

TABLE 8.—SUMMARY OF PROPOSED REGULATORY ALTERNATIVE COSTS

	TCI (1,000\$)	TAC (1,000\$/yr)	AER (Mg/yr)	CE (\$/Mg)
Butyl	\$691	\$1,316	596	\$2,200
Epichlorohydrin	491	241	124	1,900
Ethylene Propylene	5,957	3,732	2,087	1,800
Halobutyl	328	322	335	1,000
Hypalon®	na
Neoprene	560	897	354	2,500
Nitrile Butadiene Latex	465	243	135	1,800
Nitrile Butadiene Rubber	397	444	365	1,200
Polybutadiene/Styrene Butadiene Rubber by Solution	11,780	8,335	1,519	^a 5,500
Polysulfide	na
Styrene Butadiene Latex	1,480	1,028	627	1,600
Styrene Butadiene Rubber by Emulsion	3,942	2,112	243	^a 8,700

^a This cost-effectiveness is primarily due to the high costs estimated to control back-end process emissions. The costs developed are costs for incineration devices to sufficient back-end vents so that emissions will be reduced to a level equivalent to the level achieved by meeting the residual HAP limit by stripping. Extrapolation of industry estimates of the cost of enhanced stripping place the cost of enhanced stripping as low as 10 percent of the cost of incineration.

Under the proposed rule, it is estimated that total capital costs for existing sources would be \$26 million (1989 dollars), and total annual costs would be \$18.7 million (1989 dollars) per year. It is expected that the actual compliance cost impacts of the proposed rule would be less than presented because of the potential to use common control devices, upgrade existing control devices, use other less expensive control technologies, implement pollution prevention technologies, or use emissions averaging. Because the effect of such practices is highly site-specific and data were unavailable to estimate how often the lower cost compliance practices could be utilized, it is not possible to quantify the amount by which actual compliance costs would be reduced.

F. Economic Impacts

Economic impacts for the regulatory alternatives analyzed show that the estimated price increases for the affected chemicals range from 0.2 percent for nitrile butadiene latex (NBL) to 2.5 percent for BR. Estimated decreases in production range from 0.7 percent for NBL to 5.0 percent for BR. No closures of facilities are expected as a result of the standard.

Three aspects of the analysis likely lead to an overestimate of the impacts. First, the economic analysis model assumes that all affected firms compete in a national market, though in reality some firms may be protected from competitors by regional or local trade barriers. Second, facilities with the highest control cost per unit of production are assumed to also have the highest baseline production costs per unit. This assumption may not always be true, because the baseline production cost per unit are not known, and thus,

the estimated impacts, particularly for the smaller firms, may be too high. Finally, economic impacts may be overstated also because the alternative for halobutyl rubber and butyl rubber that was used in this analysis is more stringent and more costly than the selected regulatory alternative. For more information, consult the Basis and Purpose Document (see the Supplementary Information section near the beginning of the preamble).

VII. Administrative Requirements

A. Public Hearing

A public hearing will be held, if requested, to discuss today's proposed standard in accordance with section 307(d)(5) of the Clean Air Act. Persons wishing to make oral presentation on today's proposed standards for BR, EPI, EPR, HYP, NEO, NBR, PBR, PSR, and SBR production should contact the EPA at the address given in the ADDRESSES section of this preamble. Oral presentations will be limited to 15 minutes each. Any member of the public may file a written statement before, during, or within 30 days after the hearing. Written statements should be addressed to the Air Docket Section address given in the ADDRESSES section of this preamble and should refer to Docket No. A-92-45.

A verbatim transcript of the hearing and written statements will be available for public inspection and copying during normal working hours at the EPA's Air Docket Section in Washington, DC (see ADDRESSES section of this preamble).

B. Docket

The docket is an organized and complete file of all the information submitted to or otherwise considered by the EPA in the development of this

proposed rulemaking. The principal purposes of the docket are:

- (1) To allow interested parties to readily identify and locate documents so that they can intelligently and effectively participate in the rulemaking process; and
- (2) To serve as the record in case of judicial review (except for interagency review materials (section 307(d)(7)(A))).

C. Executive Order 12866

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

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

Pursuant to the terms of the Executive Order, OMB has notified the EPA that it considers this a "significant regulatory action" within the meaning of the Executive Order. The EPA has submitted this action to OMB for review. Changes made in response to