

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 51**

[FRL-5710-7]

RIN 2060-AG70

**Air Quality: Revision to Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds—Exclusion of 16 Compounds****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This action proposes to revise EPA's definition of volatile organic compounds (VOC) for purposes of preparing State implementation plans (SIP's) to attain the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ozone under title I of the Clean Air Act (Act) and for any Federal implementation plan (FIP) for an ozone nonattainment area. This proposed revision would add 16 compounds (shown in Table 3) to the list of compounds excluded from the definition of VOC on the basis that these compounds have negligible contribution to tropospheric ozone formation. These compounds have potential for use as refrigerants, aerosol propellants, fire extinguishers, blowing agents and solvents. Several of these compounds may be used as alternatives to chlorofluorocarbons (CFC's) which are being phased out of production as stratospheric ozone depleters.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposal must be received by April 16, 1997. Requests for a hearing must be submitted by April 16, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be submitted in duplicate (if possible) to: Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center (6102), Attention: Docket No. A-96-36, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460. Comments should be strictly limited to the subject matter of this proposal, the scope of which is discussed below.

**Public Hearing.** If anyone contacts EPA requesting a public hearing, it will be held at Research Triangle Park, NC. Persons wishing to request a public hearing/wanting to attend the hearing or wishing to present oral testimony should notify Mr. William Johnson, Air Quality Management Division (MD-15), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, telephone (919) 541-5245. The EPA will publish notice of a hearing, if requested, in the Federal Register. Any hearing will be strictly limited to the subject matter of the proposal, the scope of which is discussed below. The EPA has

established a public docket for this action, A-96-36, which is available for public inspection and copying between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, at EPA's Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, (6102), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William Johnson, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Air Quality Management Division (MD-15), Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, phone (919) 541-5245. Interested persons may call Mr. Johnson to see if a hearing will be held and the date and location of any hearing.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Regulated entities.* Entities potentially regulated by this action are those which use and emit VOC and States which have programs to control VOC emissions.

Category	Examples of regulated entities
Industry .....	Industries that use refrigerants, blowing agents, or solvents.
States .....	States which have regulations to control volatile organic compounds.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be regulated by this action. This table lists the types of entities that EPA is now aware could potentially be regulated by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be regulated. To determine whether your organization is regulated by this action, you should carefully examine the applicability criteria in § 51.100 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed in the preceding **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

**I. Background**

On September 25, 1995 the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy submitted to the EPA a petition which requested that the compounds shown in Table 1 be added to the list of compounds which are considered to be negligibly reactive in the definition of VOC at 40 CFR 51.100(s). (The original petition also included five other compounds (CFC-111, CFC-112, CFC-112A, CFC-113a, and CFC-114a) not shown in Table 1, but the petitioner later requested that these compounds be removed from consideration.)

Potential uses for these compounds are also shown in Table 1. Blowing agent refers to products used in the manufacture of foamed plastic. The compounds for which no use is shown have no currently recognized commercial end-use. They may be either intermediates or unintentional byproducts resulting from the manufacture of other compounds. The petition points out that the use of HCFC and HFC compounds can be substituted for CFC's and can thereby reduce potential chlorine effects on stratospheric ozone.

**TABLE 1.—COMPOUNDS PETITIONED FOR VOC EXCLUSION (ALONG WITH POTENTIAL USES OF COMPOUNDS)**

Compound	Potential use
HFC-32 .....	Refrigerant.
HFC-161 .....	Aerosol propellant, blowing agent.
HFC-236fa .....	Fire extinguishant, refrigerant.
HFC-245ca .....	Refrigerant, blowing agent.
HFC-245eb .....	Refrigerant, blowing agent.
HFC 245fa .....	Refrigerant, blowing agent.
HFC 245ea .....	Solvent.
HFC-236ea .....	Refrigerant, blowing agent.
HFC-365mfc .....	Blowing agent.
HCFC-31.	
HCFC-150a.	
HCFC-151a.	
HCFC-123a .....	Blowing agent.
C <sub>4</sub> F <sub>9</sub> OCH <sub>3</sub> .....	Solvent.
(CF <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> CFCF <sub>2</sub> OCH <sub>3</sub> .....	Solvent.
C <sub>4</sub> F <sub>9</sub> OC <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub> .....	Solvent.
(CF <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> CFCF <sub>2</sub> OC <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub> .....	Solvent.

In support of the petitions, the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy supplied information on the photochemical reactivity of the individual compounds. This information consisted mainly of the rate constant for the reaction of the compound with the hydroxyl (OH) radical. This rate constant ( $k_{OH}$  value) is commonly used as one measure of the photochemical reactivity of compounds. The petitioner compared the rate constants with that of ethane which has already been listed as photochemically negligibly reactive (ethane is the compound with the highest  $k_{OH}$  value which is currently regarded as negligibly reactive). The compounds under consideration are listed in Table 2 along with their reported  $k_{OH}$  rate constants. The scientific information which the petitioner has submitted in support of the petition has been added to the docket for this rulemaking. This information includes references for the

journal articles where the rate constant values are published.

