

Sunshine Act Meetings

Federal Register

Vol. 53, No. 19

Friday, January 29, 1988

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices of meetings published under the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (Pub. L. 94-409) 5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3).

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)), of the forthcoming regular meeting of the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board). The regular meeting of the Board is scheduled for February 2, 1988.

DATE AND TIME: The meeting is scheduled to be held at the offices of the Farm Credit Administration in McLean, Virginia, on February 2, 1988, from 10:00 a.m. until such time as the Board may conclude its business.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Hill, Secretary to the Farm Credit Administration Board, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102-5090 (703) 883-4003.

ADDRESS: Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102-5090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Parts of this meeting of the Board will be open to the public (limited space available), and parts of the meeting will be closed to the public. The matters to be considered at the meeting are:

Open Session

1. FCA Mission Statement;
2. Proposed Final Rule Amending 12 CFR Part 620, on Shareholder Disclosure and 12 CFR Part 621, on Accounting and Reporting Requirements;
3. Proposed Interim Rule with Request for Comment, Amending 12 CFR Part 620 on Shareholder Disclosure;
4. Contribution of 1987 Undistributed Earnings to a Contingency Reserve Fund by the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Spokane;

* Closed Session

5. Examination and Enforcement Matters; and
6. Implementation of Agricultural Credit Act of 1987.

Dated: January 27, 1988.

David A. Hill,

Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.
[FR Doc. 88-1993 Filed 1-27-88; 3:39 pm]

BILLING CODE 6705-01-M

* Session closed to the public—exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4), (8) and (9).

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Matter To Be Withdrawn From Consideration at an Agency Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given that the following matter will be withdrawn from the "discussion agenda" for consideration at the open meeting of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation scheduled to be held at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 2, 1988, in the Board Room on the sixth floor of the FDIC Building located at 550—17th Street, NW., Washington, DC:

Memorandum and resolution re: Proposed amendments to Part 308 of the Corporation's rules and regulations, entitled "Rules of Practice and Procedures."

Requests for further information concerning the meeting may be directed to Mr. Hoyle L. Robinson, Executive Secretary of the Corporation, at (202) 898-3813.

Dated: January 27, 1988.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Margaret M. Olsen,

Deputy Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 88-2013 Filed 1-27-88; 3:59 pm]

BILLING CODE 6714-01-M

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Pursuant to the provisions of the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given that at 11:15 a.m. on Tuesday, January 26, 1988, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation met in closed session, by telephone conference call, to consider: (1) Matters relating to the possible failure of certain insured banks; (2) a request for financial assistance pursuant to section 13(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and (3) a recommendation regarding an administrative enforcement proceeding against an insured bank.

In calling the meeting, the Board determined, on motion of Director Robert L. Clarke (Comptroller of the Currency), seconded by Chairman L. William Seidman, that Corporation business required its consideration of the matters on less than seven days' notice to the public; that no earlier notice of the meeting was practicable; that the public interest did not require consideration of the matters in a meeting open to public observation; and that the

matters could be considered in a closed meeting pursuant to subsections (c)(4), (c)(6), (c)(8), (c)(9)(A)(ii), and (c)(9)(B) of the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4), (c)(6), (c)(8), (c)(9)(A)(ii), and (c)(9)(B)).

Dated: January 27, 1988.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Margaret M. Olsen,

Deputy Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 88-2014 Filed 1-27-88; 3:59 pm]

BILLING CODE 6714-01-M

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Matter To Be Added to the Agenda for Consideration at an Agency Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given that the following matter will be added to the "discussion agenda" for consideration at the open meeting of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation scheduled to be held at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 2, 1988, in the Board Room on the sixth floor of the FDIC Building located at 550 17th Street NW., Washington, DC:

Staff status report on bank examination frequency.

Requests for further information concerning the meeting may be directed to Mr. Hoyle L. Robinson, Executive Secretary of the Corporation, at (202) 898-3813.

Dated: January 27, 1988.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Margaret M. Olsen,

Deputy Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 88-2015 Filed 1-27-88; 3:59 pm]

BILLING CODE 6714-01-M

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

"FEDERAL REGISTER" CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: January 26, 1988, 53 FR 21439.

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED TIME AND DATE OF MEETING: January 27, 1988, 10:00 a.m.

CHANGE IN THE MEETING: The following Docket Number has been added:

Item No., Docket No., and Company

CAG-1

Docket No. CP88-203-000, El Paso Natural Gas Company

Lois D. Cashell,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 88-1899 Filed 1-26-88; 4:08 pm]

BILLING CODE 6717-02-M

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

TIME AND DATE: 10:00 a.m., February 3, 1988.

PLACE: Hearing Room One, 1100 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20573.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Inquiry Into Laws, Regulations and Policies of the Republic of Korea Affecting Shipping in the United States/Korea Trade.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE

INFORMATION: Joseph C. Polking, Secretary, (202) 523-5725.

Joseph C. Polking,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 88-1995 Filed 1-27-88; 3:39 pm]

BILLING CODE 6730-01-M

POSTAL SERVICE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Amendment to Meeting

"FEDERAL REGISTER" CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: 53 FR 2145, January 26, 1988.

