November 12, 2026

Submitted via regulations.gov

Rudolf Abdelmessih
Industrial Processing and Power Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Air and Radiation
Research Triangle Park, NC 27711

Re: Reconsideration of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Gasoline Distribution Technology Reviews and New Source Performance Standards Review for Bulk Gasoline Terminals [Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2025-0302]

Dear Mr. Abdelmessih:

The Energy Marketers of America ("EMA") commends the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or "Agency") for reconsidering certain emission standards applicable to gasoline distribution facilities under the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants ("NESHAP") and New Source Performance Standards ("NSPS") programs of the Clean Air Act ("CAA").[1] EMA appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the cargo tank vapor tightness certification requirements, which enable fuel marketers to load and transport fuel to retail outlets and consumers across the country.

EMA is a federation of 48 state and regional trade associations representing family-owned and operated small business energy marketers throughout the United States. As a vital link in the supply chain, EMA marketers supply 80 percent of all finished motor and heating fuel products sold nationwide, including gasoline, diesel, biofuels, heating fuel, jet fuel, kerosene, racing fuel, and lubricating oils. EMA marketers distribute motor fuels in cargo tank vehicles to approximately 40,000 gas stations and operate an additional 60,000 retail locations. As key stakeholders in gasoline distribution, EMA marketers are directly affected by the cargo tank vapor tightness standards at issue in this rulemaking and are well positioned to provide practical insight into their operational and economic consequences.

---

[1] Environmental Protection Agency, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Gasoline Distribution Facilities and Standards of Performance for Bulk Gasoline Terminals Reconsideration, 91 Fed. Reg. 61175 (Sept. 28, 2026) (hereinafter the "Proposed Rule").

Cargo tank vapor tightness certification plays a critical role not only in controlling volatile organic compound emissions, but also in maintaining operational continuity across the gasoline supply chain. Maintaining the uninterrupted distribution of fuel throughout the nation is critical to energy security and resilience, particularly at a time of geopolitical uncertainty affecting petroleum markets. While EMA supports emission reduction objectives, regulatory measures must be grounded in operational reality, feasibility, and cost-effectiveness. On that basis, EMA supports EPA's proposal to set the vapor tightness standards in all gasoline distribution rules at graduated limits of 1.0 to 2.5 inches of water column, based on cargo tank compartment capacity, as originally required under NESHAP subpart R prior to the rule change in 2024.

As detailed below, the 2024 harmonization of the vapor tightness certification standards at 0.5 to 1.25 inches of water pressure drop represents an unnecessary burden on fuel transportation. Given testing precision limits, estimated failure rates, and economic impacts of the 2024 standard, EMA urges the Agency to finalize a harmonized standard of 1.0 to 2.5 inches of water pressure drop over a five-minute period across all regulatory programs subject to this rulemaking. To provide regulatory certainty and allow for adequate compliance planning, EMA encourages EPA to finalize the rulemaking as soon as possible, and to provide narrow compliance relief while the rulemaking is completed.

I. The 2024 Rule Failed to Adequately Consider the Universe of Cargo Tank Motor Vehicles Impacted by the 0.5-inch Vapor Tightness Standard.

On May 8, 2024, EPA finalized its reviews of the NESHAP and NSPS for gasoline distribution facilities and adopted a graduated cargo tank vapor tightness requirement ranging from 0.5 to 1.25 inches of water pressure drop over five minutes, depending on cargo tank compartment capacity. For compartments of 2,500 gallons or more, the applicable annual certification standard is a maximum allowable pressure or vacuum change of 0.5 inches of water over five minutes. The 2024 Rule, however, did not take a hard look at the operational diversity of the cargo tank fleet that must comply with this highly sensitive standard. EMA commends the Agency for identifying this aspect of the regulation as an item for reconsideration.

A. <u>The 2024 Rule Did Not Adequately Account for MC-306 Cargo Tanks When Setting the Standard.</u>

Although the graduated standard is based on compartment size, many fuel marketers must comply with a 0.5-inch standard in practice. Gasoline is transported in atmospheric cargo tanks constructed primarily to the MC-306 or DOT-406 specifications. MC-306 cargo tanks were manufactured until 1995, when the DOT-406 specification superseded them. Both specification cargo tanks are widely used for petroleum transportation and commonly consist of multiple compartments with average aggregate capacities of 9,000 to 9,500 gallons, many of which include

compartments of 2,500 gallons or more. For those cargo tank vehicles, the 2024 Rule establishes a 0.5-inch threshold.

