

Texas Register

Volume 13, Number 91, December 9, 1988

Pages 6045-6128

In This Issue...

Attorney General

Open Records Decisions

6053-ORD-511 (RQ-1411)

6053-ORD-512 (RQ-1519)

Opinions

6053-JM-984 (RQ-1469)

6053-JM-985 (RQ-1483)

Requests for Opinions

6053-(RQ-1591)-(RQ-1600)

Proposed Sections

Texas Department of Agriculture

6055-Seed Certification Standards

State Securities Board

6055-Terminology

6055-Transactions Exempt from Registration

6056-Administrative Guidelines for Registration of Equipment Programs

Public Utility Commission of Texas

6063-Substantive Rules

Texas State Board of Dental Examiners

6068-Conduct

Board of Vocational Nurse Examiners

6068-Administration

6069-Education

Texas State Board of Public Accountancy

6069-Professional Conduct

Texas Department of Human Services

6070-Child Protective Services

Texas Rehabilitation Commission

6072-Memoranda of Understanding with Other State Agencies

Withdrawn Sections

State Securities Board

6073-Dealers and Salesmen

Board of Nurse Examiners

6073-Licensure and Practice

State Property Tax Board

6073-Tax Record Requirement

Adopted Sections

State Securities Board

6075-Confidentiality of Information

6075-Exemptions by Rule or Order

State Board of Dental Examiners

6075-Extension of Duties of Auxiliary Personnel

Board of Nurse Examiners

6076-Bylaws

Statewide Health Coordinating Council

6077-Health Planning and Resource Development

General Land Office

6079-Energy Resources

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

6080-Fisheries

Texas Air Control Board

6081-General Rules

6082-Control of Air Pollution from Volatile Organic Compounds

State Property Tax Board

6094-Tax Record Requirements

Texas Department of Public Safety

6094-Commercial Driver Training School Regulations

State Board of Insurance Exempt Filing

6100-Notifications Pursuant to the Insurance Code, Chapter 5, Subchapter L

Open Meetings

6103-Texas Department of Agriculture

6103-Automated Information and Telecommunication Council

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

Effective date: December 21, 1988
Proposed publication date: June 7, 1988
or further information, please call: (512)
51-5711 ext.354

Specified Solvent-Using Processes

31 TAC §§115.171-115.176

The Texas Air Control Board (TACB) adopts amendments to §§115.171-115.176. Sections 15.172-115.175 are adopted with changes to the proposed text as published in the June 1988, issue of the *Texas Register* (13 TexReg 2809). Section 115.171 and §115.176 are adopted without changes and will not be republished.

The amendment to §115.171, concerning cutback asphalt, require any state, municipal, or county agency which uses or specifies the use of cutback asphalt or asphalt emulsions to maintain records sufficient to document compliance with applicable requirements. The amendments to §115.172, concerning old solvent cleaning, establish a minimum control efficiency of 65% for emissions capture and control systems. The amendments to §115.173, concerning open-top vapor degreasing operations, and §115.174, concerning conveyorized degreasing operations, establish a minimum control efficiency of 85% in refrigerated chillers or alternate capture and control systems. These amendments also specify the necessary test methods and recordkeeping requirements for all affected sources. The amendments to §115.175, concerning exemptions, eliminates any size exemption for degreasing operations in Dallas and Tarrant counties after August 31, 1990. The amendments to §115.176, concerning counties and compliance schedule, specify that all affected sources in Dallas and Tarrant counties must begin maintaining necessary records no later than August 31, 1990. Various additional amendments to these sections clarify and simplify the enforcement of current requirements.

The Administrative Procedure and Texas Register Act, Texas Civil Statutes, Article 252-13a, §5(C)(1), requires categorization of comments as being for or against a proposal. A commenter who suggested any changes in the proposal is categorized as against the proposal, while a commenter who agreed with the proposal in its entirety is categorized as being for the proposal.