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED DATE OF MEETING: February 2, 1988.

CHANGE: Addition of the following item to the open meeting agenda:
"Officer Compensation"

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE

INFORMATION: David F. Harris, (202) 268-4800.

David F. Harris,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 88-1922 Filed 1-27-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

Corrections

Federal Register

Vol. 53, No. 19

Friday, January 29, 1988

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains editorial corrections of previously published Presidential, Rule, Proposed Rule, and Notice documents and volumes of the Code of Federal Regulations. These corrections are prepared by the Office of the Federal Register. Agency prepared corrections are issued as signed documents and appear in the appropriate document categories elsewhere in the issue.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 910

[Lemon Regulation 593]

Lemons Grown in California and Arizona; Limitation of Handling

Correction

In rule document 87-29765 appearing on page 48794 in the issue of Monday, December 28, 1987, make the following correction:

In the second column, in the first line, remove "not".

BILLING CODE 1505-01-D

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Part 852

Acquisition Regulations; Construction Contracting Procedures

Correction

In rule document 88-1080 beginning on page 1630 in the issue of Thursday, January 21, 1988, make the following corrections:

852.236-72 [Corrected]

1. On page 1631, in the third column, in the 22nd line, the section number should read "852.236-72".

852.236-75 [Corrected]

2. On the same page, in the same column, in the 16th line from the bottom, the section number should read "852.236-75".

BILLING CODE 1505-01-D

Corrections

The Editor of the *Journal of the American Veterinary Association* is requested to publish the following corrections in the next issue of the *Journal*.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

1. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

2. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

3. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

4. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

5. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

6. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

7. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

8. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

9. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

10. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

VETERINARY ASSOCIATION

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

1. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

2. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

3. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

4. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

5. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

6. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

7. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

8. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

9. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

10. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

11. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

12. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

13. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

14. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

15. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

16. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

17. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

18. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

19. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

20. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

21. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

22. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

23. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

24. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

25. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

26. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

27. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

28. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

29. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

30. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

31. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

32. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

33. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

34. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

35. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

36. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

37. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

38. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

39. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

40. *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 10.

Federal Register

Friday
January 29, 1988

Part II

Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR Part 60

**Standards of Performance for New
Stationary Sources; Industrial Surface
Coating; Plastic Parts for Business
Machines; Final Rule**

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 60**

[AD-FRL-3163-4]

Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources; Industrial Surface Coating; Plastic Parts for Business Machines**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: Standards of performance for new, modified, or reconstructed facilities that surface coat plastic parts for business machines were proposed in the *Federal Register* on January 8, 1986 (51 FR 854). This action promulgates the standards of performance for affected facilities that surface coat plastic parts for business machines. These standards implement section 111 of the Clean Air Act and are based on the Administrator's determination that emissions from facilities that surface coat plastic business machine parts cause, or contribute significantly to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. The intended effect of these standards is to require all new, modified, and reconstructed facilities that surface coat plastic parts for business machines to control emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) to the level achievable by the best demonstrated system of continuous emission reduction, considering costs, nonair quality health, and environmental and energy impacts.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 29, 1988.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, judicial review of the actions taken by this notice is available only by the filing of a petition for review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit within 60 days of today's publication of this rule. Under section 307(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act, the requirements that are the subject of today's notice may not be challenged later in civil or criminal proceedings brought by EPA to enforce these requirements.

ADDRESSES: *Background Information Document.* The background information document (BID) for the promulgated standards may be obtained from the U.S. EPA Library (MD-35), Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541-2777. Please refer to "Surface Coating of Plastic Parts for Business Machines—Background Information for Promulgated Standards" (EPA-450/3-85-019b). The BID contains

(1) a summary of all the public comments made on the proposed standards and the Administrator's response to the comments; (2) a summary of the changes made to the standards since proposal; and (3) the final Environmental Impact Statement, which summarizes the impacts of the standards.

Docket. A docket, number A-83-50, containing information considered by EPA in development of the promulgated standards, is available for public inspection between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, at EPA's Central Docket Section (LE-131), South Conference Center, Room 4, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For policy questions—Mr. Doug Bell or Ms. Laura Butler, Standards Development Branch, Emission Standards and Engineering Division (MD-13), U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone (919) 541-5578; for technical questions—Mr. James C. Berry, Chemicals and Petroleum Branch, Emission Standards and Engineering Division (MD-13), U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541-5605.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. The Standards**

Standards of performance for new sources established under Section 111 of the Clean Air Act reflect:

* * * application of the best technological system of continuous emission reduction which (taking into consideration the cost of achieving such emission reduction, any nonair quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements) the Administrator determines has been adequately demonstrated [Section 111(a)(1)]. For convenience, this will be referred to as "best demonstrated technology" or "BDT."

The promulgated standards apply to new, modified, or reconstructed spray booths that perform surface coating of plastic parts for business machines. The standards require that these affected facilities limit VOC emissions to no more than 1.5 kilograms of VOC per liter (kg VOC/l) of coating solids applied (i.e., deposited on the surface) for prime and color coats and to no more than 2.3 kg VOC/l of coating solids applied for texture and touch-up coats.

