamble is organized as follows:

- I. What is the background of these rules?
- II. What types of public comments were received on the March 9, 1999 proposal?
- III. What major issues were raised in the public comments and what changes were made for the final amendments?
 - A. Compliance Dates
 - B. Flexible Operation Unit Applicability Provisions
 - C. Definitions
 - D. Additions to Existing Affected Sources
 - E. Halogenated Batch Process Vents
 - F. PET and Polystyrene Continuous Process Vents
 - G. Start-up, Shutdown, and Malfunction and Periods of Nonoperation
 - H. Organic HAP Lists
 - I. Other Clarifications
- IV. What are the administrative requirements for these final amendments?
 - A. Executive Order 12866
 - B. Executive Order 13132
 - C. Executive Order 13084
 - D. Executive Order 13045
 - E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
 - F. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*
 - G. Paperwork Reduction Act
 - H. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
 - I. Congressional Review Act

I. What is the Background of These Rules?

On September 5, 1996 (61 FR 46906) and September 12, 1996 (61 FR 48208), we issued NESHAP for Group I Polymers and Resins (40 CFR part 63, subpart U) and Group IV Polymers and Resins (40 CFR part 63, subpart JJJ), respectively. On August 26, 1996 (61 FR 43698), prior to the promulgation of subparts U and JJJ, we proposed amendments to the HON, which subparts U and JJJ both reference. Subparts U and JJJ were modeled after the HON due to similarities in emission characteristics and emission controls at HON and Polymers and Resins affected sources.

On November 4, 1996, the Dow Chemical Company (Dow) filed petitions for review of the promulgated Polymers and Resins I and IV NESHAP in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, *The Dow Chemical Company v. EPA*, 96-1417 and 96-1421 (D.C. Cir.). Dow raised over 280 technical issues on the rules' structure and applicability, including questions about the applicability of the HON amendments to subparts U and JJJ. Dow raised issues regarding details of the technical requirements, drafting clarity, and structural errors in the drafting of certain sections of the rules. On October 30, 1996, the Union Carbide Corporation filed a petition for review of the promulgated Polymers and Resins I NESHAP in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, *Union Carbide Corporation v. EPA*, 96-1413 and Consolidated Cases (D.C. Cir.).

On March 9, 1999 (64 FR 11561), we proposed amendments to subparts U and JJJ to incorporate the concepts and new references related to the promulgated HON amendments and to propose changes pursuant to settlements reached with industry. In this action, we are promulgating the amendments proposed on March 9, 1999.

In addition to these final amendments to subparts U and JJJ, other actions taken to amend various aspects of subparts U and JJJ since the original promulgation of these rules in September of 1996 include the following **Federal Register** notices: January 14, 1997 (62 FR 1835), equipment leaks compliance date extension for both rules; June 6, 1997 (62 FR 30993), equipment leaks compliance date extension for poly(ethylene terephthalate) (PET) resin affected sources; July 15, 1997 (62 FR 37720), minor corrections and clarifications to the rules; February 27, 1998 (63 FR 9944), change in the effective date of the rule for subpart JJJ to February 27, 1998; March 31, 1998

(63 FR 15312), a temporary compliance extension until February 27, 2001 for existing affected sources producing PET using the continuous terephthalic acid (TPA) high viscosity multiple end finisher process; December 9, 1998 (63 FR 67879), notification of a proposed partial settlement; March 9, 1999 (64 FR 11536), clarifications and corrections to the promulgated rules; May 7, 1999 (64 FR 24511), withdrawal, as a result of adverse comments, of one amendment from the amendments in the March 9, 1999 direct final rule; June 8, 1999 (64 FR 30406), equipment leaks compliance date extension for new and existing affected sources producing PET; June 8, 1999 (64 FR 30456), proposed denial of petition for reconsideration of the equipment leak requirements in subpart JJJ; and June 30, 1999 (64 FR 35023), indefinite stay of the compliance dates for certain provisions under subparts U and JJJ.

