are reduced from the nationwide annual costs associated with monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping in the proposed rule of \$8.6 million for hard chromium electroplaters, \$1.6 million for decorative chromium electroplaters using a trivalent chromium plating process, \$14 million for other decorative chromium electroplaters, and \$3.8 million for chromium anodizers.

C. Economic Impacts

The economic impacts for the sources covered by this rulemaking are unchanged from proposal because the basis of the MACT standards have not changed.

IV. Public Participation

Prior to proposal of the chromium electroplating and anodizing rule, meetings of the National Air Pollution Control Techniques Advisory Committee (NAPCTAC) were held on January 30 and November 19, 1991. These meetings were open to the public, and each attendee was given an opportunity to comment on the draft rule.

The proposed rule was published in the **Federal Register** on December 16, 1993 (58 FR 65768). The preamble to the proposal discussed the availability of the proposal BID (Chromium Electroplating NESHAP—Background Information for Proposed Standards (Volume I: EPA-453/R-93-030a and Volume II: EPA-453/R-93-030b)) which describes in detail the regulatory alternatives considered and the impacts associated with those alternatives. Public comments were solicited at the time of proposal, and copies of the proposal BID were made available to interested parties.

The public comment period officially ended on March 14, 1994. A public hearing was held on January 20, 1994. In addition, 62 comment letters were received during the public comment period; 3 late comments were also received. The comments were carefully considered, and where determined to be appropriate by the Administrator, changes were made in the final rule.

V. Significant Comments and Responses

Comments on the proposed rule were received from industry, environmental groups, and State and local regulatory agencies. A detailed discussion of these comments and responses can be found in the promulgation BID (see ADDRESSES section). The summary of comments and responses in the promulgation BID serves as the basis for the revisions that have been made to the rule between proposal and promulgation.

A. Selection of Source Categories and Pollutants To Be Regulated

Six commenters said that maximum cumulative potential rectifier capacity was an inappropriate parameter for determining facility size. Sources may have excess rectifier capacity to handle atypical applications, for safety purposes, or for other reasons, but may routinely operate at a significantly lower rectifier output. Several commenters urged the EPA to consider alternatives to the maximum potential rectifier capacity specified, such as actual annual ampere-hour usage, raising the maximum potential ampere-hour limit for small sources to 100 million amp-hr/ yr, allowing sources to multiply the maximum potential rectifier capacity by 0.75 to account for oversizing, or allowing sources to accept Federallyenforceable limits on their rectifier capacity that would allow them to be categorized as "small" facilities.

Although the cutoff between small and large hard chromium electroplating facilities has not been changed, the EPA has included two provisions in the final rule to allow sources to use actual rectifier capacity or to limit their potential rectifier capacity. The first provision is available to facilities whose production records show that the previous annual, actual rectifier capacity was less than 60 million amphr/yr. Under this provision, hard chromium electroplating facilities may determine their size by using actual cumulative rectifier capacity in lieu of the maximum potential capacity if nonresettable, amp-hr meters are used on affected tanks. The final rule (§ 63.346(b)(12) and § 63.347(c)(1)(vi)) requires that records of amp-hr usage be kept.

The final rule also allows all sources performing hard chromium electroplating to establish Federallyenforceable limits on their rectifier capacity to allow facilities to comply with the standards for small, hard chromium electroplating tanks, even if those facilities have potential rectifier capacities that exceed the 60 million amp-hr/yr cutoff. A Federallyenforceable limit is obtained through the title V permit that is required by § 63.340(e) of the final rule. Records are required in accordance with § 63.346(b)(12) and § 63.347(c)(1)(viii) to document that the Federally-enforceable limit is being maintained.

The final rule has also been clarified to state that only the rectifiers associated with hard chromium electroplating should be used to determine maximum cumulative potential rectifier capacity.

Comments were received regarding other processes conducted by this source category that were not identified in the process description. One commenter pointed out a distinction among decorative chromium electroplating processes: Black chromium and white chromium. The commenter stated that black chromium electroplating is more like hard chromium electroplating in terms of process parameters, and the commenter recommended that black chromium electroplating be subject to the same requirements as hard chromium electroplating processes. Other commenters noted that the proposed rule did not cover a hard chromium electroplating method that uses lower amperage and a longer electroplating time (less amperage per square foot than decorative electroplating process) such that emissions are lower.

In the final rule, the definitions of hard chromium electroplating, decorative chromium electroplating, and chromium anodizing have been expanded, and are now expressed in terms of process parameters as well as by function. Regardless of what name a facility has assigned to its process, for the purposes of the regulation, the process will be regulated according to its function, bath operating parameters, and desired plating characteristics. Therefore, black decorative chromium electroplaters would likely be subject to the standards for hard chromium electroplaters based on plating characteristics. The EPA will provide States with additional guidance on these types of applicability issues in the enabling document.

The commenters that use a lowamperage electroplating process were concerned that such a process would not be allowed by the rule, even though emissions from this process are low. Although the process does differ from other hard chromium electroplating processes in that a lower amperage is used, the rule does not preclude the use of this process or any other technique to meet the applicable emission limitation. The rule does require that the technique be demonstrated through performance testing conducted in accordance with the test methods and procedures identified in the final rule, and that compliance monitoring be conducted to determine continuous compliance.

B. Selection of MACT/GACT Approach

Ten commenters questioned the Agency's decision to regulate area sources with MACT. A number of these commenters disagreed that the chromium compound toxicity data alone was justification for regulating