The BDT for these standards is a combination of coating formulations and application technologies. The BDT for prime and color coating is based on the use of organic-solvent-based coatings

containing approximately 60 percent, by volume, solids as applied and sprayed at a transfer efficiency (TE) of 40 percent. The BDT for fog coating, a special type of color coating, is the application of waterborne coatings at a TE of 25 percent. The BDT for texture and touch-up coating is the application of organic-solvent-based coatings containing approximately 60 percent solids at a TE of 25 percent. The standards for prime, color, texture, and touch-up coating can also be met by using waterborne coatings applied at a TE of 25 percent. As noted in Table 1 of the regulation, a TE of 25 percent may be assumed for air atomized spray equipment for prime, color, texture, touch-up, and fog coats; and a TE of 40 percent may be assumed for either air-assisted airless or electrostatic air spray equipment for prime and color coats.

Compliance is determined by using data on the VOC content of the coatings applied and of the solvents used for diluting the coatings, records of monthly coating consumption, and a TE value obtained from Table 1 of the regulation to calculate the VOC emissions from each type of coating used at each affected facility during each nominal 1-month period. Data on the VOC content of the coatings applied and of the solvents used for diluting the coating must be determined by the use of EPA Reference Method 24. Coaters have the option of using Table 1 or demonstrating to the Administrator on a case-by-case basis that they achieve TE's higher than the assigned values for the spray equipment. Reports of noncompliance will be submitted on a quarterly basis; statements of compliance will be submitted on a semiannual basis.

It is important to note that the standards for surface coating of plastic parts under section 111 of the CAA are technology-based and are intended to reflect best demonstrated technology. As described elsewhere in this preamble, higher-efficiency application equipment has been identified as part of BDT and the numerical level of the standards reflects the use of this equipment. The TE table values are based on typical or average performance of this and other equipment. They are consistent with the data upon which the standards are based. They are provided to assist facilities in demonstrating compliance with the NSPS when these technologies are used. The TE values are not necessarily appropriate for any purposes other than determining compliance with the NSPS. Such other purposes include SIP requirements,

emission trading baselines, and emission reduction credit calculations.

II. Environmental Impacts

There has been no change in the environmental impacts since proposal. The promulgated standards will reduce the national VOC emissions in 1990 from new, modified, and reconstructed facilities that perform exterior coating of plastic parts for business machines by about 2,200 megagrams (Mg) (2,430 tons), or 51 percent of the total emissions from affected facilities. In a typical plant, the promulgated standards will reduce annual overall VOC emissions by 51 percent below baseline.

Water pollution from waterwash spray booths will be reduced under this new source performance standard (NSPS) because of improved TE for prime and color coating.

Solid waste generated by a typical plant will be reduced approximately 25 percent below baseline discharge levels because improving TE for prime and color coating from 25 percent to 40 percent will reduce solid waste that results from overspray.

There are no noise or radiation impacts associated with these standards.

III. Energy Impacts

There has been no change in energy impacts since proposal. The coatings outlined in the control technologies that are the basis for the regulatory alternatives can all be cured at low temperatures and, therefore, have a negligible effect on the energy requirements for facilities that surface coat plastic parts for business machines. Therefore, the energy impact attributed to the standards is considered negligible.

IV. Cost Impacts

There has been no change in cost impacts since proposal. The initial capital cost for a typical medium-size plant controlled to the level of the standards is \$545,000, and the annualized cost is approximately \$752,000 below the regulatory baseline. The nationwide cumulative 5-year capital costs for plants covered by the standards are \$23 million compared with \$20 million at the regulatory baseline. The nationwide annualized costs in the fifth year of applicability of the standards at plants covered by the standards are estimated to be \$120 million compared with the annualized costs of \$150 million at new plants with emissions at the regulatory baseline. The total nationwide cost to comply with the standards in the fifth year of

applicability is projected to be a net credit of \$30 million.

V. Economic Impact

As discussed, the standards result in a net annualized credit in the fifth year. Also, in the fifth year of implementation, the standards will result in reductions of 24 percent and 13 percent in the overall price for the surface coating of plastic parts for business machines for small plants and large plants, respectively. In addition, the availability of the lower cost technologies on which the standards are based could increase the amount of plastic parts coated for business machines to 24.6 million square meters (m^2) in 1990 compared to 23.6 million m^2 without the standards.

The environmental, energy, and economic impacts are discussed in greater detail in the BID for the proposed standards ("Surface Coating of Plastic Parts for Business Machines—Background Information for Proposed Standards" [EPA-450/3-85-019a]).

In addition to the economic impact analysis, an analysis also was made of the cost effectiveness of alternative standards to determine the alternative that achieves the greatest emission reduction for a reasonable cost and to ensure that the controls required by this rule are reasonable relative to other regulations. In this case, the promulgated standards will reduce the operating costs of the affected spray booths and result in a net annualized credit of \$30 million in the fifth year compared to the baseline. Additional details on costs can be found in the proposal BID.

