

RULE 67.1
ALTERNATIVE EMISSION CONTROL PLANS
WORKSHOP REPORT

A workshop notice was mailed to each company known to be involved in operations (in San Diego County) which might be affected by new Rule 67.1 - Alternative Emission Control Plans. Notices were also mailed to all Economic Development Corporations and Chambers of Commerce in San Diego County, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Air Resources Board (ARB), and other interested parties.

The workshop was held on March 6, 1991 and was attended by 19 people. Written comments were also received. The comments and District responses are as follows:

WORKSHOP COMMENT:

There are certain rules mentioned in Section (a). Are these rules new?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

No, all rules in the Applicability section are existing District rules. Some of them have a provision for equivalency plans which are inconsistent with EPA requirements and are therefore, deficient. Rule 67.1 is designed to supersede these equivalency provisions and to correct SIP deficiencies in these rules. It provides an option to comply with certain requirements of existing surface coating rules by other equivalent methods.

WORKSHOP COMMENT:

Will new Rule 67.1 replace the other rules mentioned in Section (a)?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

No. Rule 67.1 presents an alternative method to comply with certain requirements of rules mentioned in Section (a).

WORKSHOP COMMENT:

The proposed rule requires that an AECP achieved twenty percent emission reduction compared to baseline emissions. How can this reduction be achieved?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

The VOC emission reduction can be achieved by using emission control equipment such as incinerators or carbon adsorbers. Another option is to use low VOC coatings, for example, water based or high solids coatings which have VOC content lower than that required by the applicable rule.

WORKSHOP COMMENT:

How specific is the recordkeeping requirement in relation to the identification of a substrate being coated?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

There is no requirement in Rule 67.1 to identify the substrate being coated.

WORKSHOP COMMENT:

In Subsection (e)(1) two test methods are identified. Should both methods be used or it can be either of these?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Both methods should be used. The EPA Test Method 24 does not provide information on the identity or quantity of exempt compounds in coatings. Therefore, ASTM Method D 4457-85 has to be used to identify and quantify the exempt compounds.

WORKSHOP COMMENT:

Some District rules allow credit for higher transfer efficiency of application equipment. Why does Rule 67.1 not allow it ?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

EPA's Emission Trading Policy Guidelines specifies that transfer efficiency cannot be used to achieve equivalency requirements due to the absence of an approved test method for quantitative determination of transfer efficiency of an application equipment. No other District rule allows such credit.

WORKSHOP COMMENT:

Rule 67.1 eliminates existing equivalency plans after a six months grace period. That means that sources in the aerospace industry have to comply with amended Rule 67.9. However, some sources may find themselves in violation of this rule since they do not have complying coatings.

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Most of the specialty category coatings in the amended Rule 67.9 have VOC contents consistent with those being used now by industry. Sources which cannot comply with the rule's limits always have the option to apply for a variance. During workshop on Rule 67.9 information was supplied to the District that showed there were problems in complying with the VOC limits in the amended Rule 67.9.

WORKSHOP COMMENT:

Some companies may have difficulties in compiling daily records for the two years directly preceding an application date for a new AECP. Such records may not exist for certain pieces of equipment or certain categories of coatings. Would yearly procurement records or purchase records be acceptable?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Yes. If daily records on the use of VOC containing materials are not available, the source can use purchase records and/or procurements records, provided that this information is sufficient to calculate baseline emissions for pieces of equipment submitted for inclusion in the AECP.

WRITTEN COMMENT:

If a company needs to apply for equivalency plan to operate after the first compliance date (7/1/92), the company should be able to incorporate noncompliant applications when the second compliance date (7/1/94) becomes effective

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Subsection (d)(8)(ii) of the rule outlines a procedure to follow when an applicable lower VOC content for a coating goes into effect. It requires to submit a modified or updated AECP within 60 days following the date the new VOC content limit is effective.

EPA COMMENT:

Is it the District's intent to simultaneously delete the AECP provision in the seven coating regulations which are referenced?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Some of these regulations have already been amended and the AECP provision has been deleted. Rule 67.9 is the only rule which still has the AECP provision and it is being amended now.

EPA COMMENT:

The reference to EPA's Capture Efficiency Protocol is not adequate. Based on recent comments from the Headquarters Office, the District should either adopt EPA model CE rule or develop a CE method and submit it as a SIP revision. As a minimum, the reference to 55 FR 26865 dated June 29, 1990 should be incorporated in the rule.

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

The suggested reference has been incorporated. The EPA's Capture Efficiency Protocol was recently referred to in other District rules which were deemed approvable by the EPA. The District is planning, however, to adopt the EPA model rule for capture efficiency determination in the near future.