II. What Types of Public Comments Were Received on the March 9, 1999 Proposal?

We received six public comment letters on the March 9, 1999 proposed amendments. All comment letters were from industry representatives. The comment letters generally supported the proposed amendments, but also suggested clarifications and corrections to the proposed amendments. We considered these comments and, where appropriate, made changes to the proposed amendments. This preamble summarizes significant issues raised and the changes to the proposed amendments. Our response to all comments can be found in National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Polymers and Resins (Groups I and IV): Summary of Public Comments and Responses on Proposed Amendments, EPA-453/R-99-001. This document may be found in both dockets.

III. What Major Issues Were Raised in the Public Comments and What Changes Were Made for the Final Amendments?

As noted above, these final amendments incorporate the concepts and new references in response to the promulgated HON amendments and include changes related to settlement negotiations with industry. In addition to a number of clarifications and reference changes, the amendments include changes to the applicability provisions for flexible operation units, the batch process vent group determination procedures, and the reporting and recordkeeping requirements. We believe that these

changes provide additional clarity to the rules. In the preamble to the March 9, 1999 proposed amendments, we provided a detailed explanation of the proposed amendments. The following discussion summarizes the major public comments on the proposed amendments and significant changes made in response to these comments.

A. Compliance Dates

Due to the extensive nature of the proposed amendments and the proximity of the proposed amendments to the September 1999 compliance dates (September 5 for subpart U and September 12 for subpart JJJ), several commenters requested an extension of the compliance dates for existing sources. They indicated that due to the proposed amendments, they would have to re-evaluate applicability, compliance status, and the basis for demonstrating compliance. As discussed in the preamble to the proposed amendments (64 FR 11573), we were aware of the possibility that specific proposed amendments might affect the compliance status of one or more facilities. We specifically requested comments on this issue, along with specific examples of the proposed rule changes that could cause a facility to be out of compliance.

After review of the comments submitted in response to that request and the specific proposed rule examples provided, we decided that setting a new compliance date for the amended rule was warranted. Therefore, on June 30, 1999, we published a direct final rule in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 35023) which stayed certain compliance dates "indefinitely." That stay was effective August 30, 1999. Specifically, that action stayed the existing source compliance dates for storage vessels, process vents, back-end process operations (subpart U only), heat exchange systems, and wastewater. That stay did not impact the equipment leaks at any facility or the process contact cooling tower provisions at facilities that produce PET using a continuous terephthalic acid high viscosity multiple end finisher process. That action also stayed the compliance date for all emission sources at new affected sources that had an initial start-up date on or after March 9, 1999.

In the June 30, 1999 **Federal Register** document, we indicated that we would publish new compliance dates, which would provide a reasonable amount of time in which to comply with the amended regulations, when we promulgated the final amendments to the regulations. As pointed out by the commenters, many of the proposed rule

changes that may affect compliance are related to the provisions that are used to determine whether controls are required for a particular emission point. In addition, we recognized that a change in compliance date also affects certain reports that the promulgated rules required to be submitted prior to the compliance date (discussed below). One commenter suggested a compliance date of at least 9 months after promulgation of the amendments. However, we did not believe that 9 months was a sufficient time period to allow for (1) the re-evaluation of whether controls are required by the owner or operator, (2) the submission of reports that are due prior to the compliance date, and (3) the review of these reports by the Administrator. We concluded that 1 year was a reasonable amount of time for accomplishment of these activities.

Therefore, the final amendments require that existing affected sources comply with the nonequipment leak requirements by June 19, 2001. The final amendments also require, in accordance with the CAA, that all new affected sources comply with the amended regulations on June 19, 2000, or at initial start-up, whichever is later. Note: New affected sources that produce PET as their primary product are not required to comply with the equipment leak provisions in § 63.1331 until February 27, 2001 or at initial start-up, whichever is later.

