

INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST
1SUPPORTING STATEMENT
NESHAP FOR PRIMARY ALUMINUM REDUCTION PLANTS (40 CFR PART 63, SUBPART
LL) (PROPOSED RULE)

PART A

1.0 Identification of the Information Collection

(a) Title and Number of the Information Collection.

“NESHAP for Primary Aluminum Reduction Plants (40 CFR part 63, subpart LL).” This is a new information collection request (ICR), and the EPA tracking number is 2447.01 (OMB Control Number 2060-NEW).

(b) Short Characterization.

This ICR covers information collection requirements in the proposed amendments to the Primary Aluminum NESHAP (40 CFR part 63, subpart LL).

The potential respondents are owners or operators of any existing, new, or reconstructed primary aluminum reduction plant. Per the applicability section of subpart LL, the following affected sources at a primary aluminum reduction plant are covered: each new and existing pitch storage tank, potline, paste production plant and anode bake furnace that is located at a plant site that is a major source as defined in 40 CFR 63.2. There are 15 facilities currently subject to the NESHAP, all of which will be affected by these proposed amendments. The proposed amendments would include new polycyclic organic matter (POM) emission limits for prebake potlines, new carbonyl sulfide (COS) emission limits for potlines, revised POM emission limits for Soderberg potlines, new POM emission limits for existing pitch storage tanks and new requirements for periods of startup and shutdown. These amendments are explained further in the section 4 of this supporting statement.

The information collection requirements associated with the proposed amendments to the NESHAP are listed in Attachment 1.

2. Need For and Use of the Collection

(a) Need/Authority for the Collection.

Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the EPA to establish NESHAP for both major and area sources of HAP that are listed for regulation under CAA section 112(c). A major source is a stationary source that emits or has the potential to emit more than 10 tons per year (tpy) of any single HAP or more than 25 tpy of any combination of HAP. An area source is a stationary source that is not a major source (i.e., an area source does not emit and does not have the potential to emit more than 10 tpy of any single HAP or more than 25 tpy of any combination of HAP). There are no area sources subject to subpart LL. For major sources, these technology-based standards must reflect the maximum degree of

emission reductions of HAP achievable (after considering cost, energy requirements, and non-air quality health and environmental impacts) and are commonly referred to as maximum achievable control technology (MACT) standards. Section 112(d)(6) requires the EPA to review these technology-based standards and to revise them “as necessary (taking into account developments in practices, processes, and control technologies)” no less frequently than every 8 years. In addition, section 112(f) of the CAA requires the EPA to determine for source categories subject to certain CAA section 112(d) standards whether the emissions limitations provide an ample margin of safety to protect public health. For MACT standards for HAP “classified as a known, probable, or possible human carcinogen” that “do not reduce lifetime excess cancer risks to the individual most exposed to emissions from a source in the category or subcategory to less than 1-in-1 million,” the EPA must promulgate residual risk standards for the source category (or subcategory) as necessary to provide an ample margin of safety to protect public health. In doing so, the EPA may adopt standards equal to existing MACT standards, if the EPA determines that the existing standards are sufficiently protective. The EPA must also adopt more stringent standards, if necessary, to prevent an adverse environmental effect, but must consider cost, energy, safety and other relevant factors in doing so.

Certain records and reports are necessary for the Administrator to confirm the compliance status of sources subject to NESHAP, identify any new or reconstructed sources subject to the standards, and confirm that the standards are being achieved on a continuous basis. These recordkeeping and reporting requirements are specifically authorized by section 114 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7414) and set out in the part 63 NESHAP General Provisions. The recordkeeping and reporting requirements for operating permits (i.e., title V permits) are contained in 40 CFR 70.6 and 40 CFR 71.6. Under parts 63 and 70 or 71, the owner or operator must keep each record for 5 years following the date of each occurrence, measurement, maintenance, corrective action, report or record.

(b) Use/Users of the Data.

The information will be used by the delegated authority (state agency, or Regional Administrator if there is no delegated state agency) to ensure that the standards and other requirements are being achieved. Based on review of the recorded information at the site and the reported information, the delegated permitting authority can identify facilities that may not be in compliance and decide which facilities, records or processes may need inspection.