VI. Public Participation

Prior to proposal of the standards, interested parties were advised by public notice in the Federal Register (50 FR 12869) (April 1, 1985) of a meeting of the National Air Pollution Control Techniques Advisory Committee to discuss the standards recommended for proposal for the surface coating of plastic parts for business machines. This meeting was held on May 2, 1985. The meeting was open to the public, and each attendee was given an opportunity to comment on the standards recommended for proposal.

The proposed standards were published in the Federal Register on January 8, 1986. The preamble to the proposed standards discussed the availability of the BID ("Surface Coating of Plastic Parts for Business Machines—Background Information for Proposed Standards" [EPA-450/3-85-019a]), which describes in detail the regulatory alternatives considered and the impacts of those alternatives. Public comments

were solicited at the time of proposal, and copies of the proposal BID were distributed to interested parties.

The opportunity for interested persons to present data, views, or arguments concerning the proposed standards at a public hearing was provided. However, there were no requests to hold such a hearing, and, therefore, no hearing was held.

The public comment period was from January 8, 1986, to March 18, 1986. Five comment letters were received during the comment period concerning issues relative to the proposed standards of performance for affected spray booths. The comments have been carefully considered, and, where determined to be appropriate by the Administrator, changes have been made in the proposed standards.

VII. Significant Comments and Changes to the Proposed Standards

Comments on the proposed standards were received from industry, one State air pollution control agency, and one trade association. A detailed discussion of these comments and responses can be found in the promulgation BID, which is referred to in the ADDRESSES section of this preamble. The summary of comments and responses in the BID serves as the basis for the revisions that have been made to the standards between proposal and promulgation.

In response to the public comments and as a result of reevaluation by EPA, several changes have been made to the standards since proposal. Section 60.721 has been amended by the addition of a definition for "coating operation." This definition clarifies the compliance provisions of the regulation for situations where two or more types of coatings are applied at different times at a single affected spray booth.

Also, the meaning of the symbol "T" used in the equations to determine compliance was revised to be the transfer efficiency for a coating operation. A symbol " T_{ave} " was added to represent the volume-weighted average transfer efficiency for a coating operation to ensure that the distinction is clear between transfer efficiency and average transfer efficiency in equations presented later in the regulation.

Section 60.722 has been clarified to state specifically that all VOC emissions that are caused by coatings applied in each affected facility, regardless of the actual point of discharge of those emissions into the atmosphere, are covered by the standards and must be included when compliance with the numerical emission limits is determined.

Table 1 in § 60.723 has been revised to clarify the applicability of the TE values for specific coating types (i.e., prime, color, texture, touch-up, and fog). Approval of alternate TE's on a case-by-case basis will be granted by the Administrator if the owner or operator can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Administrator that TE's other than those presented in Table 1 are appropriate.

The major comments and responses are summarized in this preamble. Most of the comment letters contained multiple comments. The comments have been divided into the following areas: Standards and Affected Facility, Achievability of the Standards, Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements, Emission Control Technology, Economic Impact, and Electromagnetic Interference/Radio Frequency Interference (EMI/RFI) shielding.

Standards and Affected Facility

One commenter stated that because the affected facility is the spray booth, the standards for VOC emissions set forth in § 60.722 could be interpreted as applying only to those VOC's emitted from the spray booth. The effect of this interpretation would be to exclude VOC's that are emitted from outside the spray booth (i.e., flash-off area and oven) from being covered by the standards. To rectify this problem, the commenter suggested that VOC emission limits be established for the entire line (i.e., spray booth, flash-off area, and oven) but that the reconstruction provisions still apply only to the spray booth.

The EPA believes that the wording of the proposed standards precludes the interpretation suggested by the commenter and, therefore, that it is unnecessary to implement the commenter's solution. Section 60.722 of the regulation uses the language "no affected facility *shall cause* the discharge into the atmosphere" (emphasis added). The coatings application that takes place in the spray booth is clearly the cause of VOC emissions from the flash-off area and oven. Therefore, VOC emissions from these areas are covered by the standards.

The language of § 60.723 of the regulation also precludes the commenter's interpretation. The calculations by which performance is determined include all VOC's resulting from coatings applied in the spray booth and do not allow for the exclusion of VOC's that may be emitted from the flash-off area and oven.

However, to protect against possible misinterpretation, EPA has revised the regulation to specify that all VOC emissions caused by coatings applied in each affected facility, regardless of the actual point of discharge of emissions into the atmosphere, shall be included in determining compliance with the emission limits. It also should be noted that because the affected facility remains unchanged, the reconstruction provisions still apply only to the spray booth.

Achievability of the Standards

One commenter stated that coatings that comply with the standards cannot achieve performance levels for abrasion, adhesion, and chemical resistance. Another commenter stated that these coatings could not meet chemical and stain resistance specifications for certain business machine uses. This commenter suggested that the regulation allow variances on a case-by-case basis if the coater can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Administrator that no coating exists that meets both the emission limits and necessary performance specifications.