The 2024 Rule did not consider the scale of the relevant fleet impacted by a 0.5-inch vapor tightness threshold during the standard-setting process. Indeed, the 2024 analyses did not account for the continued use of MC-306 cargo tanks. Although DOT-406 became the successor specification in 1995, MC-306 tanks did not disappear from the commercial fleet when production of the specification ceased. Older tanks remain in service subject to applicable inspection, testing, and maintenance requirements. EMA conducted a survey of its membership and found that 42 percent of the 65 respondents operate MC-306 cargo tanks. The Cargo Tank Registration database maintained by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration also shows that there are hundreds of "active" registered facilities that perform services associated with MC-306 cargo tanks.[2] The 2024 Rule did not consider these data to evaluate whether the standard is reliably achievable nationwide across the population of existing cargo tank motor vehicles.

B. The Scale of the Affected Fleet Underscores the Need for a Reliably Achievable Standard.

The 2024 Rule's failure to properly characterize the impacted cargo tank fleet affects the feasibility foundation of the standard itself. EMA provides data points below to facilitate a fleet-level analysis that supports the Agency's proposed vapor tightness threshold and to correct the record underlying the 2024 standard.

In a recent rulemaking addressing placarding requirements for cargo tank vehicles, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration ("PHMSA") estimated that approximately 171,136 cargo tank vehicles are used to transport petroleum distillate fuels, including gasoline.[3] Although this figure encompasses cargo tanks transporting several liquid petroleum commodities, it reflects the scale of the commercial fleet potentially implicated by the standard for two reasons. First, gasoline is by far the most-consumed petroleum product in the United States.[4] Second, the next most-consumed commodity, distillate fuel oil, is frequently transported in the same cargo tank motor vehicles through split loads.[5] Accordingly, while PHMSA's estimate is not a count of the cargo tanks subject to the vapor tightness requirements, it

[2] Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Cargo Tank Facility Registration Search, available at https://safer.fmcsa.dot.gov/mcs150t/pkg_ct_public.prc_ct_public_search.
[3] Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Hazardous Materials: Eliminating Unnecessary Regulatory Burdens on Fuel Transportation, Regulatory Impact Analysis (PHMSA-2018-0080), available at https://www.regulations.gov/document/PHMSA-2018-0080-0053.
[4] Energy Information Administration, Oil and petroleum products explained: Use of oil (noting that consumption of finished motor gasoline represents about 43% of total U.S. petroleum consumption), available at https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/oil-and-petroleum-products/use-of-oil.php.
[5] *Id.*

illustrates the scale of the fleet potentially affected and provides a reasonable starting point for estimating the cost implications of the standard.

In sum, the 2024 Rule did not meaningfully evaluate whether the 0.5-inch threshold is achievable and reliably measurable across the actual population of gasoline cargo tanks, including older MC-306 tanks that remain in service. Because adequately characterizing the affected fleet is important to evaluating the feasibility of the standard — as required by the CAA and principles of reasoned decision-making — EPA is properly exercising its discretion to reconsider this issue. In the sections that follow, EMA provides further detail on the burden and reliability implications of the 0.5-inch standard, and explains why it supports a harmonized standard of 1.0 to 2.5 inches of water pressure drop over a five-minute period.

II. EPA's Revision is Grounded in Law and Sound Policy Because It Considers Feasibility and Cost-Effectiveness in Setting the Standard.

EPA's proposed revision rests on sound statutory footing. For the NESHAP, section 112(d)(6) of the CAA directs EPA to review and revise emission standards "as necessary," taking into account developments in practices, processes, and control technologies. For the NSPS, section 111(b)(1)(B) directs EPA to review and, if appropriate, revise standards of performance. In the preamble of the Proposed Rule, EPA explains that the reported precision of Method 27 is 0.5 inches of water column, that small temperature changes during testing can produce pressure changes of that magnitude, and that the Agency lacks evidence that the 0.5-inch threshold can be accurately and consistently demonstrated under actual operating conditions nationwide.[6] On that basis, EPA concludes that the additional stringency adopted in 2024 is not achievable in practice nationwide, is likely not cost-effective, and therefore was not necessary under section 112(d)(6). EMA's testing and cost data, summarized below, provide additional real-world support for those findings.