TABLE 2.—REACTION RATE CONSTANTS WITH OH RADICAL REPORTED RATE CONSTANT AT 25°C

Compound	cm <sup>3</sup> /molecule/sec	CAS number
Ethane .....	$2.4 \times 10^{-13}$	
HFC-32 .....	$1.0 \times 10^{-14}$	75-10-5
HFC-161 .....	$17 \times 10^{-14}$	353-36-6
HFC-236fa .....	$0.034 \times 10^{-14}$	690-39-2
HFC-245ca .....	$0.91 \times 10^{-14}$	679-86-7
HFC-245ea .....	$1.6 \times 10^{-14}$	
HFC-245eb .....	$1.5 \times 10^{-14}$	431-31-2
HFC-245fa .....	$0.66 \times 10^{-14}$	690-39-1
HFC-236ea .....	$0.66 \times 10^{-14}$	431-63-0
HFC-365mfc .....	$0.87 \times 10^{-14}$	406-58-6
HCFC-31 .....	$4.5 \times 10^{-14}$	593-70-4
HCFC-123a .....	$1.23 \times 10^{-14}$	354-23-4
HCFC-150a .....	$2.6 \times 10^{-13}$	75-34-3
HCFC-151a .....	$6.9 \times 10^{-14}$	1615-75-4
C <sub>4</sub> F <sub>9</sub> OCH <sub>3</sub> .....	$1.4 \times 10^{-14}$	163702-07-6
(CF <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> CFCF <sub>2</sub> OCH <sub>3</sub> .....	$1.4 \times 10^{-14}$	163702-08-7
C <sub>4</sub> F <sub>9</sub> OC <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub> .....	$6.4 \times 10^{-14}$	163702-05-4
(CF <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> CFCF <sub>2</sub> OC <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub> .....	$6.4 \times 10^{-14}$	163702-06-5

## II. The EPA Response to the Petitions

For the petition submitted by the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy, the existing data support that the reactivities of the compounds submitted (except for HCFC-150a), with respect to reaction with OH radicals in the atmosphere, are lower than that of ethane.

In the petition, the petitioner did not submit reactivity data with respect to other VOC loss reactions (such as reaction with O-atoms, nitrogen trioxide (NO<sub>3</sub>)-radicals, and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), and for photolysis). However, there is ample evidence in the literature that

halogenated paraffinic VOC, such as the compounds listed above, do not participate in such reactions significantly.

The information submitted by the petitioner for HCFC-150a does not justify the petitioners request that this compound be declared "negligibly reactive." The reactivity of HCFC-150a with respect to reaction with OH is higher than that of ethane (i.e.,  $26 \times 10^{-14}$  cm<sup>3</sup> molecule<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> vs.  $24 \times 10^{-14}$  cm<sup>3</sup> molecule<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, for reaction rate constants). This suggests, but in the absence of detailed information on the atmospheric chemistry of HCFC-150a does not prove, a higher ozone-forming

reactivity. In the cases of such VOC species, for which conclusive scientific evidence is not available, the EPA policy has been to assume the VOC species to have significant ozone-forming reactivity unless and until additional specific evidence is produced that attests the contrary position. At this time, therefore, a "negligibly reactive" rating for HCFC-150a cannot be justified.

The EPA is responding to the petition by proposing in this notice to add the compounds in Table 3 to the list of compounds appearing in 40 CFR 51.100(s).

TABLE 3.—COMPOUNDS PROPOSED TO BE ADDED TO THE LIST OF NEGLIGIBLY REACTIVE COMPOUNDS

Compound	Chemical name or formula
HFC-32 .....	Difluoromethane.
HFC-161 .....	Ethylfluoride.
HFC-236fa .....	1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoropropane.
HFC-245ca .....	1,1,2,2,3-pentafluoropentane.
HFC-245ea .....	1,1,2,3,3-pentafluoropropane.
HFC-245eb .....	1,1,1,3,4-pentafluoropentane.
HFC-245fa .....	1,1,1,3,3-pentafluoropentane.
HFC-236ea .....	1,1,1,2,3,3-hexafluoropropane.
HFC-365mfc .....	1,1,1,3,3-pentafluorobutane.
HCFC-31 .....	chlorofluoromethane.
HCFC-123a .....	1,2-dichloro-1,1,2-trifluoroethane.
HCFC-151a .....	1 chloro-1-fluoroethane.
C <sub>4</sub> F <sub>9</sub> OCH <sub>3</sub> .....	1,1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4-nonafluoro-4-methoxy-butane.
(CF <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> CFCF <sub>2</sub> OCH <sub>3</sub> .....	2-(difluoromethoxymethyl)-1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane.
C <sub>4</sub> F <sub>9</sub> OC <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub> .....	1-ethoxy-1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4,4-nonafluorobutane.
(CF <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> CFCF <sub>2</sub> OC <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub> .....	2-(ethoxydifluoromethyl)-1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane.