3. Nonduplication, Consultations and Other Collection Criteria

(a) Nonduplication.

A computer search of the EPA’s ongoing ICRs revealed no duplication of information-gathering efforts.

(b) *Public Notice Required Prior to ICR Submission to OMB.*

The preamble to the proposed rule will provide public notice of this ICR.

(c) *Consultations.*

The proposed amendments were developed in consultation with individual primary aluminum production companies and trade associations. The non-EPA persons consulted on the information collection activities are identified in Table 1.

TABLE 1. PERSONS CONSULTED ON THE INFORMATION COLLECTION ACTIVITIES

Contact	Organization	Telephone No.
Charles Johnson, Jr.	The Aluminum Association, Inc.	703-358-2981
Mike Palazzolo	Alcoa, Inc.	412-553-4832
Don Backfisch	Noranda Aluminum, Inc.	573-643-2361

(d) *Effects of Less Frequent Collection.*

If the relevant information was collected less frequently, the delegated permitting authority (state or the EPA) will not be reasonably assured that a facility is in compliance with the standards.

(e) *General Guidelines.*

None of the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.6 are being exceeded.

(f) *Confidentiality.*

All information submitted to the Agency for which a claim of confidentiality is made will be safeguarded according to the Agency policies set forth in Title 40, Chapter 1, Part 2, Subpart B-Confidentiality of Business Information (see 40 CFR 2; 41 FR 36902, September 1, 1976; amended by 43 FR 39999, September 28, 1978; 43 FR 42251, September 28, 1978; 44 FR 17674, March 23, 1979).

(g) *Sensitive Questions.*

This section is not applicable because this ICR does not involve matters of a sensitive nature.

4. The Respondents and the Information Requested

(a) *Respondents/NAICS Codes.*

Potential respondents under subpart LL are owners or operators of any existing or new facility engaged in Primary Aluminum Reduction operations. Primary Aluminum Reduction facilities are primarily classified under NAICS code 331312, Primary Aluminum Production.

There are an estimated 15 facilities that would be subject to the proposed amendments to the NESHAP. Fourteen of these facilities manufacture primary aluminum and one facility produces anodes for offsite use in other primary aluminum facilities. We are not aware of any new primary aluminum facility being constructed and no new sources are expected during the 3year period of this ICR.

(b) *Information Requested.*

(i) *Data Items, Including Recordkeeping Requirements.* Attachment 1, Information Requirements, summarizes the data items, including recordkeeping and reporting requirements, for the Primary Aluminum Reduction source category.

(ii) *Respondent Activities.* The respondent activities that will be required by the proposed amendments to the Primary Aluminum Reduction NESHAP are identified in Table 3 and are introduced in section 6(a).

(iii) *Summary of Requirements.* The EPA is including in Table 2 an estimate of the burden associated with performing an affirmative defense. The EPA is providing this as an illustrative example of the potential additional administrative burden a source may incur to assert an Affirmative Defense in response to an action to enforce the standards set forth in subpart LL.

This illustrative estimate is not considered a duplicate estimate of cost under the General Duty to Minimize Emissions clause under 40 CFR 63.6(e)(1)(i), which states: “At all times, the owner and operator must operate and maintain any affected source, including associated air pollution control equipment and monitoring equipment, in a manner consistent with safety and good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions. Determining whether such operation and maintenance procedures are being used will be based on information available to the Administrator which may include, but is not limited to, monitoring results, review of operation and maintenance procedures, review of operation and maintenance records, and inspection of the source.”

To provide the public with an estimate of the relative magnitude of the burden associated with an assertion of the affirmative defense position adopted by a source, the EPA provides an administrative adjustment to this ICR that estimates the costs of the notification, recordkeeping and reporting requirements associated with the assertion of the affirmative defense. The EPA’s estimate for the required notification, reports and records, including the root cause analysis, associated with a single incident totals approximately \$3,142 and is based on the time and effort required of a source to review relevant data, interview plant employees and document the events surrounding a malfunction that has caused an exceedance of an emission limit. The estimate also includes time to produce and retain the records and reports for submission to the EPA. The EPA provides this illustrative estimate of this burden because these costs are only incurred if there has been a violation and a source chooses to take advantage of the affirmative defense.