As explained above, gasoline cargo tanks must conform to a substantially more stringent standard under the 2024 Rule. Recent tightness tests illustrate the impracticability of certifying to the new standard. EMA has engaged with cargo tank testing and repair companies across multiple states, and their data indicate that the 0.5-inch threshold imposes significant burdens without a corresponding environmental benefit. The following section details these operational impacts and supports EPA's proposed 1.0- to 2.5-inch threshold, recognizing that most marketers would have to comply with a 1.0-inch standard for the same reasons explained in Section I.

[6] *See* Proposed Rule at 61194.

A. The 0.5-Inch Threshold is Unreliably Sensitive, Overlooks Testing Limits, Ignores Ambient Temperature Factors, and Produces False Failures.

EPA Method 27, the test method incorporated by reference in the relevant regulations, measures pressure decay using field equipment that is inherently sensitive to ambient temperature, barometric pressure, and even minor thermal gradients within the cargo tank shell. A cargo tank sitting in direct sunlight, or one moved from an unheated storage yard into a warmer test bay, can register a pressure change attributable to gas expansion or contraction rather than to any leak in the tank's structural integrity. In addition, as EPA recognizes in the proposal, temperature variation can affect the testing protocol. At a 0.5-inch threshold, these variabilities can routinely exceed the margin between a passing and a failing result, effectively setting the compliance standard too close to the reliable precision of the test method itself. These factors are important when assessing the feasibility and practicability of the nationwide standard.

Because "the current vapor pressure limits are set at a value equal to the precision level of the test method," the standard creates a substantial risk of false failures under ordinary field testing conditions.[7] In other words, a standard that risks producing significant false failures, without a corresponding air quality benefit, is not "necessary" within the meaning of the CAA. It would only impose redundant testing efforts, unnecessary equipment repairs, and operational downtime, adding undue stress to the gasoline distribution network.

Results from six cargo tank tightness tests conducted between May 2025 and March 2026 on DOT-406 and MC-306 tanks show this dynamic. In five of the six tests, the tank recorded a pressure loss of 0.52 to 0.58 inches of water on its first attempt — exceeding the 0.5-inch threshold — and required a second or, in three instances, a third test run to achieve certification. All five of those tanks would have passed on the first run under a 1.0-inch standard. Notably, in five of the six tests, the corrective action recorded to achieve final certification was additional "equalization time," meaning the tank required additional time to stabilize between test runs, rather than the repair or replacement of a component responsible for vapor leakage. These results demonstrate that, at 0.5 inches, the standard can produce false failures attributable to testing artifacts, such as ambient temperature and pressure equalization, and raise substantial questions about whether it reliably distinguishes genuine vapor leaks from ordinary testing variability.[8]

Accordingly, given the precision of EPA Method 27 and the ambient temperature variability inherent in field testing conditions, EMA supports EPA's revision to the cargo tank vapor tightness standard as sound policy and more closely aligned with the lawful exercise of the Agency's discretion. A standard that produces false failures as an inherent feature of the regulatory regime is neither necessary nor reasonable.

These data also respond to EPA's request for comment on the precision of Method 27, the lowest pressure or vacuum change that can be accurately assessed in practice, particularly in extreme temperatures, and potential alternative vapor tightness standards.[9] EMA's data show first-run results clustered just above the 0.5-inch limit that resolved with additional equalization time, and testing providers report that weather variability and inadequate equalization routinely cause

[7] *Id.*
[8] *See* "Cargo Tank Testing Results Summary" in Attachment A.
[9] *See* Proposed Rule at 61196 (Comment C-18).

otherwise compliant tanks to fail initial runs. Although these data do not establish a single numerical floor for the reliable performance of Method 27 under all field conditions, they support EPA's determination that the proposed graduated limits of 1.0 to 2.5 inches are more reliably achievable under actual field conditions nationwide.

B. False Failures Drive Meaningful Repair and Retesting Costs.

In addition, testing data collected by EMA marketers and independent cargo tank testing companies indicate that the 0.5-inch standard increases retesting costs and may implicate equipment replacement even on cargo tank vehicles that present no genuine vapor leak. Measurable operational, technical, and economic impacts have been observed by multiple testing companies that EMA has engaged with.