The EPA has determined that high-solids solvent-based and waterborne coatings that comply with the emission limits when used with appropriate coating application technologies are being used for prime, color, texture, and touch-up coats by coaters in at least two States. These coatings have been approved by some original equipment manufacturers (OEM's) for performance specifications including abrasion, adhesion, and chemical and physical stain resistance. The EPA expects coaters to use high-solids solvent-based coatings to achieve compliance and has determined that these coatings are available for use. Waterborne coatings also can be used to meet the standards and are available for use. For these reasons, EPA has determined that the standards are achievable and has not revised the standards.

One commenter stated that none of the waterborne primers available will achieve the standards.

The EPA has determined that waterborne primers that will achieve the standards are available for use with waterborne coatings and are being used in production. These waterborne coatings can be applied as a prime/barrier coat for certain types of plastic that are sensitive to direct application of solvent-based coatings. In many cases, waterborne coatings are not used as primers, but are applied as a color coat to the part(s) without the use of a primer coating.

Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements

One commenter stated that recordkeeping requirements to determine compliance are excessive, particularly for large surface coating operations that coat both plastic and metal parts with a variety of coatings. The commenter also stated that the cost of analyzing coatings using EPA Reference Method 24 could be unreasonable. He requested that the language of the standards be changed to allow alternate methods of compliance on a case-by-case basis for facilities that use a large number of paint formulations. One such method suggested by the commenter would allow small-volume coatings to be grouped with a large-volume coating (i.e., 90 percent of the total coating volume) having similar formulation and application characteristics. The costs of monthly compliance testing would be reduced because it would be necessary only to test the large volume coating formulation and to measure the total coatings volume.

The time and costs associated with the recordkeeping necessary to determine compliance with the standards have previously been evaluated by EPA and were determined to be reasonable. Most coaters maintain operation or inventory logs that contain at least some of the information that is required by these standards, and some coaters are already maintaining the information needed to perform the calculations to determine compliance with the standards. In addition, the recordkeeping requirements, as written, are the only feasible way for a coater to demonstrate continuous monthly compliance with the standards. Also, in most cases, coating composition data determined by EPA Reference Method 24 can be obtained from the coating manufacturer. In rare cases such as when coaters manufacture coatings in-house or modify (e.g., add solvent to) the formulation of a purchased coating, a coater may have to perform an EPA Reference Method 24 test in-house when such data are not available from an outside coating manufacturer. The cost to the coater to perform EPA Reference Method 24 is estimated to be \$200 per coating. The EPA considers this cost to be reasonable.

Because the time and costs necessary to perform the compliance calculations were determined to be reasonable and because EPA Reference Method 24 coating composition data can, in most cases, be obtained from the coating manufacturer, EPA has determined that

the recordkeeping and reporting requirements of the standards are not excessive. Therefore, the standards have not been revised.

One commenter stated that the 1-liter sample size requested for the determination of VOC content of each coating using EPA Reference Method 24 is unreasonable, especially in the case of specialty coatings. The commenter said that 1 liter may be equivalent to the total volume of coating manufactured or supplied for a specialty coating, whereas EPA Reference Method 24 requires only a 10-gram sample size. The commenter noted that the cost of manufacturing or purchasing additional paint for sample analysis alone would be unreasonable. The commenter recommended that the standards be rewritten to specify a sample size of 10 grams.

The sample size was set at 1 liter for several reasons: (1) Losses of the sample could occur during transfer of the sample between pieces of equipment or sample container and equipment, (2) losses of the sample could occur during equipment setup, and (3) additional runs of the EPA Reference Method 24 tests could require additional sample in the event of problems with the initial runs. Therefore, to account for any sample losses and for the need for additional test runs, the sample size remains at 1 liter.

Additionally, the low-volume usage of specialty coatings is expected to be a rare occurrence. It should be noted that coaters who perform the EPA Reference Method 24 test are free to use as small a volume as necessary to conduct the test. The 1-liter sample size requirement applies when a coating sample is requested for analysis by EPA.

Economic Impact

One commenter said that because compliance coatings that will meet all performance specifications are not available, the proposed standards would force OEM's either to change to solid wall plastics with molded-in color, which would eliminate structural foam and all coatings and severely impact both industries, or to move tooling, molding, and finishing operations offshore, which would result in additional loss of jobs in the already depressed business machine cabinetry market as well as loss of local, State, and Federal tax revenues.

The EPA has determined that both waterborne and high-solids solvent-based coatings that meet the standards are available and are being used by industry. In addition, EPA has performed an economic market analysis, presented in Chapter 9 of the Volume I

BID for this industry, that indicates that the use of the combination of the BDT coatings and coating application equipment will result in a net credit to industry of \$30 million/yr. Therefore, because BDT coatings are available and are being used and because there is a net credit from the use of BDT coatings and application techniques, no adverse economic impacts are expected.

VIII. Administrative

The docket is an organized and complete file of all the information considered by EPA in the development of this rulemaking. The docket is a dynamic file because material is added throughout the rulemaking development. The docketing system is intended to allow members of the public and industries involved to readily identify and locate documents so that they can intelligently and effectively participate in the rulemaking process. Along with the statement of basis and purpose of the proposed and promulgated standards and EPA responses to significant comments, the contents of the docket, except for interagency review materials, will serve as the record in case of judicial review [Section 307(d)(7)(A)].