The promulgated rules require the owner or operator to submit two reports, the precompliance report and the emissions averaging plan (if applicable), prior to the compliance date. The promulgated rules originally required the owner or operator to submit these reports prior to the publication of the proposed amendments on March 9, 1999. We believe that facilities should have the opportunity to submit, or resubmit, these reports after evaluating the final amendments. Therefore, the final amendments change the required submission date of the emissions averaging plan to September 19, 2000 (9 months before the compliance date) and the due date of the precompliance report to December 19, 2000 (6 months before the compliance date). Even if a facility does not need to make changes to an emissions averaging plan or precompliance report previously submitted, the facility must either resubmit the plan or report, or submit a notification that the previously submitted plan or report is still valid. This will avoid any confusion regarding your intention.

In another compliance date issue, a commenter requested that the EPA change the compliance date for new

emission points and newly created Group 1 emission points to 120 days after the initial start-up, rather than the proposed requirement that such points be in compliance at initial start-up. Upon consideration of the comments, we agree that time may be necessary to evaluate the actual impact of a process change after initial start-up in some instances. Therefore, the final rule requires that new emission points and newly created Group 1 emission points be in compliance with the existing source requirements within 120 days of initial start-up.

B. Flexible Operation Unit Applicability Provisions

The promulgated rules specify that the owner or operator must redetermine the primary product of a flexible operation unit (based on actual previous production) whenever changes in products occur that could reasonably be expected to change the primary product. If the primary product indeed changes, then the process unit would no longer be subject to subpart U or JJJ if the new primary product makes the process unit subject to another subpart of 40 CFR part 63 (*i.e.*, another maximum achievable control technology (MACT) standard). If the new primary product does not make the process unit subject to another MACT standard, then the process unit must continue to comply with subpart U or JJJ, provided that the production of elastomer/thermoplastic continues. One commenter objected to the idea that the owner or operator of an elastomer product process unit (EPPU) or thermoplastic product process unit (TPPU) that has been operating as a flexible operation unit must continue to comply with subpart U or JJJ, even when an elastomer/thermoplastic product is no longer the primary product of the flexible operation unit.

If we had incorporated the commenter's suggestion, a major source could have continued to produce a product covered by a MACT standard (*i.e.*, an elastomer or thermoplastic) and emit hazardous air pollutants (HAP) but not be subject to any requirements to reduce those HAP emissions. Therefore, controls used to reduce HAP might be removed. We believe that such a situation is contrary to the intent of section 112 of the CAA; therefore, we did not change the final rule in response to this comment.

We did make a clarification to the proposed flexible operation unit applicability provisions with regard to annual redeterminations. This change clarifies that annual applicability determinations are not required for flexible operation units in which the

owner or operator does not intend to produce elastomer/thermoplastic in the future.

C. Definitions

We revised several proposed definitions in response to comments. The proposed addition of a definition of *net positive heating value* was an attempt to provide additional clarification to the definition of *recovery device*, which uses the term *net positive heating value*. After review of the comments, we concluded that a single all-inclusive definition that works for this term was not possible, and we removed the entire term from the final amendments. Therefore, you must be able to demonstrate, in engineering terms appropriate to each individual situation, that a recovered stream has net positive heating value.

A commenter pointed out that the proposed definition of *supplemental combustion air* could be interpreted to require application of the oxygen correction factor when a facility adds air to exhaust streams controlled by catalytic oxidizers to ensure proper operation and to prevent damage to the catalyst bed. We agree a facility should not consider air added to ensure proper operation and to avoid damage to a catalytic oxidizer to be *supplemental combustion air*; therefore, the definition of *supplemental combustion air* in the final amendments includes an additional sentence clarifying this point.

We agree with a commenter that the proposed definition of *stripping* in subpart U used language that excluded certain operations, specifically drum dryers which have devolatilization as their primary purpose. Therefore, the final definition of *stripping* clarifies that processes that occur in dryers with the primary purpose of devolatilization are considered to be stripping.