For example, a tightness test conducted in Arizona on a 2017 DOT-406 cargo tank vehicle required extensive component replacement, including all manway lid and cover gaskets, tubing, and all pressure-vacuum (PV) vents across all four compartments, followed by multiple retests to achieve certification. The total cost of testing and repairs was more than twice the cost of annual vapor tightness testing conducted under prior certification requirements. The total additional certification expenses for that marketer, which operates 77 units, were estimated at close to $60,000.[10] Similarly, tests conducted in Minnesota and Wisconsin indicate that the increased sensitivity of the 0.5-inch threshold requires "multiple equilibration cycles, additional diagnostics, and often parts replacements even when no true defect exists."[11] According to the testing facility, longer testing times and additional parts replacement may increase costs by up to $1,500 per trailer, not including lost revenue attributable to operational downtime.

Additional information collected by Fueling Minnesota, a state association member of EMA, illustrates the incremental costs associated with the 0.5-inch standard.[12] Based on information provided by a cargo tank testing and repair facility, replacement components that may be necessary to achieve the tighter threshold — including normal vents, ten-inch fill gaskets, API head poppet O-rings, and flange gaskets — were estimated to cost between $60 and approximately $200, with associated repair and retesting labor estimated at $303.75 to $540.00. These estimates indicate potential incremental certification expenses of approximately $364 to $740 per tank compared with certification at 1.0 inch. Although these estimates are not necessarily representative of every cargo tank configuration, they illustrate the additional costs that marketers may incur solely to satisfy the more stringent requirement.

A separate cargo tank testing and repair provider reported measurable operational, technical, and economic impacts across multiple cargo tank configurations since the 0.5-inch standard took effect. For DOT-406 tanks, the provider reported that the physical design generally allows compliance with fewer hardware changes, but that the tolerance under the new standard is extremely tight and highly sensitive to ambient temperature and pressure fluctuations. In practice, achieving two consecutive passing test runs at 0.5 inches often requires multiple additional test

[10] *See* Proposed Rule Docket Documents, Meeting Record for meetings between Representatives of Energy Marketers of America (EMA) and Representatives of OAQPS (U.S. EPA) and letter from EMA, available at https://www.regulations.gov/document/EPA-HQ-OAR-2025-0302-0007.
[11] *Id.*
[12] *See* "Summary of Fueling Minnesota Cost Information" in Attachment B.

runs, which the provider estimated has increased testing time by approximately one hour per unit on average, with the potential for significantly longer delays during winter conditions. Unless test equipment can be staged indoors and allowed sufficient time to equalize to facility temperature and pressure, external weather conditions routinely cause otherwise compliant tanks to fail initial runs.

For MC-306 tanks, the same provider reported that the impacts are more substantial, as many units already operate close to the minimum allowable pressure limits under existing DOT requirements. As a result, the provider is increasingly required to replace standard normal vents (such as the Betts 6238 series) simply to meet the new test threshold, even where those vents remain fully compliant with existing DOT specifications. These tanks also often require extended stabilization time to maintain test pressure within the new limits. Based on the provider's experience to date, a DOT-406 tank may incur approximately $500 in additional cost to reliably pass the 0.5-inch requirement, while an MC-306 tank will typically incur $500 to $1,500 in added expense, particularly where vapor recovery vents must be installed or upgraded.

The most severe impacts, according to the provider, occur with older MC-306 tanks equipped with pushrod-style vents. When these units fail under the new standard, compliance may require internal compartment entry to remove pushrods, followed by conversion to newer air-operated vapor recovery vents. Because these components are frequently not direct-mount replacements, compliance can necessitate additional structural modifications, such as installing sumps, converting manways, and modifying vapor rails. When required, these repairs are estimated to exceed $5,000 — often surpassing the remaining value of the tank and effectively forcing the unit out of service. In such a scenario, the compliance pathway may be tank replacement.

C. Unnecessary Downtime from the 0.5-Inch Threshold Constrains Gasoline Distribution Capacity.

The challenges described above result in significant inefficiencies across the fuels sector by causing artificial operational downtime. False failure indications, extended equalization time, and unnecessary repairs build a compounding backlog at certified testing facilities. As a result, critical energy transportation assets sit in test bays instead of delivering gasoline. This bottleneck can disrupt the fuels distribution network.