In this source category, it is unlikely that a control device malfunction would cause an exceedance of any emission limit. For reasons explained in the FRN, we have asserted that although a cost for affirmative defense is possible, we believe that malfunctions are unlikely. Thus for this source category, the EPA is not assigning any burden associated with affirmative defense.

TABLE 2. COST ESTIMATE FOR ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS

Personnel	Number of Personnel	Time Requirement (hours)	Total Hours	Hourly Rate (\$/hr)	Total
Technical Personnel	3	6	18	98.20	\$ 1,768
Managerial Personnel	2	6	12	114.49	\$ 1,374
Total	5		30		\$ 3,142

5. The Information Collected–Agency Activities, Collection Methodology and Information Management

(a) Agency Activities.

The Agency activities associated with the proposed amendments to the Primary Aluminum Reduction NESHAP are provided in Table 4 and are introduced in section 6(c).

(b) Collection Methodology and Management.

Data and records maintained by the respondents are tabulated and published for use in compliance and enforcement programs of the delegated permitting authority. The EPA is the permitting authority until the state or local agency is delegated authority to implement the final amendments to the rule. Therefore, information contained in any report submitted to the Regional Administrator will be entered into the Air Facility System (AFS), which is operated and maintained by the EPA’s Office of Compliance. AFS is the EPA’s database for the collection, maintenance, and retrieval of compliance data for approximately 125,000 industrial and government-owned facilities. The EPA uses the AFS for tracking air pollution compliance and enforcement by local and state regulatory agencies, EPA regional offices and EPA headquarters. The EPA and its delegated authorities can edit, store, retrieve and analyze the compliance data.

(c) Small Entity Flexibility.

The Small Business Administration defines a small entity engaging in Primary Aluminum Reduction as a firm having no more than 1,000 employees. There are no small businesses operating primary aluminum reduction facilities.

(d) Collection Schedule.

The specific frequency for each information collection activity within this request is shown in Table 3 for the Primary Aluminum Reduction Source Category.

6. Estimating the Burden and Cost of the Collection

(a) Estimating Respondent Burden.

The annual burden estimates for the proposed amendments to the Primary Aluminum Reduction NESHAP are shown in Table 3. These numbers were derived from estimates based on the EPA's experience with other standards. No burden estimates are provided for new sources because no new facilities are expected to become affected sources during the 3year period of this ICR.

(b) Estimating Respondent Costs.

(i) Estimating Labor Costs. Table 3 presents estimated costs for the required data collection activities. Labor rates and associated costs are based on Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data. Technical, management and clerical average hourly rates for private industry workers and were taken from the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, September 2009, "Table 2. Civilian Workers, by occupational and industry group," available at www.bls.gov/news.release/ecec.t02.htm. Wages for occupational groups are used as the basis for the labor rates with a total compensation of \$46.76 per hour for technical, \$54.52 per hour for managerial and \$23.11 per hour for clerical. These rates represent salaries plus fringe benefits and do not include the cost of overhead. An overhead rate of 110 percent is used to account for these costs. The fully-burdened hourly wage rates used to represent respondent labor costs are: technical at \$98.20, management at \$114.49 and clerical at \$48.53.

(ii) Estimating Capital and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Costs. Capital costs are estimated at \$500 per facility to account for storage of records. No O&M costs are associated with the information collection requirements of the proposed amendments to the Primary Aluminum Reduction NESHAP. The proposed amendments would require affected facilities to conduct new performance testing for POM emissions from prebake potlines, calculate COS emissions from potlines and prepare design reports for pitch storage tank controls.

(iii) Annualizing Capital Costs. Annualized capital costs are approximately \$55/facility or \$825 for the industry.

(iv) Affirmative Defense/Root Cause Analysis/Malfunction Costs. The EPA's estimate for a root cause analysis is based on general experience to calculate the time and effort required of a source to review relevant data, interview plant employees and reconstruct the events prior to a malfunction in order to determine primary and contributing causes. The level of effort also includes time to produce and retain the report in document form so that the source will have it available should the EPA or state enforcement agencies ever request to review it.

(c) Estimating Agency Burden and Cost.