We also agree with commenters that the proposed change to the definition of *elastomer product* in subpart U, which separated polybutadiene rubber by solution and styrene butadiene rubber by solution into two different products, was not appropriate. At the majority of facilities, these two polymers are produced in the same process. Further, in the solution process that is used at these facilities, the HAP emissions are primarily from the use of the solvent, not the reactants, which means that there is little difference in emissions between the two products. In fact, total HAP emissions were usually reported for the entire facility and not for the individual products, so we originally developed the back-end process operation limitations based on the emissions from both of these polymers.

Therefore, we recombined these polymers as a single elastomer product in the final amendments.

Changes were also made to the definition of *material recovery* section in subpart JJJ to clarify that contact and non-contact condensers removing ethylene glycol from vapor streams coming out of polymerization vessels are part of the polymerization reaction section.

D. Additions to Existing Affected Sources

The proposed definition of *reconstruction* and the proposed provisions that applied the definition of *reconstruction* (§§ 63.480(i)(2)(i) and 63.1310(i)(2)(i)) were inconsistent. To summarize, the proposed §§ 63.480(i)(2)(i) and 63.1310(i)(2)(i) stated that if a facility made any process change or addition that met the definition of reconstruction after June 5, 1995 (June 12, 1995 for subpart JJJ), the source is a new affected source. However, the proposed definition of *reconstruction* in §§ 63.482 and 63.1312 only addressed the *replacement*, and not the *addition*, of components. One commenter suggested that we amend the definition of *reconstruction* to also include additions.

The general provisions for part 63 clearly separate replacements from additions. The definition of *reconstruction* in the general provisions only addresses the *replacement* of components, while § 63.5(b)(6) of the general provisions addresses additions. In the proposed language for §§ 63.480(i)(2)(i) and 63.1310(i)(2)(i), we combined these two concepts, thus creating confusion and making them inconsistent with our policies regarding replacements and additions. Therefore, rather than amend the definition of *reconstruction* in §§ 63.482 and 63.1312, we revised the provisions in §§ 63.480(i)(2) and 63.1312(i)(2) to clearly distinguish how a facility is to handle replacements of components and additions. In summary, if the replacement of components at an existing affected source meets the definition of *reconstruction*, then the affected source becomes a new affected source. If an owner or operator makes an addition to an existing affected source, then the addition becomes part of the existing affected source.

E. Halogenated Batch Process Vents

The purpose of the halogenated vent provisions is to reduce the hydrogen halides that are created when halogenated organic compounds are routed to a combustion device. Therefore, the important location for

determining whether a vent stream is halogenated is prior to the stream entering a combustion device. The location specified in both subparts U and JJJ for making batch vent group determinations is at the exit of the batch unit operation (*i.e.*, before any recovery, recapture, or combustion device). Therefore, any reduction in the mass emission rate of halogen atoms that occurs in a recovery or recapture device would not be taken into account. A commenter requested that the rules allow the determination of the concentration of each organic compound containing halogen atoms at the recovery device or process discharge for the purposes of determining the halogenated status of a vent stream. We agree with the commenter. We have changed the rules to specify that an owner or operator must determine the concentration of each organic compound containing halogen atoms at the exit of the last recovery or recapture device.

F. PET and Polystyrene Continuous Process Vents

Continuous process vents at PET and polystyrene affected sources are subject to emission limitations that apply to all process vents in entire sections (*i.e.*, material recovery section, polymerization reaction section) of the process unit. This differs from the requirements for other continuous process vents which are subject to control requirements based on the group status of individual process vents.

One commenter requested that the rule exempt process vents at PET and polystyrene affected sources subject to these section-specific emission limitations from certain control, testing, and recordkeeping requirements if they meet the Group 2 criteria. However, since the concept of group status does not apply for these process vents, we did not make changes in response to these comments. We believe that the emission limitations for process vents in the applicable sections, which were determined to be the MACT floor for the applicable subcategories, provide an owner or operator with various compliance demonstration options, including a kilogram of HAP per megagram of product limit, which allow the owner or operator to choose which process vents to control.