Energy marketers rely on continuous, predictable use of their fleets to prevent localized fuel shortages. Every cargo tank pulled from service for extended diagnostics or unnecessary component upgrades reduces delivery capacity. For a typical marketer operating dozens of trailers, the combination of extended testing times, multiple retest runs, and parts backlogs removes essential multi-compartment DOT-406 and MC-306 units from active distribution networks. At a time when the energy sector is stressed, unfeasible requirements that remove cargo tanks from service without a corresponding environmental benefit have the real potential to constrain transportation networks and exert upward pressure on fuel prices. Simply put, forcing trucks off the road for "equalization time" that serves no environmental purpose reduces delivery capacity

and can delay fuel deliveries to retail stations and consumers, particularly in winter and in regions with limited testing capacity.

D. EPA's Economic Analysis Should Consider the Benefits of the Proposed Feasible Standard.

EMA recognizes that EPA's economic analysis does not project net cost changes attributable to the proposed revision of the cargo tank vapor tightness requirements.[13] EMA supports the conclusion that the projected cost savings attributed to recovered product value under the 2024 pressure limits are not attainable.[14] Nevertheless, EPA should consider that fuel marketers have incurred and continue to face additional costs attempting to certify to the 0.5-inch standard, and the information presented in these comments identifies actual and anticipated compliance expenditures that restoring the prior standards would avoid. EMA therefore urges EPA to consider these savings in the final rule and to quantify them to the extent the available evidence permits.

These savings provide further support for the proposed revision, even if the Agency retains its existing analytical baseline. The data above provide a basis for quantifying them. The per-tank estimates above come from different testing providers and should be treated as alternative, illustrative estimates rather than additive cost categories. Applying representative, rather than exceptional, per-tank costs to an appropriately defined population of gasoline cargo tanks subject to annual certification would allow EPA to estimate both the recurring annual certification savings of the proposed revision and the one-time costs avoided for vent conversions, other equipment modifications, and premature tank retirement, as well as avoided downtime. EMA would welcome the opportunity to work with EPA staff on that estimate.

III. EPA Should Provide Interim Compliance Relief from the 2024 Cargo Tank Vapor Tightness Requirements While This Rulemaking Is Completed.

Although EPA has not proposed specific changes to the compliance dates established by the 2024 Rule, the Agency has requested comment on the appropriateness of those dates.[15] To preserve regulatory certainty and avoid irreversible compliance costs while EPA completes this reconsideration action, EMA urges the Agency to provide timely compliance relief from the 0.5-inch standard. EMA does not seek to suspend the longstanding obligation to maintain and certify cargo tank vapor tightness. Rather, EMA requests that the more stringent certification limits adopted in 2024 not become enforceable while EPA completes its reconsideration, with the previously applicable limits remaining in effect during that period.

---

[13] *See* Proposed Rule Docket Documents, Economic Impact Analysis for the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Gasoline Distribution Technology Review and Standards of Performance for Bulk Gasoline Terminals Review: Reconsideration Proposal, pg. 16 (EPA-HQ-OAR-2025-0302-0024) ("The proposed revision of the vapor tightness requirements for gasoline cargo tanks is not expected to result in compliance cost changes because the 2024 final rule standard is now considered to be infeasible").

[14] *See* Proposed Rule at 61195.

[15] *See* Proposed Rule at 61196 (Comment C-20).

Specifically, EMA requests that EPA extend the NESHAP subparts R and BBBBBB compliance dates applicable to the cargo tank vapor tightness requirements, currently May 8, 2027, by at least one year. EMA urges EPA to adopt that extension promptly through a separate action, using an appropriate and legally available procedure.[16] Given the annual certification cycle and the lead time required for testing and equipment modifications, EMA urges EPA to act on this request sufficiently in advance of May 8, 2027, to prevent marketers from incurring the very costs that the proposed reconsideration is intended to avoid. Under the current compliance schedule, 40 C.F.R. § 63.425(e) requires facilities to meet the tighter certification limits "as expeditiously as practicable."[17] Thus, terminals have already begun requiring certification to the 0.5-inch standard well ahead of the compliance deadline to ensure "the entire fleet of gasoline cargo tanks would have certifications at the lower level" by May 8, 2027.[18] Any extension should therefore make clear that federal law does not require certification to the more stringent limits before the extended compliance date, and that certifications under the previously applicable limits satisfy the applicable federal requirements until that date.