Because the information collection requirements were developed as an incidental part of standards development, no costs can be attributed to the development of the information collection requirements. Because reporting and recordkeeping requirements on the part of the respondents are required under the operating permits rules in 40 CFR part 70 or part 71 and the part 63 NESHAP General Provisions, no operational costs will be incurred by the Federal Government. Publication and distribution of the information are part of the Compliance Data System, with the result that no Federal costs can be directly attributed to the ICR. Examination of records to be maintained by the respondents will occur incidentally as part of the periodic inspection of sources that is part of the EPA's overall compliance and enforcement program, and, therefore, is not attributable to the ICR. The only costs that the Federal government will incur are user costs associated with the analysis of the reported information, as presented in Table 4.

The Agency labor rates are from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) 2010 General Schedule, which excludes locality rates of pay. These rates can be obtained from Salary Table 2010-GS available on the OPM website, http://www.opm.gov/oca/10tables/pdf/gs_h.pdf. The government employee labor rates are \$15.63/hour for clerical (GS-6, Step 3), \$28.88 for technical (GS-12, Step 1) and \$38.92/hr for management (GS-13, Step 5). These rates were increased by 60 percent to include fringe benefits and overhead. The fully-burdened wage rates used to represent Agency labor costs are: clerical at \$25.01/hour, technical at \$46.21/hour and management at \$62.27/hour.

(d) Estimating the Respondent Universe and Total Burden and Costs.

There are an estimated 15 existing facilities that are currently subject to the Primary Aluminum Reduction NESHAP. No new major sources are expected during the next 3 years. Consequently, the average number of primary aluminum respondents during the 3-year period of this ICR is:

$$(1 \text{ respondent/facility}) \times (15 \text{ facilities}) / (3 \text{ years}) = 5 \text{ respondents per year.}$$

For the proposed amendments to the Primary Aluminum Reduction NESHAP, the components of the total annual burden attributable to this ICR include reading the amendments to the NESHAP, conducting the performance testing to demonstrate compliance with the proposed emission limits and reporting the results of those emissions tests. All other recordkeeping and reporting activities are already accounted for in the ICR for the NESHAP.

(e) Bottom Line Burden Hours and Cost Tables.

(i) Respondent tally. The bottom line respondent burden hours and costs presented in Table 3 are calculated by adding person-hours per year down each column for technical, managerial and clerical staff, and by adding down the cost column. The average annual burden for the recordkeeping and reporting requirements in the proposed amendments to subpart LL for the 15 existing facilities that are

subject to the Primary Aluminum NESHAP is 120 person-hours, with an annual average cost of \$11,316.

(ii) *The Agency tally.* The average annual Federal Government cost is \$3,109 for 69 hours for the proposed amendments to subpart LL. The bottom line Agency burden hours and costs presented in Table 4 are calculated by adding person-hours per year down each column for technical, managerial and clerical staff and by adding down the cost column.

(iii) *Variations in the annual bottom line.* This section does not apply since no significant variation is anticipated.

(f) *Reasons for Change in Burden.*

This ICR covers information collection requirements in the proposed amendments to the Primary Aluminum NESHAP (40 CFR part 63, subpart LL). The proposed amendments would include new polycyclic organic matter (POM) emission limits for prebake potlines, new carbonyl sulfide (COS) emission limits for potlines, revised POM emission limits for Soderberg potlines, new POM emission limits for existing pitch storage tanks and new requirements for periods of startup and shutdown. These amendments are explained further in the section 4 of this supporting statement.

(g) *Burden Statement*

The average annual respondent burden for the proposed amendments to the Primary Aluminum Reduction NESHAP is estimated at 60 hours per response.

Burden means the total time, effort or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for the EPA's regulations in 40 CFR part 63 are listed in 40 CFR part 9.

To comment on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates and any suggestions for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection techniques, the EPA has established a public docket for this ICR under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0797 which is available for online viewing at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or

in person viewing at the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center in the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the Air Docket is (202) 566-1742. An electronic version of the public docket is available at <http://www.regulations.gov>. This site can be used to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the public docket and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. When in the system, select “search,” then key in the Docket ID Number identified above. Also, you can send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503, Attention Desk Officer for EPA. Please include the relevant Docket ID Number (EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0797) and OMB Control Number 2060-NEW in any correspondence.