Three commenters, an individual, General Dynamics (GD), and Texas Instruments (TI), testified against the proposed amendments to §§115.172-115.174, while no comments were received in favor of the proposals. One commenter, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), testified against the proposed amendments to §115.175, while no comments were received in favor of the proposal. No comments were received regarding §§115.171 or §115.176. A summary of comments and a discussion of issues follows. Copies of the written testimony and of the hearing transcript are available for inspection at the TACB office, 6330 Highway 290 East, Austin, Texas 78723.

The individual commenter suggested that the proposed control efficiencies were not strin-

gent enough, while GD stated that controls should be verified under actual operating conditions. These controls were developed in conformance with the control technique guidelines (CTG) published by EPA which specify appropriate design efficiency criteria. No independent demonstrations to confirm design performance appears necessary.

TI objected to recordkeeping requirements for individual degreasers at facilities where numerous degreasers are utilized and recommended monthly solvent purchase and disposal records for the entire plant rather than for each degreaser. The regulation is applicable to each individual degreaser, necessitating some way of determining compliance for each unit. Records for an entire plant would not be sufficient to satisfy this condition. However, since the exemption for small degreasers has been eliminated in Dallas and Tarrant counties, no record of solvent purchase or disposal appears necessary. Information regarding maintenance and testing of control equipment will still be required.

GD advocated the development of non-volatile solvents for degreasers. Such activity is encouraged where the substitute solvent does not represent a public health risk due to its toxicity.

EPA stated that in order to demonstrate application of RACT to all CTG sources, the exemption level of three pounds per day must either be deleted for Dallas and Tarrant counties or must be shown to have an insignificant effect on overall emissions. Most cold solvent cleaning operations already appear to utilize vapor control technology which satisfies TACB requirements for economic reasons. Therefore, elimination of the current exemption for small degreasing operations is not expected to require most sources to install additional control equipment. However, the effective enforcement of controls on individual cold solvent cleaners is expected to prove difficult and impractical due to the very large numbers of such cleaners in use. Enforcement is expected to be accomplished whenever violations are observed in conjunction with another investigation or through routine surveillance as resources allow.

The amendments are adopted under Texas Civil Statutes, Article 4477-5, §3.09(a), which provide the TACB with the authority to make rules and regulations consistent with the general intent and purpose of the Texas Clean Air Act and to amend any rule or regulation the TACB makes.

§115.172. Cold Solvent Cleaning.

(a) No person shall own or operate a system utilizing a volatile organic compound for the cold cleaning of objects without the following controls:

(1) A cover shall be provided for each cleaner which shall be kept closed whenever parts are not being handled in the cleaner. The cover shall be designed for easy one-handed operation if any one of the following exists:

(A)-(C) (No change.)

(2) (No change.)

(3) A permanent label summarizing the operating requirements in subsection (b) of this section shall be attached to the cleaner in a conspicuous location near the operator.

(4) If a solvent spray is used, it must be a solid fluid stream (not a fine, atomized, or shower-type spray) and at an operating pressure of 10 psig or less as necessary to prevent splashing above the acceptable freeboard.

(5) One of the following controls is required if the solvent vapor pressure is greater than 0.6 psia (4.1 kPa), as measured at 100 degrees Fahrenheit (38 degrees Celsius), or if the solvent is heated above 120 degrees Fahrenheit (49 degrees Celsius):

(A) a freeboard that provides a ratio (the freeboard height divided by the degreaser width) equal to or greater than 0.7; or

(B) (No change.)

(6) Compliance with this subsection shall be determined by applying the following test methods, as applicable:

(A) ASTM Test Method D 323-82 for determining Reid Vapor Pressure, or

(B) Equivalent test methods and procedures approved by the executive director.

(7) An alternative capture and control system with a demonstrated overall volatile organic compound emission reduction efficiency of 65% or greater may be used in lieu of the requirements of paragraphs (1)-(6) of this subsection, if approved by the executive director.

(b) No person shall own or operate a system using a volatile organic compound for the cold cleaning of objects without complying with the following operating procedures:

(1) Waste solvent shall not be disposed of or transferred to another party such that the waste solvent can evaporate into the atmosphere. Waste solvents shall be stored only in covered containers.

(2) The degreaser cover shall be kept closed whenever parts are not being handled in the cleaner.

(3) (No change.)

§115.173. Open-Top Vapor Degreasing.