With respect to the NSPS, EMA requests that EPA issue interim enforcement guidance recognizing the Agency's findings on Method 27 precision and the practical achievability of the 0.5-inch threshold. Because enforcement guidance does not amend regulatory requirements or bind state authorities, EMA urges EPA to pursue legally effective regulatory relief wherever feasible. Importantly, if prompt enforcement relief is not granted, EPA should establish a 180-day compliance window following the startup date before the vapor tightness certification requirement takes effect, giving regulated facilities and cargo tank fleet operators sufficient time to coordinate and adjust.

Compliance takes time. Cargo tanks are certified annually, and marketers must rotate dozens of units through a limited number of certified testing and repair facilities, often scheduling months in advance. Without timely relief, many marketers will begin certifying to the 0.5-inch standard, and incur the repair, retesting, and downtime costs described above, before EPA finalizes this revision. If EPA then adopts a 1.0- to 2.5-inch threshold, those costs will have been incurred to comply with a standard EPA itself has proposed to find unnecessary.

A compliance pause pending final action serves several important goals. First, it gives marketers, testing facilities, and state enforcement personnel certainty about their obligations while the standard is under reconsideration. Second, it prevents costs that small business marketers cannot recover if the standard changes, such as premature tank replacement and unnecessary

[16] To the extent the much-needed one-year delay is not separately adopted, EPA should address the compliance dates in the final reconsideration rule.
[17] 40 C.F.R. § 63.425.
[18] National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Gasoline Distribution Technology Reviews and New Source Performance Standards Review for Bulk Gasoline Terminals, 89 Fed. Reg. 39327 (May 8, 2024) (Final Rule).

component upgrades. Third, it eases pressure on already backlogged testing and repair facilities, keeping cargo tanks in service while fuel supply chains remain strained. Fourth, it carries little environmental risk, because cargo tanks would remain subject to the vapor tightness requirements that applied for decades before the 2024 Rule. Finally, it protects the integrity of this rulemaking by ensuring that EPA's reconsideration delivers meaningful relief, rather than arriving after the regulated community has already absorbed the burden it was meant to avoid.

IV. Conclusion

EMA commends EPA for reconsidering the 2024 cargo tank vapor tightness standard and urges the Agency to finalize a harmonized threshold of 1.0 to 2.5 inches of water pressure drop over five minutes across all applicable regulatory programs. The 0.5-inch standard adopted in 2024 was not grounded in a realistic assessment of the affected fleet, overstates the precision of EPA Method 27 under field conditions, and imposes repair, retesting, and downtime costs that bear no proportionate relationship to any air quality benefit. EMA's member data indicate that false failures, rather than genuine vapor leaks, can contribute materially to the compliance burden under the current standard.

EPA's proposed revision corrects that analytical record and restores a threshold that is both reliably achievable and consistent with the Agency's statutory obligations under the Clean Air Act. EMA respectfully urges EPA to finalize the revised standard, consider the compliance cost savings of the proposal, and promptly provide interim relief pending final action. Timely action will prevent irreversible compliance costs, preserve distribution capacity, and ensure that the final rule delivers the regulatory certainty that fuel marketers, testing facilities, and enforcement authorities need.

Please contact EMA's regulatory counsel, Jeffrey Leiter (jleiter@bmalaw.net) or Jorge Roman (jroman@bmalaw.net), if you have any questions on this submission.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Underwood