PART B

This section is not applicable because statistical methods are not used in data collection associated with the proposed rule.

TABLE 3. ANNUAL RESPONDENT BURDEN AND COST - AMENDMENTS TO PRIMARY ALUMINUM NESHAP^a

Burden item	(A) Person-hours per occurrence	(B) No. of occurrences per respondent	(C) Person-hours per respondent (C=A*B)	(D) Respondents per year	(E) Technical person-hours per year (E=C*D)	(F) Management person-hours per year (E*0.05)	(G) Clerical person-hours per year (E*0.1)	(H) Cost ^e , \$
1. Applications	N/A							
2. Surveys and Studies	N/A							
3. Acquisition, Installation, and Utilization of Technology and Systems	N/A							
4. Reporting Requirements								
A. Read instructions ^b	4	1	4	15	60	3	6	\$ 6,527
B. Required activities ^c (compliance testing)	106	0.67	71	15	1065	53	107	\$ 115,844
C. Create information	N/A							
D. Gather existing information	N/A							
E. Write report ^d	46	0.33	15	15	225	11	23	\$ 24,471
5. Recordkeeping Requirements								
A. Read instructions	See 4A							
B. Plan activities	N/A							
C. Implement activities (COS calculations)	1	12	12	15	180	9	18	\$ 19,580
D. Develop record system	N/A							
E. Time to enter information	See 4C							
F. Time to train personnel	N/A							
G. Time to adjust existing ways to comply with previously applicable requirements	N/A							
H. Time to transmit or disclose information	1	2	2	15	30	2	3	\$ 3,321
I. Time for audits	N/A							
TOTAL LABOR BURDEN AND COST (SALARY)					1,560	78	157	\$ 169,743
TOTAL NUMBER OF ANNUAL RESPONSES				30				
ANNUAL CAPITAL COSTS ^e								\$ 825
TOTAL ANNUALIZED COSTS								\$ 170,568

N/A = not applicable.

^a This ICR uses the following labor rates: \$114.49 for managerial labor, \$98.20 for technical labor, and \$48.53 for clerical labor. These rates are based on the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2009.

^b There are an estimated 15 existing facilities; no new facilities are expected; the average number expected to read the rule during the 3-yr compliance period is 15/3=5.

^c The average facility cost for polycyclic organic matter testing was calculated at 115,844/15 = \$7,723.

^d 15 facilities would be required to submit a one-time design specification for pitch storage tank controls.

^e 15 facilities would be required to provide record storage at \$500/ facility, annualized at 7% for 15 years.

TABLE 4. ANNUAL BURDEN AND COST TO THE AGENCY - AMENDMENTS TO PRIMARY ALUMINUM NESHAP

Burden item	(A) Person-hours per occurrence	(B) Occurrences per respondent	(C) EPA person- hours/year (C=A*B)	(D) Facilities per year	(E) Technical person-hours/yea r (E=C*D)	(F) Management person-hours/year (F=0.05*E)	(G) Clerical person- hours/year (G=0.1*E)	(H) Cost^a, \$
Report Review:								
Review performance test reports and pitch storage tank control system design ^b	4	1	4	15	60	3	6	\$3,109
TOTAL BURDEN AND COST								\$3,109

^a This ICR uses the following average hourly labor rates: \$62.27 for managerial (GS-13, Step 5), \$46.21 (GS-12, Step 1) for technical, and \$25.01 (GS-6, Step 3) for clerical. These rates are from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) 2010 General Schedule, which excludes locality rates of pay.

^b Assumes Agency will review all of the annual reports - including the polycyclic organic matter performance test reports and the pitch storage tank control design specifications.

ATTACHMENT 1. INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS - AMENDMENTS TO PRIMARY ALUMINUM NESHAP

Requirement	Citation for existing sources	Citation for new sources	General Provisions citation
<i>POM limit for prebake potlines</i>	§63.843(a)(2)(iv-vii)	§63.844(a)(2)	
<i>Design specifications for pitch storage tanks</i>	§63.843(d)	N/A	
<i>Calculation of monthly COS emissions</i>	§63.843(e)	§63.844(e)	