(a) No person shall own or operate a system utilizing a volatile organic compound for the open-top vapor cleaning of objects without the following controls.

(1) (No change.)

(2) The following devices which will automatically shut off the sump heat:

(A) a condenser coolant flow sensor and thermostat which will detect if the condenser coolant is not circulating or if the condenser coolant temperature exceeds the solvent manufacturer's recommendations;

(B) a solvent level sensor which will detect if the solvent level drops below acceptable design limits; and

(C) a vapor level sensor which will detect if the vapor level rises above acceptable design limits.

(3) (No change.)

(4) One of the following controls:

(A) a freeboard that provides a ratio (the distance from the top of the vapor level to the top edge of the degreasing tank divided by the degreaser width) equal to or greater than 0.75 and, if the degreaser opening is greater than 10 ft (1m), a powered cover;

(B) a properly sized refrigerated chiller capable of achieving 85% or greater control of volatile organic compound emissions;

(C)-(D) (No change.)

(E) an alternate capture and control system with a demonstrated overall volatile organic compound emission reduction efficiency of 85% or greater, if approved by the executive director.

(5) (No change.)

(6) Compliance with paragraphs (4)(D) and (4)(E) of this subsection shall be determined by applying the following test methods, as appropriate:

(A) Test Methods 1-4 (40 Code of Federal Regulations 60, Appendix A) for determining flow rates, as necessary;

(B) Test Method 18 (40 Code of Federal Regulations 60, Appendix A) for determining gaseous organic compound emissions by gas chromatography;

(C) Test Method 25 (40 Code of Federal Regulations 60, Appendix A) for determining total gaseous nonmethane organic emissions as carbon;

(D) Test Methods 25A or 25B (40 Code of Federal Regulations 60, Appendix A) for determining total gaseous

organic concentrations using flame ionization or nondispersive infrared analysis; or

(E) equivalent test methods and procedures approved by the executive director.

(b) No person shall own or operate a system using a volatile organic compound for the open-top vapor cleaning of objects without complying with the following operating procedures:

(1) (No change.)

(2) parts shall be positioned so that complete drainage is obtained.

(3) (No change.)

(4) The work load shall be retained in the vapor zone at least 30 seconds or until condensation ceases.

(5) Any pools of solvent on the cleaned parts shall be removed by tipping the part before withdrawing it from the vapor zone.

(6)-(9) (No change.)

(10) Solvent leaks shall be repaired immediately, or the degreaser shall be shut down until repairs are made.

(11) Waste solvent shall not be disposed of or transferred to another party such that the waste solvent will evaporate into the atmosphere. Waste solvent shall be stored only in covered containers.

(12)-(13) (No change.)

(c) The owner or operator of any open-top vapor degreasing operation in Dallas or Tarrant Counties shall maintain the following records at the facility for at least two years and shall make such records available to representatives of the Texas Air Control Board or the local air pollution control agency having jurisdiction in the area, upon request:

(1) a record of control equipment maintenance, such as replacement of the carbon in a carbon adsorption unit; and

(2) the results of all tests conducted at the facility in accordance with the requirements described in subsection (a)(6) of this section.

§115.174. Conveyorized Degreasing.

(a) No person shall own or operate a system utilizing a volatile organic compound for the conveyorized cleaning of objects without the following controls.

(1) One of the following major control devices is required:

(A) a properly sized refrigerated chiller capable of achieving 85% or greater control of volatile organic emissions; or

(B) a carbon adsorption system with ventilation equal to or greater than 50 cfm/ft (15 in/min/ft) of air/vapor area (when down-time covers are open) and exhausting less than 25 ppm of solvent by volume averaged over one complete adsorption cycle; or

(C) an alternative capture and control system with a demonstrated overall volatile organic compound emission reduction efficiency of 85% or greater, if approved by the executive director.

(2)-(6) (No change.)

(7) Down-time covers which close off the entrance and exit during non-operating hours.

(8) A permanent, conspicuous label near the operator summarizing the operating requirements in subsection (b) of this section.

