



AIR RESOURCES BOARD

**Initial Statement of Reasons
for the Proposed Amendments to the Regulation
for Reducing Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from
Aerosol Coating Products and
Proposed Tables of
Maximum Incremental Reactivity (MIR) Values,
and
Proposed Amendments to Method 310, “Determination of
Volatile Organic Compounds
in Consumer Products”**

Release Date: May 5, 2000

State of California
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS
FOR THE PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Public Hearing To Consider

Proposed Amendments to the Regulation
for Reducing Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from
Aerosol Coating Products and
Proposed Tables of
Maximum Incremental Reactivity (MIR) Values,
and
Proposed Amendments to Method 310, “Determination of Volatile Organic
Compounds in Consumer Products”

To be considered by the Air Resources Board on June 22 or 23, 2000, at:

Air Resources Board
Board Hearing Room, Lower Level
2020 L Street
Sacramento, California

Air Resources Board
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, CA 95812

This report has been prepared by the staff of the California Air Resources Board. Publication does not signify that the contents reflect the views and policies of the Air Resources Board, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

Initial Statement of Reasons for the
Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for Reducing
Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from
Aerosol Coating Products
and Proposed Tables of
Maximum Incremental Reactivity (MIR) Values,
and
Adoption of Proposed Amendments to Method 310, “Determination of Volatile Organic
Compounds in
Consumer Products”

Prepared By:

Stationary Source and
Monitoring and Laboratory Divisions
Air Resources Board

Proposed Amendments to the Aerosol Coating Products Regulation and
Proposed Tables of MIR Values Reviewed By:

Carla D. Takemoto, Manager, Technical Evaluation Section
Janette Brooks, Chief, Air Quality Measures Branch
Donald J. Ames, Assistant Chief, Stationary Source Division
Peter D. Venturini, Chief, Stationary Source Division

Proposed Amendments to Air Resources Board Method 310 Reviewed By:

Michael Spears, Manager, Evaluation Section
George Lew, Chief, Engineering and Laboratory Branch
William V. Loscutoff, Chief, Monitoring and Laboratory Division

Date: May 5, 2000

Acknowledgments

This report on the proposed amendments to the Aerosol Coating Products Regulation, the Proposed Tables of MIR Values, and the Proposed Amendments to Method 310 were developed by the Air Resources Board Stationary Source and Monitoring and Laboratory Division staffs with the participation of industry representatives. We would particularly like to thank:

National Paint and Coatings Association
Chemical Manufacturers Association, Hydrocarbon Solvents Panel
Chemical Manufacturers Association
National Aerosol Association
Reactivity Scientific Advisory Committee
Reactivity Research Advisory Committee
Reactivity Subgroup of the Consumer Products Working Group,
Western Aerosol Information Bureau
Dr. William P. L. Carter, and
Mr. Doug Raymond, Sherwin-Williams, Consumer Group

The following Air Resources Board staff participated in the preparation of this report:

Principal Authors

Andrew Chew, M.S. (Lead)
Eric S.C. Kwok, Ph. D.
Carla D. Takemoto

Contributing Staff:

Pam Clymer	Terry Houston, Ph.D.
Wendy Howard	Robert C. Jenne, J.D.
Jacqueline Johnson	David Julian, P.E.
David Kemena	Robert Krieger
Reza Mahdavi, Ph.D.	Eileen McCauley, Ph.D.
Paul Milkey	Harry Ng
Randy Pasek, Ph.D.; P.E.	Kathy Spring
Floyd Vergara, P.E.	Eric Walton
Melinda Weaver	Dodie Weiner

Initial Statement of Reasons for the Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for Reducing Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Aerosol Coating Products and Proposed Tables of Maximum Incremental Reactivity (MIR) Values, and of Proposed Amendments to Method 310, “Determination of Volatile Organic Compounds in Consumer Products”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
A. Introduction	1
B. Summary of Proposed Rulemaking	2
C. Background and Staff Proposal	4
D. Effects of the Proposed Rulemaking	10
E. Regulatory Development Process and Evaluation of Alternatives.....	11
F. Compliance with the Proposed Amendments	12
G. Economic Impacts	14
H. Environmental Impacts	17
Recommendation.....	21
 TECHNICAL SUPPORT DOCUMENT	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Overview	1
B. Legislative History	1
C. Background	3
1. Consumer Product Regulations Adopted to Date.....	3
2. The State Implementation Plan.....	4
3. Comparable Federal Regulations.....	5
4. Use Of Photochemical Reactivity as a VOC Control Strategy	6
II. BACKGROUND ON THE SCIENCE OF VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUND PHOTOCHEMICAL REACTIVITY	8
A. Introduction	8
B. Background on the Science of Reactivity	8
C. Development of Methods to Compare VOC Reactivities.....	9
D. Appropriateness of the MIR Scale.....	12
E. Uncertainty of MIR Values	12
F. ARB’s Commitment to Reactivity-based Control Strategies.....	15
G. ARB’s Current Use of Reactivity	17
H. A Reactivity-based Regulation for Aerosol Coatings	18

