Federal Register / Vol. 60, No. 12 / Thursday, January 19, 1995 / Proposed Rules

process conditions encountered by owners and operators of industrial process refrigeration equipment. However, EPA believes there are many other similar types of conditions that other industrial process refrigeration equipment owners or operators face. Therefore, this list of potential conditions is not intended to be allinclusive.

EPA believes it is appropriate to provide additional time when a supplier of the system or one or more of its critical components has quoted a delivery time of more than 30 weeks from when the order is placed, assuming the order was placed in a timely fashion. EPA realizes that it may not be possible to specify a date by which the parts must be ordered. This is true because of the need to identify the specific leak point, determine the cause, decide appropriate action, create specifications and obtain any necessary modification approvals from facility managers and/or other regulatory entities. EPA believes that the 30-week time frame acknowledges that other activities, such as designing, installing, testing, etc. will more than fill up the remainder of the year. Thus, no matter when these facilities order the parts, if the suppliers quote 30 weeks or longer, they are already in the two-year time track for retrofitting or replacing the system. EPA believes that facilities have an incentive to expedite repairs, retrofits or replacements in order to avoid losing valuable refrigerant and to continue production under an efficiently running system. However, EPA does believe that, while it proposes additional time if delivery time is quoted as 30 weeks or more, a log of when the parts were ordered should be maintained by the company. This is especially critical for facilities that may later request an extension beyond the two years.

The owner or operator would be required to notify EPA within six months of the expiration of the 30-day period following the discovery of an exceedance of the 35 percent leak rate, to identify the owner or operator, describe the system involved, explain why more than one year is needed, and demonstrate that the first two criteria discussed above are met; and the owner or operator would be required to maintain records adequate to allow a determination that the criteria are met. This information would be maintained and reported using the recordkeeping scheme described in the section II.H.1. All of the information described here would fit within that scheme. EPA believes using the same recordkeeping and reporting requirements will streamline the requirements for the

affected community and will lessen the regulatory burden.

EPA requests comment on the need to provide one year beyond the initial one year to complete all retrofitting or replacement activities when the facility is custom-built and when a supplier is quoting more than 30 weeks for delivery of a crucial component. EPA also requests comments on the associated recordkeeping and reporting requirements discussed in this section.

3. Additional Time Beyond the One Additional Year

EPA believes that in an extremely limited number of cases additional time beyond the one additional year may be necessary to retrofit or replace a system. Through this action, EPA is proposing that if more than one additional year is needed, the owner may request EPA to extend the deadline for completing all retrofit or replacement action. EPA proposes that such a request be submitted to EPA before the end of the ninth month of the additional year that was granted to retrofit, replace or retire the system. The request would be required to include revisions to that information submitted for the first additional year as proposed under §82.166(o). Unless EPA objects to the request within 30 days of receipt, it would be deemed approved.

As EPA has earlier noted, one facility estimates that it will take three years to retrofit or replace its refrigeration units. These particular units have refrigerant charges of approximately 175,000 pounds each and are used in the processing of chlorine. The owner of that system has many other facilities that will be able to complete all retrofit or replacement work without need for this additional time extension. While EPA believes that in certain cases additional time may be necessary, EPA is concerned with scope of such an extension. As noted in the discussion concerning ordering parts, EPA would not favor an extension caused by a company delaying to place orders for components or other similar scenarios. EPA intends this extension to be granted only in cases where the actual nature of the retrofit or replacement activities is such that the additional time beyond the one year is crucial. The submittal of revised information requesting additional time under this provision could be consistent with submittal of information requesting additional time beyond the one-year timeframe. As stated in the discussion regarding the need for an additional year to complete retrofit or replacement activities, EPA believes that using the same recordkeeping and reporting scheme for

all retrofit extensions lessens the burden for the affected community.

EPA requests comment on the need to provide additional time beyond the one additional year for industrial process refrigeration equipment, where necessary. In addition, EPA requests comments on the potential number of facilities and the potential reasons that may be cited for requesting such an extension. Furthermore, EPA requests comments on the associated recordkeeping and reporting requirements.

## I. Allowing Appliances To Be Pressurized to Slightly Above 0 Psig

Members of the regulated community have requested that EPA revise requirements relating to oil changes. However, members of industry have expressed concern with respect to the status of small quantities of refrigerant that may escape from the appliance itself while oil is being removed.

Sections 82.156 and 82.158 call for evacuation of the refrigerant from the appliance, to a specified level of vacuum (or to atmospheric pressure, for non-major repairs that are not followed by an evacuation of the appliance to the environment). However, new information indicates that these levels of vacuum may often be impractical during oil changes. A small positive pressure is needed during oil changes, to force the oil from its reservoir. Oil will not flow from a reservoir that is under vacuum. Therefore, EPA is proposing to allow owners or operators to evacuate the appliance to slightly above atmospheric pressure specifically, to a pressure not exceeding 5 psig to perform oil changes. EPA believes that this approach will reduce emissions of ozone-depleting refrigerants to the atmosphere, and thus will have an overall positive impact on the environment. There are three principal reasons why this approach should produce an environmental benefit.

First, oil changes are a necessary part of preventive maintenance. If owners or operators are required to draw a deep vacuum before oil changes, that will add significant delay and expense, serving as a disincentive to regular oil changes. If appliances are not regularly maintained, they are more likely to break down and increase their emissions of refrigerant. They will also be more subject to catastrophic failures that could result in release of the entire refrigerant charge. Second, if a deep vacuum is required, air and moisture will be drawn into the system and will need to be purged later, which will result in emissions of refrigerant. This can be minimized by filling the

4002