Air Resources Board
Stationary Source Division
Workshop Summary

Workshop: Architectural Coatings

Date: September 8, 1999

Location: Diamond Bar, California

Purpose: To receive comments on the 8/19/99 revision of proposed changes to the Suggested Control Measure for Architectural Coatings (SCM).

Attendees: The workshop was attended by over 60 people representing paint manufacturers, painting contractors and other users, ingredient and equipment manufacturers, public agencies, consultants, U.S. EPA, districts, and industry associations.

Key Points: The SCM will focus on the South Coast Air Quality Management District 2001 and 2002 volatile organic compound (VOC) limits. Board consideration of the SCM has been postponed until April 2000. Companies were encouraged to schedule meetings with ARB to share data relevant to the proposed VOC limits.

Definitions discussed were: aerosol coating, bituminous roof, colorant, clear brushing lacquer, fire retardant, industrial maintenance, low solids, metallic pigmented, multi-color, nonflat, roof, rust preventative, sealer, shellac, specialty primer, shop application, tint base, VOC, quick-dry, and wood preservative.

VOC limits discussed were: bituminous roof, roof, industrial maintenance, anti-graffiti, flat, nonflat, floor, asphalt primer, swimming pool repair and maintenance, and stain.

SCM sections discussed were: applicability; most restrictive VOC limit; prohibitions regarding industrial maintenance and rust preventative coatings and thinning; container labeling requirements; sell-through provision; no new use of toxic exempt compounds; date code reporting requirements; labeling provisions for maximum VOC, clear brushing lacquers, and quick-dry products; and reference table for analogous National Rule and SCM categories.

Concern was expressed about the safety of acetone. Some manufacturers said t-butyl acetate, which the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency may soon exempt from the VOC definition, will be an excellent replacement solvent. District delays in amending rules to include newly-exempted solvents create distribution problems for manufacturers.

Comments suggested that ARB should advise districts that future effective dates should be used if the district rule is adopted near the effective date of the SCM.

Manufacturers requested that ARB conduct a workshop in late October on the averaging compliance option.

Manufacturers and industry groups expressed concern about how they would meet customers' performance expectations with low VOC coatings in several categories. They asked for clarification regarding ARB's criteria for determining technological feasibility, and requirements for supporting data.

A district Air Pollution Control Officer shared the difficulties faced by nonattainment districts in meeting both the federal and State ozone standards. He believes that ARB historically adopts technology-forcing standards that come to fruition.