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
III. OZONE FORMATION FROM AEROSOL COATING EMISSIONS.....	24
A. Emissions from Aerosol Coating Products Contribute to the Formation of Ozone in the Troposphere.....	24
B. Air Resources Board Emissions Survey	25
C. Summary of the Data from the 1997 Aerosol Coatings Survey.....	25
IV. USE OF PHOTOCHEMICAL REACTIVITY AS AN OZONE CONTROL APPROACH	30
A. Introduction.....	30
B. Program Elements.....	31
1. Using the Maximum Incremental Reactivity (MIR) Scale	31
2. Including “Exempt” Organic Compounds in Reactivity-based Regulations	31
3. Calculating Upper Limit MIR Values.....	32
4. Calculating Group MIR Values for Hydrocarbon Solvent Mixtures.....	32
5. Addressing Uncertainty in the Maximum Incremental Reactivity Scale	36
6. Calculating “Equal Air Quality Benefit” Reactivity Limits.....	37
V. PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE AEROSOL COATING PRODUCTS REGULATION, PROPOSED TABLES OF MAXIMUM INCREMENTAL REACTIVITY (MIR) VALUES, AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO AIR RESOURCES BOARD METHOD 310	42
A. Introduction.....	42
B. Role of the Reactivity Subgroup	42
C. Reactivity Research Advisory Committee (RRAC).....	43
D. Reactivity Scientific Advisory Committee (RSAC).....	44
E. Public Workshops, Aerosol Coatings Workgroups and Other Meetings	44
VI. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE AEROSOL COATING PRODUCTS REGULATION, PROPOSED TABLES OF MAXIMUM INCREMENTAL REACTIVITY (MIR) VALUES, AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO AIR RESOURCES BOARD METHOD 310.....	47
A. Introduction.....	47
B. Proposed Amendments to the Aerosol Coatings Regulation.....	48
1. Introduction	48
2. Proposed Amendments to Definitions, section 94521	49
3. Proposed Amendments to Standards and Requirements for Aerosol Coating Products, section 94522	51
4. Exemptions, section 94523.....	56
5. Administrative Requirements, section 94524.....	56

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
(VI. cont.)	
6. Test Methods, section 94526	57
C. Proposed New Subchapter 8.6, sections 94700-94701, Tables of MIR Values.....	57
D. Proposed Amendments to ARB Method 310, Determination of Volatile Organic Compounds in Consumer Products	58
 VII. TECHNOLOGICAL AND COMMERCIAL FEASIBILITY OF THE PROPOSED REACTIVITY LIMITS	60
A. Process of Setting Proposed Reactivity Limits	60
B. Technological and Commercial Feasibility	60
1. Technologically Feasible.....	60
2. Commercially Feasible.....	61
 VIII. REFORMULATION OPTIONS TO MEET THE PROPOSED REACTIVITY LIMITS.....	65
A. Product Formulation of Solvent-based Aerosol Coatings.....	66
B. Product Formulation of Water-based Aerosol Coatings.....	66
C. Reactivity-based Reformulation Strategies.....	67
1. Solvent-based Products	69
2. Water-based Products	69
D. Conclusion.....	70
 IX. DESCRIPTION OF AEROSOL COATINGS CATEGORIES AND PROPOSED REACTIVITY LIMITS.....	72
A. Description of the Seven Major Categories	73
1. Clear Coatings	74
2. Flat Paint Products	75
3. Fluorescent Coatings.....	77
4. Metallic Coatings	78
5. Non-Flat Paints	80
6. Primer Coatings	82
7. Ground Traffic/Marking Paints	83
B. Description of Remaining Specialty Categories	85
 X. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	90
A. Summary of Environmental Impacts	90
B. Legal Requirements Applicable to the Analysis	91
C. Compliance Alternatives.....	91
D. Potential Environmental Impacts	94
1. Impact on Ground-Level Ozone	94
2. Impact on Particulate Matter (Aerosols)	95
3. Impact on Global Warming	97
4. Impact on Stratospheric Ozone Depletion.....	98

Contents

Page

(X. cont.)

5.	Impacts on Water Quality and Solid Waste Disposal	99
E.	Other Potential Environmental Impacts	100
1.	Impact from Use of Toxic Air Contaminants	100
F.	Impacts on the State Implementation Plan for Ozone	105
1.	Background	105
2.	Summary of Findings	105
XI.	ECONOMIC IMPACTS	112
A.	Introduction	112
B.	Summary of Findings	113
C.	Economic Impacts Analysis on California Businesses as Required by the California Administrative Procedure Act (APA)	114
1.	Legal Requirements	114
2.	Findings	114
D.	Analysis of Potential Impacts to California State or Local Agencies	118
E.	Analysis of the Cost-Effectiveness and the Impacts on Per-Unit Cost of the Proposed Limits	118
1.	Introduction	118
2.	Methodology	118
3.	Assumptions	120
4.	Results	122
F.	Analysis of the Impacts to Raw Materials Cost	125
1.	Introduction	125
2.	Methodology	126
3.	Assumptions	126
4.	Results	126
G.	Analysis of the Combined Impacts on Per-Unit Cost from Recurring and Non-recurring Costs	128
1.	Introduction	128
2.	Methodology	129
3.	Results	129
XII.	FUTURE ACTIVITIES	133