Paragraph § 63.1313(b) of subpart JJJ addresses the control of combined streams. One commenter believed that these provisions do not adequately address how to handle process vents in sections of PET and polystyrene facilities that are subject to the requirements in §§ 63.1316 through

63.1320 and other combined streams that do not include Group 1 emission streams. The commenter suggests using the Total Resource Effectiveness (TRE) value to determine applicability for this combined vent stream, and if the combined stream does not meet the Group 1 criteria, no control would be required.

If a combined emission stream has no Group 1 emission streams, the combined emission stream could either (1) have no emission streams requiring control, or (2) have process vent emission streams subject to §§ 63.1316 through 63.1320. For the first case, there is no reason for an owner or operator to evaluate the combined emission stream for control. For the second case, consider the following example. A facility makes polystyrene using a continuous process so emissions from the material recovery section must be controlled in accordance with § 63.1316(c). If a stream from the material recovery section is combined with emission streams that are not required to be controlled (*i.e.*, Group 2 emission streams), and the TRE of the combined stream does not meet the Group 1 criteria, then no control would be required if we adopted the commenter's suggested approach of applying the TRE to these combined streams. The result would be that emissions that are required to be controlled under § 63.1316(c) would not be controlled. This approach would result in a situation where the control requirements of §§ 63.1316 through 63.1320 could be circumvented by combining subject streams with other streams that are not required to be controlled. Therefore, we believe that the provisions in § 63.1313(b) adequately address the situations raised by the commenter, and we did not change the rule in response to this comment.

G. Start-up, Shutdown, and Malfunction and Periods of Nonoperation

We received several comments on the provisions related to the requirements during start-up, shutdown, and malfunction and during periods of nonoperation. As a result of these comments, we made the following changes. The promulgated rules require that owners and operators implement measures to prevent or minimize excess emissions during periods of start-up, shutdown, and malfunction. One commenter suggested changes to the definition of excess emissions with which we agreed. Therefore, in the final rule, we have defined excess emissions as "emissions greater than those allowed by the emissions limitation

which would apply during operational periods other than start-up, shutdown, and malfunction." Commenters also made suggestions related to the records required during periods of start-up, shutdown, and malfunction. In response to these comments, we reduced the amount of information required to be submitted with reports of start-ups, shutdowns, and malfunctions to the level specified by the 40 CFR part 63 general provisions. Finally, we revised Table 1 of both promulgated rules to clarify that immediate start-up, shutdown, and malfunction reports are not required.

H. Organic HAP Lists

As a result of comments, we revised the tables specifying known HAP emitted from the production of specific elastomer/thermoplastic products (Table 5 in subpart U and Table 6 in subpart JJJ). Specifically, Table 5 in subpart U no longer identifies hexane, toluene, and xylenes as known organic HAP emitted from the production of styrene butadiene rubber by emulsion and styrene butadiene latex elastomer. We have no information that indicates that these HAP are used or emitted from the production of these elastomer products, but they were inadvertently identified in the table as known organic HAP emitted from their production. Carbon disulfide is a HAP known to be emitted during the production of styrene butadiene rubber via an emulsion process, so we added carbon disulfide to the table and indicated that it is a known organic HAP emitted from the production of styrene butadiene rubber by emulsion. Also, Table 6 of subpart JJJ no longer identifies 1,3-butadiene as a known organic HAP emitted from the production of acrylonitrile styrene acrylate resin/alpha methyl styrene acrylonitrile resin (ASA/AMSAN), as we have no information that indicates ASA/AMSAN production processes use or emit this HAP.

I. Other Clarifications

A change was made to clarify that process units that produce elastomers which are, in turn, used at least 50 percent of the time to produce thermoplastics, are subject to subpart JJJ and not subpart U. Another change clarifies that changes that do not alter the equipment configuration and operation conditions are not process changes, and that these configurations and conditions are not required to be documented in the Notification of Compliance Status reports. We made changes to clarify the organic HAP subject to the process and maintenance wastewater requirements. In subpart U,

we made a change to clarify the elastomer products that are not subject to back-end process operation residual HAP limitations. We also clarified the monitoring requirements for flares used to control process back-end HAP emissions.