## III. Proposed Action

Today's proposed action is based on EPA's review of the material in Docket No. A-96-36. The EPA hereby proposes

to amend its definition of VOC at 40 CFR 51.100(s) to exclude the compounds in Table 3 as VOC for ozone SIP and ozone control purposes. The revised definition will also apply in

Federal Implementation Plans for ozone nonattainment areas pursuant to the 40 CFR 52.741(a)(3) definition of volatile organic material or VOC. States are not obligated to exclude from control as a

VOC those compounds that EPA has found to be negligibly reactive. However, if this action is made final, States should not include these compounds in their VOC emissions inventories for determining reasonable further progress under the Act (e.g., section 182(b)(1)) and may not take credit for controlling these compounds in their ozone control strategy.

#### IV. Administrative Requirements

##### A. Docket

The docket is an organized and complete file for all information submitted or otherwise considered by EPA in the development of this proposed rulemaking. The principle purposes of the docket are: (1) To allow interested parties to identify and locate documents so that they can 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)).

##### B. Executive Order 12866

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), the Agency must determine whether a regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review and the requirements of this 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 obligation 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 Executive Order 12866, it has been determined that this rule is not "significant" because none of the listed criteria apply to this action. Consequently, this action was not submitted to OMB for review under Executive Order 12866.

##### C. Unfunded Mandates Act

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Unfunded Mandates Act) (signed into

law on March 22, 1995) requires that the Agency prepare a budgetary impact statement before promulgating a rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100 million or more in any 1 year. Section 204 requires the Agency to establish a plan for obtaining input from and informing, educating, and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely affected by the rule.

Under section 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Act, the Agency must identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives before promulgating a rule for which a budgetary impact statement must be prepared. The Agency must select from those alternatives the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule, unless the Agency explains why this alternative is not selected or the selection of this alternative is inconsistent with law.

Since this proposed rule is deregulatory in nature and does not impose a mandate upon any source, this rule is not estimated to result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments or the private sector of \$100 million in any 1 year. Therefore, the Agency has not prepared a budgetary impact statement or specifically addressed the selection of the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative. Because small governments will not be significantly or uniquely affected by this rule, the Agency is not required to develop a plan with regard to small governments.

##### D. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) of 1980 requires the identification of potentially adverse impacts of Federal regulations upon small business entities. The Act specifically requires the completion of an RFA analysis in those instances where the regulation would impose a substantial impact on a significant number of small entities. Because this proposed rulemaking imposes no adverse economic impacts, an analysis has not been conducted. Pursuant to the provision of 5 U.S.C. 605(b), I hereby certify that the proposed rule will not have an impact on small entities because no additional costs will be incurred.

##### E. Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed rule does not change any information collection requirements subject to OMB under the Paperwork

Reduction Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

##### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 51

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: March 10, 1997.

Carol M. Browner,  
Administrator.

For reasons set forth in the preamble, part 51 of chapter I of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is proposed to be amended as follows:

#### **PART 51—REQUIREMENTS FOR PREPARATION, ADOPTION, AND SUBMITTAL OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS.**

1. The authority citation for part 51 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7641q.

2. Section 51.100 is proposed to be amended by revising paragraph (s)(1) to read as follows:

##### **§ 51.100 Definitions.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(s) "Volatile organic compounds (VOC)" means any compound of carbon, excluding carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, carbonic acid, metallic carbides or carbonates, and ammonium carbonate, which participates in atmospheric photochemical reactions.

(1) This includes any such organic compound other than the following, which have been determined to have negligible photochemical reactivity: methane; ethane; methylene chloride (dichloromethane); 1,1,1-trichloroethane (methyl chloroform); 1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane (CFC-113); trichlorofluoromethane (CFC-11); dichlorodifluoromethane (CFC-12); chlorodifluoromethane (HCFC-22); trifluoromethane (HFC-23); 1,2-dichloro 1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethane (CFC-114); chloropentafluoroethane (CFC-115); 1,1,1-trifluoro 2,2-dichloroethane (HCFC-123); 1,1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane (HFC-134a); 1,1-dichloro 1-fluoroethane (HCFC-141b); 1-chloro 1,1-difluoroethane (HCFC-142b); 2-chloro-1,1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane (HCFC-124); pentafluoroethane (HFC-125); 1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethane (HFC-134); 1,1,1-trifluoroethane (HFC-143a); 1,1-difluoroethane (HFC-152a); parachlorobenzotrifluoride (PCBTf); cyclic, branched, or linear completely methylated siloxanes; acetone; 3,3-