APPENDICES

Title

APPENDIX A:	Proposed Amendments to the Aerosol Coating Products Regulation and Proposed Tables of MIRs Values
APPENDIX B:	Proposed Amendments to ARB Method 310
APPENDIX C:	Proposal to Establish Group MIR Values for Hydrocarbon Solvents
APPENDIX D:	Sample Calculation of Applying Maximum Incremental Reactivity (MIR) Values to an Aerosol Coating Product
APPENDIX E:	Upper Limit MIR Calculations (Examples)
APPENDIX F:	Dr. Carter's Table of MIRs with Uncertainty Factor Page
APPENDIX G:	Analysis of the Potential Impacts of Increased Use of Methylene Chloride
APPENDIX H:	Meeting Notices
APPENDIX I:	Raw Materials Cost Impacts Analysis

LIST OF TABLES

Title

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Table-1:	Proposed Limits for Aerosol Coating Products.....	3
Table-2:	Proposed Reactivity Limits and Complying Marketshares.....	13

TECHNICAL SUPPORT DOCUMENT

Table II-1:	Uncertainty Ranking and Description.....	14
Table III-1:	Summary of Data from the 1997 Aerosol Coatings Survey.....	27
Table III-2:	Summary of VOC Emissions and Target Ozone Reductions	28
Table IV-1:	Proposed Draft Approach for Assigning MIR Values to Aliphatic Hydrocarbon Solvents	35
Table IV-2:	Proposed Draft Approach for Assigning MIR Values to Aromatic Hydrocarbon Solvents	35
Table V-1:	Chronology of Reactivity Subgroup Meetings.....	43
Table V-2:	Chronology of RSAC Meetings	44
Table V-3:	Chronology of other Reactivity Meetings.....	46
Table VI-1:	Proposed Table of Reactivity Limits	53
Table VII-1:	Proposed Reactivity Limits and Complying Marketshares.....	62
Table VIII-1:	Classes of ROCs and Their MIRs.....	68
Table IX-1:	Clear Coatings	74
Table IX-2:	Clear Coatings Proposal.....	75
Table IX-3:	Flat Paint Products.....	76
Table IX-4:	Flat Paint Products Proposal.....	76
Table IX-5:	Fluorescent Coatings.....	77
Table IX-6:	Fluorescent Coatings Proposal	78

LIST OF TABLES (con't.)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table IX-7: Metallic Coatings.....	79
Table IX-8: Metallic Coatings Proposal	80
Table IX-9: Non-Flat Paints.....	81
Table IX-10: Non-Flat Paints Proposal.....	81
Table IX-11: Primer Coatings	82
Table IX-12: Primer Coatings Proposal.....	83
Table IX-13: Ground Traffic/Marking Paints	84
Table IX-14: Ground Traffic/Marking Paints Proposal.....	85
Table IX-15: Emissions Summary for 28 Specialty Categories.....	86
Table IX-16: Proposed Reactivity Limits and Compliance for 28 Specialty Categories	87
Table X-1: Methylene Chloride Emissions per Category.....	103
Table X-2: Results of SCREEN3 Modeling (Maximum Exposed Individual (MEI) at 20 meters).....	104
Table XI-1: Estimated Total Annualized Non-Recurring Fixed Costs to Comply with Proposed Limits	123
Table XI-2: Estimated Cost-Effectiveness for Proposed Limits	124
Table XI-3: Comparison of Cost-Effectiveness for Proposed Limits and Other ARB Consumer Product Regulations/Measures (adjusted to 1998 Dollars)	125
Table XI-4: Estimated Impacts to Raw Materials Cost Per Unit (\$/Unit of Product).....	127
Table XI-5: Comparison of Raw Materials Cost Impacts for the Proposed Limits and Other ARB Consumer Product Regulations (unadjusted dollars)	128
Table XI-6: Estimated Per-Unit Cost Increases from Both Annualized Non-Recurring and Annual Recurring Costs	130

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure VIII-1: Solvent-based Aerosol Coating Product	66
Figure VIII-2: Water-based Aerosol Coating Product.....	67
Figure X-1: Impact of Reactivity Compliance Option on Target Ozone Reduction.....	93

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE REGULATION FOR
REDUCING VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUND EMISSIONS
FROM AEROSOL COATING PRODUCTS,
AND
PROPOSED TABLES OF MAXIMUM INCREMENTAL
REACTIVITY (MIR) VALUES,
AND
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO METHOD 310,
“DETERMINATION OF VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS
IN CONSUMER PRODUCTS”**