IV. What Are the Administrative Requirements for These Final Amendments?

A. Executive Order 12866

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), the EPA must determine whether the regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Executive Order defines "significant regulatory action" as one that is likely to result in a rule that may:

- (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or state, local, or tribal governments or communities;
- (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;
- (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or
- (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.

Pursuant to the terms of Executive Order 12866, it has been determined that these amendments are not a "significant regulatory action" because they do not meet any of the above criteria. Consequently, these amendments were not submitted to OMB for review under Executive Order 12866.

B. Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132, entitled "Federalism" (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have "substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government." Under section 6 of Executive Order 13132, EPA

may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the regulation. The EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the regulation.

These amendments do not have federalism implications. They will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of Executive Order 13084 do not apply to these amendments.

C. Executive Order 13084

Under Executive Order 13084, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute, that significantly or uniquely affects the communities of Indian tribal governments, and that imposes substantial direct compliance costs on those communities, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by the tribal governments, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to provide to OMB, in a separately identified section of the preamble to the rule, a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected tribal governments, a summary of the nature of their concerns, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to develop an effective process permitting elected officials and other representatives of Indian tribal governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory policies on matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities." These rules do not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. No tribal governments own or operate an affected source. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 13084 do not apply to these amendments.

D. Executive Order 13045

Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), applies to any rule that: (1) Is determined to be "economically significant" as defined under Executive Order 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that the EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency.

The EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 as applying only to those regulatory actions that are based on health or safety risks, such that the analysis required under section 5-501 of the Order has the potential to influence the regulation. These rules fall into that category only in part: the minimum rule stringency for subparts U and JJJ is set according to a congressionally-mandated, technology-based lower limit called the "floor," while a decision to increase the stringency beyond this floor can be based on risk considerations. Thus, Executive Order 13045 applies to these rules only to the extent that the Agency may consider the inherent toxicity of a regulated pollutant, and any differential impact such a pollutant may have on children's health, in deciding whether to adopt control requirements more stringent than the floor level.

These amendments are not subject to Executive Order 13045 because they are not economically significant as defined in Executive Order 12866. No children's risk analysis was performed for these amendments because no alternative technologies exist that would provide greater stringency at a reasonable cost. Therefore, the results of any such analysis would have no impact on the stringency decision.

E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), Public Law 104-4, establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. Under section 202 of the UMRA, the EPA generally must prepare a written statement, including a cost-benefit analysis, for proposed and final rules with "Federal mandates" that may result in expenditures to State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any 1 year. Before

promulgating an EPA rule for which a written statement is needed, section 205 of the UMRA generally requires the EPA to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and adopt the least costly, most cost-effective, or least-burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule. The provisions of section 205 do not apply when they are inconsistent with applicable law. Moreover, section 205 allows the EPA to adopt an alternative other than the least-costly, most cost-effective, or least-burdensome alternative if the Administrator publishes with the final rule an explanation why that alternative was not adopted. Before the EPA establishes any regulatory requirements that may significantly or uniquely affect small governments, including tribal governments, it must have developed under section 203 of the UMRA a small government agency plan. The plan must provide for notifying potentially affected small governments, enabling officials of affected small governments to have meaningful and timely input in the development of EPA regulatory proposals with significant Federal intergovernmental mandates, and informing, educating, and advising small governments on compliance with the regulatory requirements.

The EPA has determined that these amendments do not contain a Federal mandate that may result in expenditures of \$100 million or more for State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or in the private sector in any 1 year. Thus, today's amendments are not subject to the requirements of sections 202 and 205 of the UMRA. In addition, the EPA has determined that these amendments contain no regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments, because they contain no requirements that apply to such governments or impose obligations on them. Therefore, today's amendments are not subject to the requirements of section 203 of the UMRA.

F. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), as Amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.

The RFA generally requires an agency to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis of a rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses,

small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions.

For purposes of assessing the impacts of these amendments on small entities, small entity is defined as: (1) A small business that has less than 750 employees and is unaffiliated with a larger domestic entity; (2) a small governmental jurisdiction that is a government of a city, county, town, school district, or special district with a population of less than 50,000; and (3) a small organization that is any not-for-profit enterprise which is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field.

After considering the economic impacts of these amendments on small entities, we have concluded that these actions will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, because they include primarily clarifications and amendments to reduce the reporting and recordkeeping burden, thus they impose no additional regulatory requirements on owners or operators of affected sources.

G. Paperwork Reduction Act

For both the Group I and Group IV Polymers and Resins NESHAP, the information collection requirements (ICRs) were submitted to OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act. At promulgation, OMB had already approved the ICR for the Group IV Polymers and Resins NESHAP and assigned OMB control number 2060-0351. Subsequently, OMB approved the ICR for the Group I Polymers and Resins NESHAP, and on July 15, 1997 (62 FR 37720) assigned OMB control number 2060-0356.

An Agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15. The EPA has amended 40 CFR 9.1 to indicate the ICRs contained in the Group I and IV Polymers and Resins NESHAP.

The amendments to the NESHAP contained in this final rule should have no impact on the information collection burden estimates made previously. Therefore, the ICRs have not been revised.

H. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104-113, (15 U.S.C. 272 note), directs all Federal agencies to use voluntary

consensus standards instead of government-unique standards in their regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or would be otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., material specifications, test method, sampling and analytical procedures, business practices, etc.) that are developed or adopted by one or more voluntary consensus standards bodies. Examples of organizations generally regarded as voluntary consensus standards bodies include the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), and the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE). The NTTAA requires Federal agencies like EPA to provide Congress, through OMB, with explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

During the rulemaking, the Agency searched for voluntary consensus standards that might be applicable. The search has identified no applicable voluntary standards. Accordingly, the NTTAA requirement to use applicable voluntary consensus standards does not apply to these amendments.

I. The Congressional Review Act

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. The EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2). This rule will be effective June 19, 2000.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 63

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Hazardous substances, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: April 20, 2000.

Carol M. Browner,
Administrator.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, part 63 of title 40, chapter I of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 63—NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS FOR SOURCE CATEGORIES

1. The authority citation for part 63 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401, *et seq.*

Subpart U—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Group I Polymers and Resins

2. Section 63.480 is amended by:
- a. Revising paragraph (a);
 - b. Revising paragraph (b);
 - c. Revising paragraph (c);
 - d. Revising paragraph (d);
 - e. Revising paragraph (e);
 - f. Revising paragraph (f);
 - g. Revising paragraph (g) introductory text;
 - h. Revising paragraphs (g)(1) through (g)(4);
 - i. Revising paragraphs (g)(6), through (g)(8);
 - j. Revising paragraph (h) introductory text;
 - k. Revising paragraphs (h)(1) through (h)(4);
 - l. Revising paragraphs (h)(6) and (h)(7);
 - m. Revising paragraph (i) introductory text;
 - n. Revising paragraph (i)(1) introductory text;
 - o. Revising paragraphs (i)(1)(i) and (i)(1)(ii);
 - p. Revising paragraph (i)(2)(i) introductory text;
 - q. Revising paragraph (i)(2)(i)(A);
 - r. Revising paragraphs (i)(2)(ii) and (i)(2)(iii);
 - s. Revising paragraphs (i)(3) through (i)(5);
 - t. Revising paragraph (j); and
 - u. Adding paragraph (i)(6).

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 63.480 Applicability and designation of affected sources.

(a) *Definition of affected source.* The provisions of this subpart apply to each affected source. Affected sources are described in paragraphs (a)(1) through (a)(4) of this section.

(1) An affected source is either an existing affected source or a new affected source. Existing affected source