The effective date of this regulation is January 29, 1988. Section 111 of the Clean Air Act provides that standards of performance or revisions thereof become effective upon promulgation and apply to affected facilities, the construction or modification of which was commenced after January 8, 1986, the date of proposal.

As prescribed by section 111, the promulgation of these standards is based on the Administrator's determination that facilities that surface coat plastic parts for business machines contribute significantly to air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. In accordance with section 117 of the Act, publication of these promulgated standards was preceded by consultation with appropriate advisory committees, independent experts, and Federal departments and agencies.

This regulation will be reviewed 4 years from the date of promulgation as required by the Clean Air Act. This review will include an assessment of such factors as the need for integration with other programs, the existence of alternative methods, enforceability, improvements in emission control technology, and reporting requirements.

Section 317 of the Clean Air Act requires the Administrator to prepare an economic impact assessment for any new source standard of performance promulgated under section 111(b) of the

Act. An economic impact assessment was prepared for this regulation and for other regulatory alternatives. All aspects of the assessment were considered in the formulation of the standards to ensure that cost was carefully considered in determining BDT. The economic impact assessment is included in the BID for the proposed standards.

Information collection requirements associated with this regulation (those included in 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart TTT) have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, and have been assigned OMB control number 2060-0162.

Under Executive Order 12291, EPA is required to judge whether a regulation is a "major rule" and, therefore, subject to the requirements of a regulatory impact analysis (RIA). The Agency has determined that this regulation would result in none of the adverse economic effects set forth in section 1 of the Order as grounds for finding a regulation to be a "major rule." The regulation results in a net annual credit to the industry, and no price increases are expected. The Agency has concluded, therefore, that this regulation is not a "major rule" under Executive Order 12291.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires the identification of potentially adverse impacts of Federal regulations upon small business entities. The Act specifically requires the completion of a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis in those instances where small business impacts are possible. Because these standards impose no adverse economic impacts, a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis has not been conducted.

Pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 605(b), I hereby certify that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 60

Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Incorporation by reference, Surface coating of plastic parts for business machines.

Date: January 13, 1988.

Lee M. Thomas,
Administrator.

PART 60—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 60 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401, 7411, 7414, 7416, and 7601.

2. 40 CFR Part 60 is amended by adding a new Subpart TTT to read as follows:

Subpart TTT—Standards of Performance for Industrial Surface Coating: Surface Coating of Plastic Parts for Business Machines

Sec.

- 60.720 Applicability and designation of affected facility.
- 60.721 Definitions.
- 60.722 Standards for volatile organic compounds.
- 60.723 Performance test and compliance provisions.
- 60.724 Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.
- 60.725 Test methods and procedures.
- 60.726 Delegation of authority.

Subpart TTT—Standards of Performance for Industrial Surface Coating: Surface Coating of Plastic Parts for Business Machines

§ 60.720 Applicability and designation of affected facility.

(a) The provisions of this subpart apply to each spray booth in which plastic parts for use in the manufacture of business machines receive prime coats, color coats, texture coats, or touch-up coats.

(b) This subpart applies to any affected facility for which construction, modification, or reconstruction begins after January 8, 1986.

§ 60.721 Definitions.

(a) As used in this subpart, all terms not defined herein shall have the meaning given them in the Act or in Subpart A of this part.

"Business machine" means a device that uses electronic or mechanical methods to process information, perform calculations, print or copy information, or convert sound into electrical impulses for transmission, such as:

- (1) Products classified as typewriters under SIC Code 3572;
- (2) Products classified as electronic computing devices under SIC Code 3573;
- (3) Products classified as calculating and accounting machines under SIC Code 3574;
- (4) Products classified as telephone and telegraph equipment under SIC Code 3661;
- (5) Products classified as office machines, not elsewhere classified, under SIC Code 3579; and
- (6) Photocopy machines, a subcategory of products classified as photographic equipment under SIC code 3661.

"Coating operation" means the use of a spray booth for the application of a single type of coating (e.g., prime coat); the use of the same spray booth for the

application of another type of coating (e.g., texture coat) constitutes a separate coating operation for which compliance determinations are performed separately.

"Coating solids applied" means the coating solids that adhere to the surface of the plastic business machine part being coated.

"Color coat" means the coat applied to a part that affects the color and gloss of the part, not including the prime coat or texture coat. This definition includes fog coating.

"Conductive sensitizer" means a coating applied to a plastic substrate to render it conductive for purposes of electrostatic application of subsequent prime, color, texture, or touch-up coats.

"Fog coating" (also known as mist coating and uniforming) means a thin coating applied to plastic parts that have molded-in color or texture or both to improve color uniformity.

"Nominal 1-month period" means either a calendar month, 30-day month, accounting month, or similar monthly time period that is established prior to the performance test (i.e., in a statement submitted with notification of anticipated actual startup pursuant to 40 CFR 60.7(2)).

"Plastic parts" means panels, housings, bases, covers, and other business machine components formed of synthetic polymers.