(9) Compliance with paragraphs (1)(B) or (1)(C) of this subsection shall be determined by applying the following test methods, as appropriate:

(A) Test Methods 1-4 (40 Code of Federal Regulations 60, Appendix A) for determining flow rates, as necessary;

(B) Test Method 18 (40 Code of Federal Regulations 60, Appendix A) for determining gaseous organic compound emissions by gas chromatography;

(C) Test Method 25 (40 Code of Federal Regulations 60, Appendix A) for determining total gaseous nonmethane organic emissions as carbon;

(D) Test Methods 25A or 25B (40 Code of Federal Regulations 60, Appendix A) for determining total gaseous organic concentrations using flame ionization or nondispersive infrared analysis; or

(E) equivalent test methods and procedures approved by the executive director.

(b) No person shall own or operate a system utilizing a volatile organic compound for the conveyorized cleaning of objects without complying with the following operating procedures.

(1) (No change.)

(2) Parts shall be positioned so that complete drainage is obtained.

(3) (No change.)

(4) Waste solvent shall not be disposed of, or transferred to another party, such that the waste solvent can evaporate into the atmosphere. Waste solvent shall be stored only in covered containers.

(5) Leaks shall be repaired im-

mediately or the degreaser shall be shut down until repairs are made.

(6)-(7) (No change.)

(c) The owner or operator of any conveyORIZED degreasing operation in Dallas or Tarrant Counties shall maintain the following records at the facility for at least two years and shall make such records available to representatives of the Texas Air Control Board or the local air pollution control agency having jurisdiction in the area, upon request:

(1) a record of control equipment maintenance, such as replacement of the carbon in a carbon adsorption unit; and

(2) the results of all tests conducted at the facility in accordance with the requirements described in subsection (a)(9) of this section.

§115.175. Exceptions.

(a)-(d) (No change.)

(e) An owner or operator who operates a remote reservoir cold solvent cleaner which uses solvent with a volatility equal to or less than 0.6 psia (4.1 kPa) measured at 100 degrees Fahrenheit (38 degrees Centigrade) and which has a drain area less than 16 in (100 cm) and who properly disposes of waste solvent in enclosed containers is exempt from §115.172(a)-(b) of this title (relating to Cold Solvent Cleaning).

(f) After December 31, 1987, only those degreasing operations located on any property in Dallas and Tarrant Counties which, when combined, would emit, when uncontrolled, a combined weight of volatile organic compounds less than three pounds (1.4 kg) in any consecutive 24-hour period shall be exempt from the provisions of §115.172 of this title (relating to Cold Solvent Cleaning), §115.173 of this title (relating to Open-Top Vapor Degreasing), and §115.174 of this title (relating to ConveyORIZED Degreasing).

(g) After August 31, 1990, no degreasing operations located on any property in Dallas and Tarrant Counties shall be exempt from the provisions of §115.172 of this title (relating to Cold Solvent Cleaning), §115.173 of this title (relating to Open-Top vapor Degreasing), and §115.174 of this title (relating to ConveyORIZED Degreasing).

This agency hereby certifies that the rule as adopted has been reviewed by legal counsel and found to be a valid exercise of the agency's legal authority.

Issued in Austin, Texas, on November 30, 1988.

TRD-8812236

Allen Ell Bell
Executive Director
Texas Air Control Board

Effective date: December 21, 1988

Proposal publication date: June 7, 1988

For further information, please call: (512) 451-5711, ext. 354

Surface Coating Processes

• 31 TAC §§115.191-115.193

The Texas Air Control Board (TACB) adopts amendments to §§115.191-115.193. Section 115.191 and §115.193 are adopted with changes to the proposed text as published in the June 7, 1988, issue of the *Texas Register* (13 TexReg 2812). Section 115.192 is adopted without changes and will not be published.