dichloro-1,1,1,2,2-pentafluoropropane (HCFC-225ca); 1,3-dichloro-1,1,2,2,3-pentafluoropropane (HCFC-225cb); 1,1,1,2,3,4,4,5,5,5-decafluoropentane (HFC 43-10mee); difluoromethane (HFC-32); ethylfluoride (HFC-161); 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoropropane (HFC-236fa); 1,1,2,2,3-pentafluoropentane (HFC-245ca); 1,1,2,3,3-pentafluoropropane (HFC-245ea); 1,1,1,3,4-pentafluoropentane (HFC-245eb); 1,1,1,3,3-pentafluoropentane (HFC-245fa); 1,1,1,2,3,3-hexafluoropropane (HFC-236ea); 1,1,1,3,3-pentafluorobutane (HFC-365mfc); chlorofluoromethane (HCFC-31); 1 chloro-1-fluoroethane (HCFC-151a); 1,2-dichloro-1,1,2-trifluoroethane (HCFC-123a); 1,1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4-nonafluoro-4-methoxy-butane ( $C_4F_9OCH_3$ ); 2-(difluoromethoxymethyl)-1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane ( $(CF_3)_2CFCF_2OCH_3$ ); 1-ethoxy-1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4,4-nonafluorobutane ( $C_4F_9OC_2H_5$ ); 2-(ethoxydifluoromethyl)-1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane ( $(CF_3)_2CFCF_2OC_2H_5$ ); and perfluorocarbon compounds which fall into these classes:

- (i) cyclic, branched, or linear, completely fluorinated alkanes;
- (ii) cyclic, branched, or linear, completely fluorinated ethers with no unsaturations;
- (iii) cyclic, branched, or linear, completely fluorinated tertiary amines with no unsaturations; and
- (iv) sulfur containing perfluorocarbons with no unsaturations and with sulfur bonds only to carbon and fluorine.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 97-6653 Filed 3-14-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE: 6560-50-P

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[AZ 059-0005b; FRL-5697-4]

#### Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve a revision to the Arizona State Implementation Plan (SIP) which concerns the control of volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from Commercial Bread Bakeries.

The intended effect of proposing approval of this rule is to regulate emissions of VOCs in accordance with

the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). In the Final Rules Section of this Federal Register, the EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for this approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this document. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by April 16, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments on this action should be addressed to: Andrew Steckel, Rulemaking Office (Air-4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Copies of the rule and EPA's evaluation report of the rule are available for public inspection at EPA's Region 9 office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule are also available for inspection at the following locations:

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, 3033 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85012

Maricopa County Department of Environmental Services, 2406 South 24th Street, Suite E-204, Phoenix, AZ 85034-6822.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christine Vineyard, Rulemaking Officer (Air-4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901, Telephone: (415) 744-1197.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This document concerns Maricopa County Environmental Services Department Rule 343, Commercial Bread Bakeries, submitted to EPA on August 31, 1995 by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. For further information, please see the information provided in the Direct Final action which is located in the Rules Section of this Federal Register.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: February 19, 1997.

Nora L. McGee,

*Acting Regional Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 97-5973 Filed 3-14-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

#### 40 CFR Part 80

[FRL-5710-6]

#### Fuels and Fuel Additives; Elimination of Oxygenated Gasoline Program Reformulated Gasoline (OPRG) Category From the Reformulated Gasoline Regulations

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** In this action, EPA is proposing to amend the reformulated gasoline (RFG) regulations to eliminate the separate treatment for a category of gasoline used in oxygen averaging. This category, oxygenated gasoline program reformulated gasoline (OPRG), includes gasoline intended for use in a state oxygenated gasoline program control area during the winter time. Under the current RFG regulations, a refiner must meet the oxygen content standards for the entire pool of gasoline they produce, and for the pool of gasoline they produce that is non-OPRG. EPA is proposing this action because it no longer believes a distinction between OPRG and non-OPRG is necessary and because removal of the OPRG category would add flexibility and reduce compliance costs for regulated parties, without producing a negative environmental impact.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposed rule must be received by April 16, 1997. EPA does not plan to hold a public hearing on this proposed rule, unless one is requested. If a request is received by April 1, 1997, a public hearing will be held. If such a hearing is held, comments must be received within 30 days of the date of such hearing.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments on this proposed action should be addressed to Public Docket # A-97-01, Air Docket Section (Room M-1500, Waterside Mall), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460. Documents related to this proposed rule have been placed in the public docket and may be inspected between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying docket material. Those wishing to notify EPA of their intent to request an opportunity for a public hearing on this action should contact Anne-Marie