standard occurs or the electroplating solution is changed out, the original monitoring schedule must be resumed.

Likewise, the final rule contains allowances to decrease the frequency of monitoring foam blanket thickness. The proposed hourly frequency is based on the EPA's experience that foam blankets can deplete quickly and must be closely monitored. The final rule is unchanged in that sources using a foam blanket must conduct a performance test, and the initial monitoring frequency is once per hour. However, as with wetting agents, the final rule allows a decrease in monitoring frequency if no exceedances occur. Section 63.343(c)(6)(ii)(B) specifies that the foam blanket thickness be measured once every hour of tank operation for the first 40 hours of tank operation after the compliance date. If no exceedances occur, the time between monitoring may be increased to once every 4 hours of tank operation. Once there are no exceedances during 40 hours of tank operation, foam blanket thickness measurement may be conducted once every 8 hours of tank operation on an on-going basis. As with wetting agents, if there is an exceedance or if the electroplating bath is changed out, the original monitoring schedule must be resumed.

I. Selection of Test Methods

Three commenters requested that CARB Method 425 be evaluated for equivalency, and if determined to be equivalent, be identified as such in the rule. These commenters also stated that sources that have performed this test should not have to retest. Four commenters asked whether retesting will be required if sources have conducted performance tests previously using 306, 306A, or an equivalent test method.

Section 63.344(c)(2) identifies the conditions under which the CARB Method 425 is considered equivalent. Basically, the acceptability of this test method will depend upon the analysis rather than the sampling train or sampling procedure. Regarding the issue of whether retesting is required, § 63.344(b) of the final rule outlines the criteria that must be met for a previous source test to be acceptable.

Two commenters requested that the rule provide guidance on how to verify compliance when both chromium anodizing and hard chromium electroplating tanks are vented to a common control device. Three commenters pointed out that the regulation does not account for the situation in which chromium electroplating sources share a ventilation system with nonchromium sources that could introduce dilution air. Three commenters noted that it is extremely difficult to reconfigure some existing systems in such a way that only the emissions from chromium electroplating or anodizing are tested.

There are basically two situations involving multiple tanks manifolded to one control system: (1) The multiple tanks include a chromium electroplating or chromium anodizing tank among other tanks not affected by the rule; or (2) the multiple tanks include chromium tanks performing different operations (e.g., electroplating and anodizing) or hard chromium tanks subject to different emission limits (e.g., a new tank and an existing small tank), which may or may not be controlled with nonaffected sources. Section 63.344(e) of the final rule includes compliance provisions for both of these situations.

J. Selection of Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements

Several commenters stated that the frequency of recordkeeping and reporting outlined in the proposed rule was overly burdensome and suggested several alternatives. Seven commenters stated that the types of recordkeeping required by the rule are inappropriate. In general, the commenters remarked that records, such as the amount of chemicals used and purchased and the amount of fume suppressant material added do not indicate compliance. Two commenters stated that recordkeeping requirements be limited to only surface tension measurements because that measurement is the basis of compliance. One commenter indicated there is no environmental benefit to keeping records of gas velocities, pressure drops, washdown conditions, and scrubber water chromium concentrations. Two commenters stated that maintaining records at a facility for 5 years is excessive; a more appropriate length of time would be 3 years. One commenter suggested a minimum of 2 years.

Two commenters suggested that the reporting schedule be replaced with a requirement that the source submit an annual certification that necessary control parameters have been met, consistent with the annual certification requirements of title V. Another commenter indicated that sources should not be required to submit compliance reports if the source's permitting agency inspects the onsite records annually. Finally, one commenter suggested that the rule allow a reduced reporting frequency after 2 years if sources do not experience exceedances of any State or Federal emission standards.

Seven commenters stated that the costs associated with the monitoring and recordkeeping constituted an unnecessary burden to both large and small facilities. These commenters also noted that the EPA underestimated the costs associated with monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping. Two of the commenters stated that small businesses do not have the resources to keep extensive records. Another commenter pointed out that the EPA has recognized differences in large and small facilities in selecting MACT emission standards and should also recognize differences between large and small facilities in selecting reporting, recordkeeping, and permitting requirements.

To respond to comments received and to reduce the burden on the many area sources that will be subject to these standards, the monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements have been reduced in the final rule to the extent possible while still providing the EPA with the ability to determine a source's continuous compliance status. The recordkeeping requirements are contained in §63.346 of the final rule. The EPA concurs that the records required to be kept should correspond specifically to that which is required to demonstrate compliance. As such, recordkeeping associated with fume suppressants requires only that sources maintain records of the date and time of surface tension or foam blanket thickness measurements, as appropriate, the value measured, and the date and time of additions of fume suppressant to the bath. Likewise, the recordkeeping associated with the add-on air pollution control devices is reduced to the extent that the monitoring requirements have been reduced. Sources will have to keep records of pressure drop and velocity pressure, as appropriate, as well as records to document adherence with the O&M plan required by §63.342(f)(3).

The final rule is unchanged from proposal in that it requires that owners or operators of affected sources maintain records for a period of 5 years following each occurrence, measurement, maintenance, corrective action, report, or record. This requirement is consistent with the General Provisions and with the title V permit program. The EPA believes retention of records for 5 years allows the EPA to establish a source's history and pattern of compliance for purposes of determining the appropriate level of enforcement action.

The final rule also requires submission of on-going compliance status reports to document whether a