The amendments to §115.191, concerning emission limitations, delete the emission limitations expressed as pounds of volatile organic compounds (VOC) per gallon of solids for automobile refinishing and architectural coatings. Limitations expressed as pounds of VOC per gallon of coating (minus water and exempt solvents) are retained. However, the amendments clarify that emission calculations for surface coating operations to satisfy the conditions for approval of any demonstration of equivalency with specified limitations will be performed on a solids basis for all affected coatings. The amendments also clarify that emission limits are to be determined for coatings as delivered to the application system. The amendments specify that only those architectural coatings manufactured after December 31, 1988, will be required to satisfy the specified emission limitations but that the date of manufacture must be clearly marked on each coating container. The amendments also eliminate the architectural coating categories and associated limitations for volatile organic compounds exterior flat and interior flat latex paints and combine all flat and non-flat latex paints under a single limitation of 2.2 pounds per gallon of coating (minus water and exempt solvent). The amendments specify additional test procedures and necessary recordkeeping to be maintained at all affected coating facilities and sales outlets in Dallas and Tarrant counties.

The amendments to §115.192, concerning control techniques, specify test methods to determine compliance with applicable requirements for add-on controls and the necessary recordkeeping for affected surface coating facilities in Dallas and Tarrant counties.

The amendments to §115.193, concerning exemptions, establish the following three exemption levels for surface coating operations in Dallas and Tarrant counties: 1) exemption for all surface coating operations on a property which emits less than three pounds per hour or 15 pounds per day of VOC from the requirement to use low-solvent coatings or to install add-on control equipment; 2) exemption for all surface coating operations on a property which emits less than 100 pounds per day of VOC from the requirement to use low-solvent coatings if documentation is provided to demonstrate that necessary coating performance criteria cannot be achieved with coatings which satisfy applicable control limitations; and 3) exemption for all surface coating operations on a property which emit less than 100 pounds per day of VOC from the requirement to install add-on control equipment. Exempted facilities will be required to maintain records sufficient to document the applicability of the conditions of the exemption. Various additional amendments to these sections clarify and simplify the enforcement

of current requirements.

The Administrative Procedure and Texas Register Act, Texas Civil Statutes, Article 6252-13a, §5(C)(1), requires categorization of comments as being for or against a proposal. A commenter who suggested any changes in the proposal is categorized as against the proposal, while a commenter who agreed with the proposal in its entirety is categorized as being for the proposal.

Eleven commenters, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), General Dynamics Corporation (GD), the City of Fort Worth Health Department (FW), Dupont Corporation (Dupont), BASF Corporation (BASF), Sherwin-Williams Company (Sherwin-Williams), Jones-Blair Company (Jones-Blair), Glidden Company (Glidden), Olympic Homecare Products Company (Olympic), Caldwell Paint Manufacturing Company (Caldwell), and the National Paint and Coatings Association (NPCA) testified against the proposed amendments to §115.191. Two commenters, an individual commenter and General Motors Corporation (GM), testified against the proposed amendments to §115.192. Eight commenters, EPA, the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG), Sherwin-Williams, Jones-Blair, Glidden, Olympic, Caldwell, and NPCA, testified against the proposed amendments to §115.193. No comments were received in favor of the proposals.

A summary of comments and a discussion of issues follows. Copies of the written testimony and of the hearing transcript are available for inspection at the TACB office, 6330 Highway 290 East, Austin, Texas 78723.

The individual commenter recommended control efficiency requirements greater than the 80% proposed. This control efficiency is based on an assumed 90% efficiency of the control equipment and 90% efficiency of the vapor capture system. While control equipment may have efficiencies substantially greater than 90%, vapor capture systems at some facilities can not always be expected to achieve the assumed efficiency. The rule provides for a balance of the two points of control.

GM suggested that control efficiency should be based only on those emissions capable of being controlled by a specific exhaust stream and that the need for a specific control efficiency was unnecessary where identifiable emission limits were applicable. As stated earlier, capture efficiency must be considered in the calculation of overall efficiency of control of a specific surface coating operation. However, only those emissions from individual sources within a facility, such as spray booths or baking ovens, should be addressed in these calculations. Total plant-wide emissions may not need to be included. However, all control equipment, if required, should be expected to meet minimum performance criteria regardless of any specified reduction goal or equivalency requirement.

The EPA and the NCTCOG commented on the proposal to drop the current exemption of 100 lb/day (12.5 t/y at typical operating schedules) to 10 t/y. The EPA stated that a 10 t/y exemption level would be acceptable only if compliance with the exemption was evaluated based on an emission rate determined by multiplying the maximum hourly