"Prime coat" means the initial coat applied to a part when more than one coating is applied, not including conductive sensitizers or electromagnetic interference/radio frequency interference shielding coatings.

"Spray booth" means the structure housing automatic or manual spray application equipment where a coating is applied to plastic parts for business machines.

"Texture coat" means the rough coat that is characterized by discrete, raised spots on the exterior surface of the part.

"Touch-up coat" means the coat applied to correct any imperfections in the finish after color or texture coats have been applied.

"Transfer efficiency" means the ratio of the amount of coating solids deposited onto the surface of a plastic business machine part to the total amount of coating solids used.

"VOC emissions" means the mass of VOC's emitted from the surface coating of plastic parts for business machines expressed as kilograms of VOC's per liter of coating solids applied (i.e., deposited on the surface).

(b) All symbols used in this subpart not defined below are given meaning in the Act or Subpart A of this part.

D_c = density of each coating as received (kilograms per liter)

D_d = density of each diluent VOC (kilograms per liter)

L_c = the volume of each coating consumed, as received (liters)

L_d = the volume of each diluent VOC added to coatings (liters)

L_s = the volume of coating solids consumed (liters)

M_d = the mass of diluent VOC's consumed (kilograms)

M_o = the mass of VOC's in coatings consumed, as received (kilograms)

N = the volume-weighted average mass of VOC emissions to the atmosphere per unit volume of coating solids applied (kilograms per liter)

T = the transfer efficiency for each type of application equipment used at a coating operation (fraction)

T_{avg} = the volume-weighted average transfer efficiency for a coating operation (fraction)

V_s = the proportion of solids in each coating, as received (fraction by volume)

W_o = the proportion of VOC's in each coating, as received (fraction by weight)

§ 60.722 Standards for volatile organic compounds.

(a) Each owner or operator of any affected facility which is subject to the requirements of this subpart shall comply with the emission limitations set forth in this section on and after the date on which the initial performance test, required by §§ 60.8 and 60.723 is completed, but not later than 60 days after achieving the maximum production rate at which the affected facility will be operated, or 180 days after the initial startup, whichever date comes first. No affected facility shall cause the discharge into the atmosphere in excess of:

(1) 1.5 kilograms of VOC's per liter of coating solids applied from prime coating of plastic parts for business machines.

(2) 1.5 kilograms of VOC's per liter of coating solids applied from color coating of plastic parts for business machines.

(3) 2.3 kilograms of VOC's per liter of coating solids applied from texture coating of plastic parts for business machines.

(4) 2.3 kilograms of VOC's per liter of coating solids applied from touch-up coating of plastic parts for business machines.

(b) All VOC emissions that are caused by coatings applied in each affected facility, regardless of the actual point of discharge of emissions into the atmosphere, shall be included in

determining compliance with the emission limits in paragraph (a) of this section.

§ 60.723 Performance tests and compliance provisions.

(a) Section 60.8 (d) and (f) do not apply to the performance test procedures required by this section.

(b) The owner or operator of an affected facility shall conduct an initial performance test as required under § 60.8(a) and thereafter a performance test each nominal 1-month period for each affected facility according to the procedures in this section.

(1) The owner or operator shall determine the composition of coatings by analysis of each coating, as received, using Reference Method 24, from data that have been determined by the coating manufacturer using Reference Method 24, or by other methods approved by the Administrator.

(2) The owner or operator shall determine the volume of coating and the mass of VOC used for dilution of coatings from company records during each nominal 1-month period. If a common coating distribution system serves more than one affected facility or serves both affected and nonaffected spray booths, the owner or operator shall estimate the volume of coatings used at each facility by using procedures approved by the Administrator.

(i) The owner or operator shall calculate the volume-weighted average mass of VOC's in coatings emitted per unit volume of coating solids applied (N) at each coating operation [i.e., for each type of coating (prime, color, texture, and touch-up) used] during each nominal 1-month period for each affected facility. Each 1-month calculation is considered a performance test. Except as provided in paragraph (b)(2)(iii) of this section, N will be determined by the following procedures:

(A) Calculate the mass of VOC's used ($M_o + M_d$) for each coating operation during each nominal 1-month period for each affected facility by the following equation:

$$M_o + M_d = \sum_{i=1}^n L_{ci} D_{ci} W_{oi} + \sum_{j=1}^m L_{dj} D_{dj}$$

where n is the number of coatings of each type used during each nominal 1-month period and m is the number of different diluent VOC's used during each nominal 1-month period. ($\sum L_{dj} D_{dj}$ will be 0 if no VOC's are added to the coatings, as received.)

(B) Calculate the total volume of coating solids consumed (L_s) in each nominal 1-month period for each coating operation for each affected facility by the following equation:

$$L_s = \sum_{i=1}^n L_{ci} V_{si}$$

where n is the number of coatings of each type used during each nominal 1-month period.

(C) Select the appropriate transfer efficiency (T) from Table 1 for each type of coating applications equipment used at each coating operation. If the owner or operator can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Administrator that transfer efficiencies other than those shown are appropriate, the Administrator will approve their use on a case-by-case basis. Transfer efficiency values for application methods not listed below shall be approved by the Administrator on a case-by-case basis. An owner or operator must submit sufficient data for the Administrator to judge the validity of the transfer efficiency claims.

