

**EPA's Proposed Electroplating/Anodizing NESHAP Meets None of the Criteria the Agency Has Used  
in Recent RTR NESHAP Decisions to Justify Significantly Tightening the Original MACT**

Issues and Criteria That EPA Cite as Justifying Tighter NESHAP	Current Status for Electroplating/Anodizing on These Issues
<p>Risk:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unacceptable MIR cancer risks from inhalation MIR &gt; <math>100 \times 10^{-6}</math> or:</li> <li>2. Large cancer population risks from inhalation Many people with risk &gt; <math>1 \times 10^{-6}</math> (76,000 was clearly acceptable, and 849,000 seemed acceptable also) or:</li> <li>3. Unacceptable MIR chronic non-cancer risks from inhalation TOSHI or equivalent well above 1 Reasonable confidence that modeled risks are real or:</li> <li>4. Significant acute inhalation risks and/or multipathway risks</li> </ol>	<p>Only 1 facility with MIR &gt; <math>20 \times 10^{-6}</math>, and that is likely between 20 and 30</p> <p>180,000 individuals (98.7% down from original estimate of 14 million) modeled as facing risk &gt; <math>1 \times 10^{-6}</math> (still likely overestimated)</p> <p>TOSHI &lt;&lt; 1</p> <p>No acute risks; no HAPs of multipathway concern</p>
<p>If risk is not judged unacceptable, then tighter MACT may still be justified on margin of safety/technology grounds if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The source category emits one or more HAPs in meaningful quantity that were not regulated in the original MACT or if:</li> <li>2. There has been significant improvement in performance of one or more emission control technologies that were the basis of the original MACT -- if so, tighten the MACT to reflect this better performance or if:</li> <li>3. There is one or more new control technology identified since original MACT that is both cost-effective and can significantly reduce HAP emissions. Control has been found cost-effective if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&lt; \$30,000/ton for HAPs generally</li> <li>&lt; \$1,400/lb for Cr(VI) or Hg</li> <li>If monetized benefits from co-control of criteria pollutants greatly exceed costs</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>No additional HAPs identified since original MACT</p> <p>No significant improvement in performance documented for fume suppressants, mesh pads, scrubbers</p> <p>No new cost-effective control technologies have been identified by EPA</p> <p>Effectiveness of more PFOS fume suppressants has not been demonstrated at lower surface tension levels. c/e of lower surface tension level reqts &gt; \$9,000/lb. c/e of tighter emission limits &gt; \$40,000/lb. EPA says HEPA filters cost &gt; \$15,000/lb and are not cost-effective</p> <p>No criteria pollutants are co-controlled</p>
<p>For the most part, EPA has also been concerned to have a strong information basis for regulation if a significantly tighter NESHAP is to be adopted -- recent ICR, good information on number of sources, good emissions information, good data on performance of control technologies, etc.</p>	<p>EPA's information basis is limited and unreliable because 1) ICR is outdated, 2) poor data on number, size and source category (hard chrome, decorative, anodizing) of facilities impacted, 3) site-specific emissions estimates for less than 10% of facilities, 4) no data on performance of non-PFOS fume suppressants, 5) EPA modeling systematically over-estimates emissions and ambient concentrations.</p>