

May 28, 2013

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Co-Presidents

David J. Shaw
New York

Barry R. Wallerstein
Los Angeles, CA

Co-Vice Presidents

George S. Aburn, Jr.
Maryland

Merlyn Hough
Springfield, OR

Co-Treasurers

Stuart A. Clark
Washington

Thomas Huynh
Philadelphia, PA

Past Co-Presidents

G. Vinson Hellwig
Michigan

Bruce S. Andersen
Kansas City, KS

Directors

Mark Asmundson
Mount Vernon, WA

Mike Bates
Arkansas

Rick Brunetti
Kansas

Anne Gobin
Connecticut

James N. Goldstene
California

David Klemm
Montana

John A. Paul
Dayton, OH

Richard A. Stedman
Monterey, CA

Barry R. Stephens
Tennessee

Executive Director

S. William Becker

EPA Docket Center
EPA West (Air Docket)
Attention Docket ID Number EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-1041 and 1042
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mailcode: 2822T
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Sir/Madam:

On behalf of the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA), thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed “National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Mineral Wool Production and Wool Fiberglass Manufacturing; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Gas-Fired Melting Furnaces Located at Wool Fiberglass Manufacturing Area Sources,” which were published in the *Federal Register* on April 15, 2013 (78 *Federal Register* 22370). NACAA is a national, non-partisan, non-profit association of air pollution control agencies in 43 states, the District of Columbia, four territories and 116 metropolitan areas. The air quality professionals in our member agencies have vast experience dedicated to improving air quality in the United States. These comments are based upon that experience. The views expressed in this document do not necessarily represent the positions of every state and local air pollution control agency in the country.

NACAA supports EPA’s conclusion that additional emission reductions and monitoring requirements beyond the original Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standard for the Mineral Wool and Wool Fiberglass source categories are warranted. We supplied comments on EPA’s proposal of November 25, 2011, many of which are still germane to the current proposal. We are including those earlier comments by reference here for your consideration.¹ Additionally, we reiterate some of our earlier points and include new comments for your review below.

Additional Requirements – Because of the adverse health effects associated with exposure to the substances emitted by Mineral Wool Production and Wool

¹ <http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/MineralwoolwoolfiberglassRTR.pdf>

Fiberglass Manufacturing, NACAA is pleased that EPA is proposing additional control measures and encourages the agency to include those additional provisions in the final rule.

Area Source Determination – EPA has indicated that gas-fired glass-melting furnaces located at wool fiberglass manufacturing facilities that may have eliminated phenol-formaldehyde binders and dropped their emissions to area-source levels continue to emit chromium and other hazardous air pollution (HAP) metal compounds.² Accordingly, NACAA commends EPA for adding those types of facilities to the list of area sources under Sections 112(c)(3) and (k)(3)(B) of the Clean Air Act and for proposing controls to address those emissions.

Allowable Emissions – NACAA recommends that EPA consider potential or allowable emissions, rather than actual emissions, as much as possible in evaluating residual risk. Since facility emissions contributing to adverse impacts could increase over time for a variety of reasons, the use of potential or allowable emissions is more appropriate. We believe an analysis based on actual emissions from a single point in time could underestimate the residual risk from a source category. Further, the major source HAP thresholds are based on maximum potential-to-emit, as opposed to actual emissions, and air pollution control agencies issue permits based on potential emissions. Limiting the scope of a risk evaluation to actual emissions would be inconsistent with the applicability section of Part 63 rules. We were pleased to see that EPA used allowable emissions in parts of the rulemaking but were concerned about the fact that EPA used actual emissions in conducting its post-control risk assessment.³ NACAA encourages the agency to use allowable emissions in the future, including in assessing acute health risks.

Property-line Concentrations – In assessing the cancer risks related to the source category, EPA used long-term concentrations affecting the most highly exposed census block for each facility.⁴ This analysis dilutes the effect of sources' emissions by estimating the impact at the centroid of the census block instead of at the property line or wherever the maximum exposed individual is. Census blocks can be large geographically, depending on the population density, so the maximum point of impact can be far from the centroid, including at or near the property line where people may live or work. Further, even if the area near the property line is not developed, over time homes and businesses could locate closer to the facility. While it is possible that population distribution is homogenous over a census block, this assumption is not necessarily accurate in considering the predicted impacts from the location of a source. Using the Human Exposure Model-3 (HEM-3), EPA can identify the maximum individual risk at any point in a census block that is within a 50-kilometer radius from the center of the modeled facility. Based on HEM-3's power and ability, NACAA suggests that EPA abandon its use of the predicted chronic exposures at the census block centroid as surrogates for the exposure concentrations for all people living in that block. Rather, we recommend that EPA use the truly maximum individual risk, irrespective of its location in the census block, in its section 112(f)(2) risk assessments.

Environmental Justice – We commend EPA for considering environmental justice issues by expressing concern about the disproportionate impacts of HAP emissions on certain social,

² 78 *Federal Register* 22375.

³ 78 *Federal Register* 22386.


⁴ 78 *Federal Register* 22393.

demographic and economic groups.⁵ However, we believe improvements are needed in EPA's methods of evaluating environmental justice and encourage EPA to continue to consider these factors in developing the final rule and subsequent regulations.

NACAA recommends that EPA conduct the demographic analysis on individuals projected to experience a risk greater than 1-in-1-million and *also* on individuals living within five kilometers of the facility, regardless of projected risk, consistent with the approach used for the Hard and Decorative Chromium Electroplating and Chromium Anodizing Tanks source category.⁶ NACAA also recommends that the rule writers work with the EPA Office of Environmental Justice to develop criteria and specific guidance on how to interpret and apply the outcome of these types of analyses in the rulemaking process.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposal. Please contact us if we can provide additional information.

Sincerely,



G. Vinson Hellwig
Michigan
Co-Chair
NACAA Air Toxics Committee



Robert H. Colby
Chattanooga, Tennessee
Co-Chair
NACAA Air Toxics Committee

⁵ 78 *Federal Register* 22392.

⁶ 75 *Federal Register* 65089.