(D) Where more than one application method is used within a single coating operation, the owner or operator shall determine the volume of each coating applied by each method through a means acceptable to the Administrator and compute the volume-weighted average transfer efficiency by the following equation:

$$T_{avg} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^p L_{cik} V_{sik} T_k}{L_s}$$

TABLE 1.—TRANSFER EFFICIENCIES

Application methods	Transfer efficiency	Type of coating
Air atomized spray	0.25	Prime, color, texture, touch-up, and fog coats.
Air-assisted airless spray.	.40	Prime and color coats.
Electrostatic air spray..	.40	Do.

where n is the number of coatings of each type used and p is the number of application methods used.

(E) Calculate the volume-weighted average mass of VOC's emitted per unit volume of coating solids applied (N) during each nominal 1-month period for

each coating operation for each affected facility by the following equation:

$$N = \frac{M_o + M_d}{L_s T_{avg}}$$

($T_{avg} = T$ when only one type of coating operation occurs).

(ii) Where the volume-weighted average mass of VOC's emitted to the atmosphere per unit volume of coating solids applied (N) is less than or equal to 1.5 kilograms per liter for prime coats, is less than or equal to 1.5 kilograms per liter for color coats, is less than or equal to 2.3 kilograms per liter for texture coats, and is less than or equal to 2.3 kilograms per liter for touch-up coats, the affected facility is in compliance.

(iii) If each individual coating used by an affected facility has a VOC content (kg VOC/l of solids), as received, which when divided by the lowest transfer efficiency at which the coating is applied for each coating operation results in a value equal to or less than 1.5 kilograms per liter for prime and color coats and equal to or less than 2.3 kilograms per liter for texture and touch-up coats, the affected facility is in compliance provided that no VOC's are added to the coatings during distribution or application.

(iv) If an affected facility uses add-on controls to control VOC emissions and if the owner or operator can demonstrate to the Administrator that the volume-weighted average mass of VOC's emitted to the atmosphere during each nominal 1-month period per unit volume of coating solids applied (N) is within each of the applicable limits expressed in paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section because of this equipment, the affected facility is in compliance. In such cases, compliance will be determined by the Administrator or a case-by-case basis.

§ 60.724 Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

(a) The reporting requirements of § 60.8(a) apply only to the initial performance test. Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart shall include the following data in the report of the initial performance test required under § 60.8(a):

(1) Except as provided for in paragraph (a)(2) of this section, the volume-weighted average mass of VOC's emitted to the atmosphere per volume of applied coating solids (N) for the initial nominal 1-month period for each coating operation from each affected facility.

(2) For each affected facility where compliance is determined under the provisions of § 60.723(b)(2)(iii), a list of the coatings used during the initial nominal 1-month period, the VOC content of each coating calculated from data determined using Reference Method 24, and the lowest transfer efficiency at which each coating is applied during the initial nominal 1-month period.

(b) Following the initial report, each owner or operator shall:

(1) Report the volume-weighted average mass of VOC's per unit volume of coating solids applied for each coating operation for each affected facility during each nominal 1-month period in which the facility is not in compliance with the applicable emission limits specified in § 60.722. Reports of noncompliance shall be submitted on a quarterly basis, occurring every 3 months following the initial report; and

(2) Submit statements that each affected facility has been in compliance with the applicable emission limits specified in § 60.722 during each nominal 1-month period. Statements of compliance shall be submitted on a semiannual basis.

(c) These reports shall be postmarked not later than 10 days after the end of the periods specified in § 60.724(b)(1) and § 60.724(b)(2).

(d) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart shall maintain at the source, for a period of at least 2 years, records of all data and calculations used to determine monthly VOC emissions from each coating operation for each affected facility as specified in 40 CFR 60.7(d).

(e) Reporting and recordkeeping requirements for facilities using add-on controls will be determined by the Administrator on a case-by-case basis.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under Control No. 2060-0162)

§ 60.725 Test methods and procedures.

(a) The reference methods in Appendix A to this part except as provided under § 60.8(b) shall be used to determine compliance with § 60.722 as follows:

(1) Method 24 for determination of VOC content of each coating as received.

(2) For Method 24, the sample must be at least a 1-liter sample in a 1-liter container.

(b) Other methods may be used to determine the VOC content of each coating if approved by the Administrator before testing.

§ 60.726 Delegation of authority.

(a) In delegating implementation and enforcement authority to a State under section 111(c) of the Act, the authorities contained in paragraph (b) of this section shall be retained by the Administrator and not transferred to a State.

(b) Authorities which will not be delegated to States:

Section 60.723(b)(1)
Section 60.723(b)(2)
Section 60.723(b)(2)(i)(C)
Section 60.723(b)(2)(i)(D)
Section 60.723(b)(2)(iv)
Section 60.724(a)(2)
Section 60.724(e)
Section 60.725(b)

[FR Doc. 88-1500 Filed 1-28-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M