President

Energy Marketers of America

EPA Method 27 Cargo Tank Vapor Tightness Testing — Summary of Results

Source: EMA Member Data | Attachment A to EMA Comments on EPA Docket

Serial Number	Date of Test	Tank Type	Year of Trailer	Work Order Number	Failed Pressure Measurement (in. H_2O)	Failed Pressure Loss (in. H_2O)	Final Pass Pressure Measurement (in. H_2O)	Final Pass Pressure Loss (in. H_2O)	Notes	Needed Repairs
8NT003221	05/28/2025	DOT-406	2021	317538	1st: 16.61 2nd: 17.45	1st: 1.39 2nd: 0.55	17.85	0.15	Would have passed on 2nd run; required 3rd run to pass under 2024 Final Rule standards.	Equalization time
K7H54694	06/06/2025	MC-306	1989	317998	17.42	0.58	17.91	0.09	Would have passed on 1st run.	Equalization time
00-10698	12/30/2025	DOT-406	2022	326161	1st: 17.15 2nd: 17.56	1st: 0.85 2nd: 0.54	17.96	0.04	Would have passed on 2nd run; required 3rd run to pass under 2024 Final Rule standards.	Equalization time
R7127954	03/11/2026	DOT-406	2024	329407	17.48	0.52	17.98	0.02	Would have passed on 1st run.	Equalization time
T001603	03/12/2026	DOT-406	2004	329409	1st: 14.41 2nd: 17.30	1st: 3.59 2nd: 0.70	18.21	−0.21	Would have passed on 2nd run; required 3rd run to pass under 2024 Final Rule standards.	Equalization time
T000503	03/13/2026	DOT-406	2002	329408	1st: 12.48 2nd: 17.41	1st: 5.52 2nd: 0.59	17.85	0.15	Would have passed on 2nd run; required 3rd run to pass under 2024 Final Rule standards.	Vapor leaks

Notes: All pressure measurements in inches of water column (in. H_2O). Pass criterion under the 2024 Final Rule: pressure loss ≤ 0.5 in. H_2O. Pass criterion under original NESHAP Subpart R: pressure loss ≤ 1.0 in. H_2O. "Equalization time" refers to additional time required between test runs for internal pressure to stabilize; tanks that require multiple runs due to equalization delay would have passed on an earlier run under the original Subpart R standard.

ATTACHMENT B

Summary of Cargo Tank Testing Cost Information

Provided by Fueling Minnesota Member Facilities

At the request of Fueling Minnesota, two cargo tank testing and repair facilities estimated the incremental costs and operational impacts attributable to the 0.5-inch pressure loss standard under the 2024 Final Rule. The information below represents direct facility-level observations and is submitted to supplement the cost discussion in EMA's comments.

Facility 1 — Incremental Parts and Labor Costs (Minnesota)

A cargo tank testing facility tracked the cost difference between achieving compliance at the 1.0-inch threshold versus the 0.5-inch threshold. The facility identified the following replacement components as commonly required to meet the tighter standard: normal vents, ten-inch fill gaskets, API head poppet O-rings, and flange gaskets.

Cost Category	Range
Replacement parts	$60 – ~$200
Repair and retesting labor	$303.75 – $540.00
Total incremental cost per tank	**$363.75 – $740.00**

Note: These figures represent incremental costs above what would have been required to certify at the 1.0-inch standard. They do not include costs attributable to operational downtime.

Facility 2 — Operational and Equipment Impacts (Multi-State)

A second cargo tank testing and repair provider documented the following observations across multiple cargo tank configurations since the 0.5-inch standard took effect.

DOT-406 Tanks. The standard's sensitivity to ambient temperature and pressure fluctuations frequently requires multiple additional test runs to achieve two consecutive passing results. Average additional testing time is approximately one hour per unit, with significantly longer delays in cold-weather conditions unless equipment is staged and stabilized indoors. Estimated additional cost: approximately $500 per unit.

MC-306 Tanks. Many units operate near minimum allowable DOT pressure limits, requiring replacement of standard normal vents (e.g., Betts 6238 series) even where those vents remain fully DOT-compliant. Extended stabilization time is frequently required. Estimated additional cost: $500 to $1,500 per unit, particularly where vapor recovery vents must be installed or upgraded.

Older MC-306 Tanks with Push-Rod Vents. When these units fail under the new standard, compliance may require internal compartment entry, pushrod removal, and conversion to air-operated vapor recovery vents. Because these are not direct-mount replacements, structural modifications — including sump installation, manway conversion, and vapor rail modification — are often necessary. Estimated cost when required: in excess of $5,000, frequently exceeding the remaining value of the unit. In such cases, the practical compliance pathway is tank retirement and replacement.

This attachment summarizes information received directly from Fueling Minnesota member facilities. Supporting test data are available upon request.